

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING, TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY, FEBRUARY 2, 2005,
TOWN CENTER, HISTORIC SCHOOLHOUSE, 765 PORTOLA ROAD, PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028

Chairman Breon called the meeting to order at 8:02 p.m. Ms. Lambert called the roll:

Present: Commissioners Elkind, McIntosh, Wengert and Zaffaroni, and Chairman Breon
Absent: None
Staff Present: Tom Vlastic, Dep. Town Planner
Leslie Lambert, Planning Manager
Richard Merk, Council Liaison
Sandy Sloan, Town Attorney

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Virginia Bacon, Golden Oak, said the agenda and supporting material for tonight's meeting were not posted on the Town's website until 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon. That was unfortunate and diluted the efforts of the Town Planner who had the material ready. She asked that all items pertinent to important policy sessions such as this one be placed on the Town's website no later than when hard copy was available to the public.

REGULAR AGENDA

(1) PUBLIC HEARING: Modification of Open Space Easement, 16 Buck Meadow Drive, Lopez

Mr. Vlastic reviewed the staff report of 1/27/05 on the request to swap equal areas of open space easement and building envelope relative to lot 33 of the Blue Oaks subdivision. Responding to Chairman Breon, he confirmed that the lawn and any ornamentals that were in the area to be added to the open space easement would be removed. There were some oaks that had been planted that were consistent with the adjacent open space area which would remain.

John Lopez, applicant, said the Council had been concerned with setting a precedent. He felt that had been addressed by the language in the PUD that related to the lot. Mr. Vlastic confirmed for Chairman Breon that there had not been any other similar requests. The language in the PUD recognized the constraints to this parcel; that was a key issue in terms of supporting the request.

Responding to Councilmember Merk, Mr. Vlastic said one of the preliminary documents showed the area to be added to the open space easement was 3,000 sf; more detailed engineering review showed it was 3,500 sf as shown in the exhibits.

Commissioner Elkind moved to find the project categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15305, Class 5 of the CEQA guidelines. Commissioner McIntosh seconded, and the motion carried 5-0.

Commissioner Elkind moved to: 1) find the easement modifications consistent with the Blue Oaks PUD; and 2) recommend that the Town Council approve the documents necessary to record the easement changes, subject to conditions "a" and "b" set forth in the 1/27/05 staff report. Commissioner Zaffaroni seconded the motion. Chairman Breon said it should also be noted that the Commission did not want to set a precedent of moving around building envelopes; this property was treated separately under the PUD as indicated in the staff report. He called for a vote, and the motion carried 5-0.

(2) PUBLIC HEARING (Continued): Conditional Use Permit Application X7D-30, 302 Portola Road, Woodside Priory

Commissioner Zaffaroni stepped down from the Commission due to the proximity of her residence to the Priory.

Mr. Vlasic reviewed the staff report of 1/27/05 and responses to public input and commission discussion/direction provided at the 1/19/05 hearing. Since the staff report, correspondence had been received from: 1) Mazzetti supporting the proposal; 2) Kate Greswold dated 1/31/05; 3) Amanda Davison dated 2/1/05; and 4) the Public Works Director on drainage. He noted that the conditions had been modified to address some of the clarity issues raised by the applicant.

With respect to drainage, Mr. Vlasic said when the Initial Study was first completed and the project presented in July, the main focus had been to ensure that the increased runoff would be maintained on site and would not change the existing condition. Based on review and public input, it had been determined that existing drainage problems had not been clarified to the extent they might need to be. There was a concern that the existing 36" pipe that drained from Kalman Field to Corte Madera Creek would be impacted and have to be changed. In light of that concern, the plan before the Commission was specifically directed at ensuring that that pipe not be changed and that the retention system in Kalman, which was for those rare but significant storm events, was protected. An easement had been drafted to ensure that the retention basin stayed and was maintained. There was also a condition that said before any improvements were done, the Priory had to do a detailed internal water flow/storm drainage plan to ensure that the water found its way properly to this retention facility. That was specifically to address existing on-site flooding conditions and make sure that the water was either dispersed on site or conveyed in a proper way to a retention facility. This had been discussed at length with the Public Works Director. His memo indicated that all of the environmental consultant's work had been submitted to an independent reviewer who advised him that they were supportive of the design and approach and that there was no significant change in the outflow into Corte Madera Creek.

The Town Geologist's office was also supportive of the plan to retain water on site and ensure that there was no significant change in the outflow to the creek. In terms of the creek itself, he said the facilities around the 36" outfall, the bridge at Grove Drive, and the improvements at Portola Road and Willowbrook Drive had all been completed—largely in conformity with the 1970 drainage plan. Improvements downstream at Westridge had also been completed. Those public bridges had all been improved to accommodate the flows that were anticipated with that earlier plan. This work was completed in the late 1980s and after the 1982-83 storms. There had been some water impacts with the 1998 El Nino, which had been identified as a 70-year storm. According to the Public Works Director, the majority of the improvements called for under the earlier plan had been completed; the key issue from his standpoint was that both the public and private facilities needed to be continually maintained to make sure that any siltation, blocking, etc., were taken care of. He discussed the 1970 plan and data it was based on and the reduction in density within the Town since that time. With the Priory project, he said a key effort had been made to not only deal with anticipated growth but to deal with existing problems with the water through the site. He felt the retention system not only addressed increased runoff but also addressed existing water flow across the Priory.

Ed Boscacci, BKF Engineers, said he had been working on the Priory's master plan since 2002. He discussed other projects he had worked on in and out of Town. He gave a presentation on the Priory project and discussed: 1) the Corte Madera Creek drainage area; 2) peak flows rates; 3) additional impervious area being added (i.e., 1.1 acres); 4) the Priory's storm drain system; 5) off-site areas that drained through the Priory; 6) existing drainage; 7) additional runoff during 10-year and 100-year events; 8) proposed retention system and reduction in peak flow to the creek; 9) contours and low points at the Priory; 10), ponding amounts and durations for 10- 25- and 100-year events; 11) high water levels in the creek and flow rates; 12) proposed solution to handle the excess; 13) overland flow and outfalls; 14) reduction in peak discharge to Corte Madera Creek; and 15) additional percolation on Kalman Field.

Responding to Councilmember Merk, Mr. Boscacci discussed cubic feet per second measurements in terms of volume and velocity. Responding to Councilmember Merk, he used the map to show where water would come down and be collected in the basin. When the flow exceeded 4.6 cfs (such as during a 2-year event), water would bubble out and be stored in the low-lying area. Responding to Councilmember Merk, he described the current flow direction to the creek. As proposed, he said the berm would block the overland flow and direct it downhill. He described where the flow would go if it was less than 4.6 cfs.

Responding to Ms. Bacon, Mr. Boscacci used a chart to illustrate storage capacity of the retention basin on

Kalman Field in 2- 10- and 100-year events. Mr. Vlastic reiterated that the master plan would be implemented over a period of years; however, the drainage improvements had to be done up front before any additional impervious surface was added.

Responding to Commissioner Wengert, Tay Peterson, Thomas Reid Associates, described the berm which is lower at the ends and higher at the middle and tapers in. Mr. Vlastic added that it would be 43-48" maximum height with a 20-25' base. It would be keyed into the site and as organic as possible. It would serve not only for retention but also provide a buffer around Kalman Field. Because of the trees, it would not go all of the way up to the property line or to the fence line. He used the map to show where people could walk around or cross over the berm. Chairman Breon discussed the need to maintain the longer views through the fields.

Referring to the staff report (p. 6), item #5, (CUP enforcement/violations), Chairman Breon said he didn't think it should be assumed that when there were repeated violations, they could continue to exist while the person tried to amend them. Ms. Sloan agreed noting that there was also the Code Compliance Ordinance that said if there was one violation and a permit was applied for for something else, the violation would have to be corrected. Referring to the proposed conditions (p.6), #16d, (community use), Chairman Breon questioned why community gatherings of less than 50 persons needed to be limited. Responding, Mr. Vlastic said there were a number of activities that the school had over the year. If there was greater frequency, it was more difficult to ensure that parking would be available, etc. The Town didn't want to encourage a major scheduling issue. The Priory also needed some framework for community use to work with when they received requests. Responding to Chairman Breon, Mr. Vlastic confirmed that The Sequoias project was outside of this drainage area. Councilmember Merk noted that the water from The Sequoias flowed into Corte Madera Creek, and he described the route. Responding, Mr. Vlastic said that was not what the Public Works Director understood. Secondly, the improvements at The Sequoias were in an area that already had impervious surface.

Chairman Breon opened the public hearing.

Leah Zaffaroni, Georgia Lane, said the residents on Georgia Lane wanted to have a good and positive relationship with the Priory moving forward. With respect to the access issue, her feeling transcended the current Priory administration. As the Priory attorney pointed out in her report, at some point, the current players at the Priory and at the Town would not be there. Her concern was a long-term concern. The current residents, faculty and staff, were fine individuals that she deeply respected. She had had very good neighborly relationships with the people who were there for almost 18 years. Based on the General Plan restriction, which required direct access from Portola Road to the Priory, her issue was how access could be legally limited in the future to that one integrated parcel if it was permitted now. Her concern was that the use would be expanded in the future. There would also be a consensus of concern by Georgia Lane residents if that access could be extended to permit more generalized access. She reiterated that it had nothing to do with the individuals who lived there or the current Priory administration.

Commissioner McIntosh said the CUP was a legal document. He suggested the CUP limit the access to just those four homes. Responding to Commissioner McIntosh, Ms. Sloan confirmed that that could be enforced. Responding to Commissioner McIntosh, Ms. Zaffaroni said it was a matter of consistency with the General Plan. If you allowed access, you were, in essence, saying there was no inconsistency with the General Plan. It would be very difficult to raise the issue of inconsistency if you had allowed access.

Virginia Bacon thanked Mr. Vlastic for clarifying some of the density issues in the staff report. However, in his figures, he included one parcel that was designated open space. She asked if dedicated open space should be considered in FAR and IS calculations. Responding, Mr. Vlastic said the parcel was a 7.46-acre parcel; only a portion (4.56 acres) of that was dedicated open space. The provisions of the zoning ordinance did not require open space easement areas to be deducted from the parcel area for purposes of density calculations. He said even though the numbers reflected the maximum potential density under the circumstances that existed there, it was highly unlikely that that number would stand up through a detailed

subdivision review process. Ms. Bacon discussed how she felt the drainage area should be reflected in the calculations. Additionally, the existing subdivision that was done in 2000, which had the same R-1 standards applied to it, ended up being three very large parcels. That could also be used as another way to measure whether this was an appropriate density for this CUP application. She had maintained all along that you ought to determine a maximum developable area for these combined parcels instead of going through a master plan process. It was fairer to the applicant and everyone else to know that these particular parcels had a maximum. Even though Mr. Vlastic had gone through an explanation, it seemed to her that these numbers were odd in terms of development.

Pierre Fischer, Valley Oak, said at the last meeting, he commented that the use of the Priory tennis courts would be a good idea when the Town courts were not useable. The minutes did not reflect the fact that he also stated that that use should be limited in time and not a permanent use.

Virginia Bacon said she had never been satisfied with the circulation plan. One of the issues that had not been addressed was the fact that institutional traffic was being directed through a residential neighborhood via that new road that extended around. She felt there were other solutions that could be proposed for this site that would prevent institutional traffic going through a residential neighborhood on the Priory property where there was housing. Secondly, she was concerned about the safety of pedestrians at the drop-off point. She had mentioned that at the site visit, but it was not in the staff report. Condition #20 said the Priory had to do a traffic and parking management plan, but she did not think the whole circulation plan had been carefully thought about. She thought people would come to the parking lot and run across the road; it would be the same problem all over again, and it was a safety issue that had not been addressed in the plan.

Chairman Breon suspended the public hearing.

Mr. Vlastic clarified that the field use agreement provided for some tennis court use, which was a reflection of an on-going pattern of tennis court use. It was not limited by time. It was also not in response to the Town Center situation. Ms. Sloan said the provisions for tennis court use allowed use of three tennis courts, one Saturday morning a month, year-round, from 8 a.m. to 11 a.m. Mr. Fischer said currently, the courts were used by elderly people every Saturday and Sunday. The league played the first Saturday of every month at Town Center. That was put in to compensate for the fact that these courts were going to be demolished, and the league needed another location. This was a new use. He did not want that to be permanent because it would be too easy for the Town to say tennis courts weren't needed at the Town Center.

With respect to condition #20 and the circulation issue, Mr. Vlastic said the drop-off point referenced by Ms. Bacon had not been identified as an area of concern. There had been some concern about getting people from the new parking area across to the school, and there had been some suggestions such as a lighted crosswalk. That was something the Priory would have to come up with within the 6 months as set forth in condition #20. There had not been any particular concern identified with the function of the internal drop-off area. It was felt that that was a good location for an internal drop-off because it got people right to the heart of the campus.

Referring to condition #6 (p. 3), Chairman Breon said he had a lot of confidence in the ASCC to review any proposed lighting. But, there was a lot of existing lighting that was potentially more damaging. As with The Sequoias new project, he suggested giving the ASCC some authority to compensate for additional lighting by reviewing some of the existing lighting with the goal that night lighting would be no more than current or, ideally, less than current. He thought condition #6 should reflect that intent. Commissioners agreed. Mr. Vlastic noted that that was the intent of the condition, but some clarification could be added to the language.

Referring to condition #31 (p. 8) on green building, Chairman Breon said he would like to see goals added that could be quantified. For example, there should be no significant increase in energy usage at the site. They would be adding some facilities, and perhaps they could take a look at some of their existing systems and ways to reduce energy usage. That would provide a benchmark by which green building standards could be judged but not mandated. He asked staff to incorporate that concept in the language.

Commissioner Elkind added that materials (e.g., fly ash concrete) used in green construction resulted in a net benefit of energy consumption. Chairman Breon said he was trying to keep it uncomplicated while providing some sort of conceptual goal. Mr. Vlasic said he thought the Priory would develop a fairly detailed approach with objectives prior to getting the building permits, which the ASCC would review. He said the condition could be clarified to add language about evaluating existing energy consumption and reducing that.

With respect to the Georgia Lane access (condition #19, p. 6), Chairman Breon said he had not previously thought that allowing access to just the four homes to Georgia Lane as proposed by the applicant was problematic. But, he had been affected by Ms. Zaffaroni's comment that once a finding was made that access besides the arterial road access was consistent and allowable, it could be argued in the future that the Town couldn't state that expansion of that use was inconsistent.

Commissioner Elkind said the fact that the parcels were all being merged into one parcel made an even stronger case for the argument put forth by Ms. Zaffaroni. This was not four residences on four separate residential lots. This was part of an institutional use on an institutional parcel. Because it was an institutional use, she felt it had to be consistent with the General Plan that indicated institutional uses had as access major arteries.

Commissioner Wengert read the language in the General Plan: "All institutional uses shall be served directly by major collector roads...." She noted that it did not say "directly and solely." She felt the Priory was served directly by Portola Road. In this case, this had been put in place in 1969. The circulation pattern being proposed by the Priory now de-emphasized internal campus traffic. Its longer term goal was to increase pedestrian traffic and not have a lot of movement in and out of the campus. They had made huge efforts to minimize the risk of thru traffic. If there were future violations, the Town would have the opportunity to point those out and propose remedies. At this point, she thought there was enough here to say that it was within the General Plan that the main access for the campus was Portola Road.

Commissioner McIntosh said he had also concluded that it was appropriate that the four houses have access. The original permit in 1969 had a discussion about not disturbing the neighborhood. The implication was that an access to Georgia Lane that was not improved at that point was cut off for that purpose. He felt the intent was that this second access for the whole campus be cut off. At that time, these four residences were not there. He agreed it should not be an access for anything other than those four residences, which he felt was in keeping with the original permit. Secondly, when Georgia Lane was expanded and completed the way it was now, the Priory did their share and contributed their land and their part of the money. And yet, you're saying that they couldn't have access to those four houses. That was inconsistent and unfair. He also thought this would be consistent with their efforts to get traffic out of the middle of the campus. He felt that in an EIR, it would be found that the traffic impact of these four units on Georgia Lane would be minimal. With respect to Ms. Zaffaroni's point, he said he was sure that she was right. But, he felt that the possibility was so remote that: 1) the Priory would try to change this in future years; and 2) the Planning Commission, over all of the objections from all of the residents on Georgia Lane, would reverse this. He felt it was fair to have access. He also thought it could be very well monitored. If there were any complaints, a system was set up, and they were required to report to the Planning Commission. This was part of what they would have to report. If there were complaints that it was being used by the rest of the school, etc., the Planning Commission would hear about it.

Responding to Councilmember Merk, Mr. Vlasic confirmed that the Priory had contributed the land for the widening of the road in front of Kalman Field and the headmaster's house.

Responding to Commissioner Elkind, Ms. Sloan reviewed her memo of 1/27/05 on the access to Georgia Lane. She said the language in the General Plan said that an institutional use shall be served directly by a collector road. But, it didn't say that there shall be no secondary access on a different road. The General Plan was general, and she felt Ms. Wengert's interpretation was legitimate. On the other hand, it could be looked at in a different way. As stated in her memo, she felt this was a policy issue. She didn't give much credence to the Priory's legal arguments but felt the Commission should look at the General Plan, the Priory,

and neighborhood adjacencies and decide what was the best thing to do. She felt either way could be legally upheld.

Chairman Breon verified that Commissioner Wengert and Commissioner McIntosh felt that access should be allowed only for the four residences and subject to the gating system proposed by the Priory. Commissioner Elkind said she was still uncomfortable with it. Chairman Breon said he could support access so long as there was a physical barrier and with the understanding that if the condition in the use permit was violated, access would be closed again.

Referring to condition #9.c (p. 4) on faculty housing, Mr. Vlastic confirmed for Commissioner Elkind that the Priory must report annually on the BMR housing. Commissioner Elkind said in a number of cases, the conditions said that questions about compliance would be sent back to the Planning Commission. She found that somewhat troubling because she was not clear what findings the Commission would be expected to make. Responding, Mr. Vlastic said the conditions about coming back to the Planning Commission had to do with the performing arts center (PAC), etc. Performance standards had to do with things like grading, ability to gain emergency access, etc. The other conditions that would require Planning Commission involvement had to do with a request for an event larger than 300 people or a community event larger than 200 people. In those cases, the issues included sufficient parking given other activities going on on site.

Commissioner Elkind said there had been concern expressed about the PAC and noise. She felt the proposed condition went a long way with respect to controlling noise that would result from activities inside the PAC and containing noise associated with the cooling system. But, a lot of times the noise came from crowds of people getting into their cars, starting up their cars, calling back and forth to each other, etc. Responding, Chairman Breon said he did not think that was controllable. Mr. Vlastic added that uses associated with schools were generally not of concern. The experience here was that there weren't people leaving at 2 a.m. He felt there was more than satisfactory control with the annual review.

Responding to Commissioner Elkind, Mr. Vlastic said the zoning requirement for entry gates was a minimum of ½ of the front yard required setback, or 25' in this case. In this case, staff suggested that the gates be set back 200-300' so that they were at the end of the driveway and not visible from off site. He said a minimum distance could be specified in the final document. (Condition #22)

Referring to condition #14, Commissioner Elkind asked what criteria the Planning Commission should use to determine the appropriateness of a special conference that was not considered part of the typical annual school use. Mr. Vlastic said a variety of things would be looked at such as: 1) could it be accommodated on site; 2) could traffic be handled; 3) were there other activities going on that would conflict with it; etc.

With respect to condition #30 on the PAC and gym, Commissioner Elkind said she wanted to be sure that the site could retain the trees and hillside slopes and avoid overly massive, bulky buildings. She also wanted to reduce the expectations that might arise with 15,000 sf and 7,000 sf maximums. She wanted to avoid compromising the opportunities for optimum site design. Her experience had been that when projects strove to achieve the maximum size, there were fewer opportunities to choose the best relationship of the structure to parking or other facilities on the site, natural open space, or circulation patterns. When you tried to squeeze the most into a limited area, you ended up having to make more and more compromises. There was also pressure to grant exceptions to design guidelines, height limits or setbacks. She felt this had happened at The Sequoias. She suggested adding language that indicated that the Planning Commission and ASCC would consider plans for a PAC not to exceed 15,000 sf "...if the Commission found there was no loss of significant trees, disturbance of the hillside slopes, no significant visual impacts or light pollution and that the parking, circulation, views of open space in relationship to other buildings met the most restrictive Town standards, ordinances, and design guidelines. Otherwise the Planning Commission and the ASCC should reduce the permissible building site to be fully consistent with all of the Town's standards, site design guidelines and best practices."

Commissioner McIntosh said he understood Commissioner Elkind's sensitivity about size and bulk. But, the

Priory had gone absolutely overboard trying to comply with a million things. In this case, the facility was trying to meet needs, and the PAC would be a little bulky. But, it was in the middle of the project and not seen from the exterior very much. The Town's standards were very vigorous, and the ASCC was very exacting and good about the issues raised by Commissioner Elkind. It would also be a challenge to the Priory to see what they could do within 15,000 sf. He felt there were lots of restrictions. He supported the condition as written.

Responding to Commissioner Wengert, Commissioner Elkind said the difference in what she was proposing was that it spelled out specific areas of concerns. Commissioner Wengert thought many of those things were implicit in the Commission's review and the criteria that the final plan would be judged on. She didn't have a problem including more specific language but agreed that the Priory had done a tremendous job in responding to a number of issues. She did not want the Priory to go away with the impression that the Planning Commission wasn't likely to approve a substantial arts center.

Chairman Breon said he was concerned that by putting in a square footage number, it would be largely assumed that that number was allowable. He suggested taking out the numbers and listing the concerns suggested by Commissioner Elkind. Ms. Sloan said a lot of the calculations (e.g., storm drainage, increased impervious surface, etc.) used the 15,000 sf number. The environmental review took that into account. Mr. Vlastic added that just listing performance standards without a number created big problems. Commissioner Wengert suggested including some of Commissioner Elkind's language/intent in condition #30. Chairman Breon suggested adding some language indicating that the Planning Commission and ASCC in the future might scale back the building—even at the cost of some functionality--in order to address these concerns. The concerns should be paramount. If they weren't met, some functionality should be eliminated. Mr. Vlastic said the biggest concerns were not to push back into that hillside and that the trees that were important to screening from Portola Road were not violated. Additionally, he had talked to members of the Priory PAC Committee who had spent a lot of time thinking about this. They were sensitive to the same issues and the important ambiance of that environment within that portion of the campus. The Town had been clear from the start that the square footage might have to be ratcheted down. He didn't want to eliminate the maximum or lose sight of the fact that fundamentally, the use was viewed as an appropriate use within the school.

Chairman Breon suggested language indicating that a performing art center and expansion of the gym were acceptable and that the Priory was being asked to minimize the impacts—even if there was a cost in some way to the functionality of the building. Mr. Vlastic said he would modify the language.

Virginia Bacon said she wanted to see language about the height of buildings and the affect on daylight planes on adjacent properties. Mr. Vlastic said normal setbacks in the district were 50' along the front and 20' along the side. The required setbacks for this use permit were 50' from all property lines. That was well beyond what would be daylight plane impacts. Additionally, the only building that had been proposed within the 50' setback was one of the residential units; the mitigation measures required that it be moved to meet the 50' setback and that a variance was not an option.

With respect to drainage, Commissioner Elkind said what was proposed was a real contribution to the community. Commissioners agreed. Commissioner Wengert added her thanks to staff for their efforts

Chairman Breon closed the public hearing and indicated if new information was provided to the commission it could be brought up at the next meeting.

To the complaints about the parking on Georgia Lane and Grove, Chairman Breon said anyone had a right to park on Georgia Lane or Grove. The Planning Commission had to make a finding that the CUP--including the field use agreement—would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding residents. If any aspect of this permit would have a substantial negative impact on surrounding residents, it should not be approved. If any Commissioner thought there would be a significant problem for Grove or Georgia Lane residents, he/she should probably not approve that use permit aspect. The impacts would not be on the Priory but on AYSO or the other leagues. It was not a question of clamping down on the Priory. If there were substantial problems in the future, he would expect the Planning Commission to end that aspect of this use permit to the detriment

of the Town and other users. Also, one should not assume that any individual resident could hold the Town responsible for any and all violations. Someone from AYSO would park on Georgia Lane and someone from little league would park on Grove. He did not think that every one of those violations had to be chased down by the Town or the Priory. If it happened on a regular basis, the appropriate way to address that would be to close that use for a year. He hoped that people would talk to each other and encourage people not to park there.

With regards to the density, Chairman Breon said there were a million ways to play with those numbers. Ultimately, it was the Planning Commission's perspective on that. His perspective was that this site was at or approaching buildout. Sites like Alpine Hills were at buildout, and the Town said "no more." Given that this site was supposed to be roughly in line with residential densities around it, he hoped that this was one of the last rounds of expansion that the Commission would see. Otherwise, it would become a use that was out of step with the Town. He did, however, feel that what was proposed was still within the boundaries. He noted that final action on the CUP would probably take place at the next meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Zaffaroni re-joined the Commission. Ms. Lambert noted that Pierre Fischer wanted a change made to his comments in the minutes of the 1/19/05 meeting. By motion of Commissioner Wengert, seconded by Commissioner Elkind, the minutes were approved as amended by a vote of 5-0.

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Ms. Lambert noted that the Stable Inspector had inspected Alpine Rock Ranch during the storm and everything was in good order.

Commissioner McIntosh said he would be attending the Town Center project meetings. He noted that there was also a committee working on financing the project. He discussed Phase 1 of the project, funding, field availability, projected construction start date, and green building efforts.

Responding to Commissioner Elkind, Ms. Lambert said she expected a new report draft on the Corte Madera Creek study by the end of this week.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

Craig Breon, Chair
Planning Commission

Leslie Lambert
Planning Manager