

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Time: 00:00:23

Chair Kopf-Sill called the Planning Commission hybrid, in person and via Zoom, meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Planning & Building Director Russell called the roll.

Present: Planning Commissioners: Brothers, Krashinsky, and Targ; Vice Chair Goulden; Chair Kopf-Sill
Absent: None
Town Staff: Laura Russell, Planning & Building Director; Jake Garcia, Consulting Planner

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Time: 00:00:48

Caroline Vertongen asked if the Commission received her email regarding issues about connecting to Town meetings and communicating with the Town.

Chair Kopf-Sill announced she had not received the email.

Ms. Vertongen expressed she had comments regarding the March 6, 2023 minutes but would hold them for a later time.

Chair Kopf-Sill thanked Town Attorney Cara Silver for her service to the Town.

Commissioner Krashinsky and Commissioner Targ echoed Chair Kopf-Sill's remark.

NEW BUSINESS

(1) Rotation of Chair and Vice Chair

Time: 00:05:29

Chair Kopf-Sill acknowledged that the typical rotation of Vice Chair was not followed in the previous rotation due to Chair Kopf-Sill and Commissioner Targ having to recuse themselves for the Stanford Wedge Project. She asked if the current Vice Chair should be made Chair or should Commissioner Targ be moved to Chair.

Commissioner Krashinsky suggested waiting until Commissioner Targ was present.

Planning & Building Director Russell suggested the Commission approve the minutes while they waited for Commissioner Targ to attend the meeting.

[The Commission moved to approval of the minutes]

Time: 00:20:20

Vice Chair Goulden announced he supported either option.

Chair Kopf-Sill shared she was in support of Vice Chair Goulden becoming Chair because that was the normal process and then Commissioner Targ become Vice Chair. Also, due to Commissioner Targ and herself having a conflict, she believed it was a better to not have them back-to-back in the rotation.

Commissioner Brothers [inaudible – off mic and no audio]

Planning & Building Director Russell summarized the Commission would take nominations for Chair and Vice Chair. Then public comments would be heard before taking a vote.

Time: 00:22:46

Commissioner Brothers nominate Vice Chair Goulden as Chair and Commissioner Targ as Vice Chair. Seconded by Chair Kopf-Sill.

Time: 0:23:04

Chair Kopf-Sill opened public comment.

Danna Breen stated that Commissioner Targ had not been Chair since 2018 and found it important for the dialectic to have the position of Chair mixed. She recommended Commissioner Targ be Chair.

Betsy Morgenthaler stated that Chair Kopf-Sill had been a wonderful Chair and echoed Ms. Breen's comment that Commissioner Targ should be Chair.

Kristi Corley agreed Commissioner Targ should be Chair and requested the public be allowed to speak the full three minutes if they desire.

Time: 0:25:19

Chair Kopf-Sill closed public comment.

Commissioner Targ appreciate the public's comment but noted his term on the Planning Commission would end in December 2023 and that should be considered.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked when Vice Chair Goulden's term was up.

Vice Chair Goulden answered it was renewed recently.

Time: 0:27:05

Chair Kopf-Sill called for a vote on the motion.

Commissioner Brothers nominate Vice Chair Goulden as Chair and Commissioner Targ as Vice Chair. Seconded by Chair Kopf-Sill, the motion passed 4-0 with Commissioner Targ abstaining.

(2) **Preliminary review of an application for a new gym, new fitness center, an addition/remodel to the existing locker room (Gambetta Gym), an addition/remodel to an existing chapel and to discuss plans for a forthcoming Conditional use Permit Amendment at Woodside Priory School. File #PLN USE01-2023**

Time: 00:28:14

Chair Goulden announced he had to recuse himself from the item due to his home's proximity to the Woodside Priory (Priory).

Vice Chair Targ noted he would be leaving the meeting early.

Commissioner Kopf-Sill volunteered to run the meeting when Vice Chair Targ leaves.

Vice Chair Targ invited staff to share their report.

Time: 0:29:13

Planning & Building Director Russell noted three Commissioners recently visited the site along with several neighbors.

Consulting Planner Garcia introduced the item and provided a brief background on the project, as outlined in the staff report. The Priory was requesting the Planning Commission consider an Amendment to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and overall Master Plan Map, as outlined in the staff report. He noted for the proposed development proposals to move forward, a CUP Amendment must be approved as the proposed projects were anticipated to exceed the maximum allowable area. Once the amendment was approved, each project would be reviewed at least once by the Architectural & Site Control Commission (ASCC) for Final Architectural Review and approval. He noted the plans and associated information was conceptual and the final proposed plan would be subject to complete review for consistency with the Town's Municipal Code, the Design Guidelines, the General Plan and approved governing CUP.

Prior to the Planning Commission meeting, Consulting Planner Garcia shared that the ASCC provided a conceptual design review of all the projects on February 27, 2023. Their feedback was summarized in the staff report.

Consulting Planner Garcia noted after the publication of the Planning Commission's Packet, the applicant submitted to the Town revised plans and those plans were not reviewed by the ASCC. Staff was not able to provide a complete review of the revised plans and scope of work prior to the Planning Commission's meeting. The proposed project presented to the Commission included a new gym and a new fitness center. Since publication, those two buildings had been combined and relocated. No changes were made to the proposed locker room renovation, the chapel renovation, the monastery renovation, the new academic offices and the middle school playground. The newly proposed overall Master Plan indicated the new gym, locker room and fitness center would be located in one building adjacent to the existing track and field. He mentioned the applicant team would be sharing conceptual drawings for the new gym, locker room and fitness center along with the locker room and chapel renovation and addition.

Consulting Planner Garcia shared photos and gave a brief description of the overall Master Plan, new gym, the locker room addition and remodel, and chapel renovations and addition, as outlined in the staff report.

With respect to public noticing, Consulting Planner Garcia said mailers were sent to folks within a 1,000-foot radius on February 17, 2023, for the ASCC meeting and on April 21, 2023, for the site visit and Planning Commission meeting. No comments were received prior to the Planning Commission's meeting.

Consulting Planner Garcia concluded that ASCC may wish to consider the forthcoming projects with respect to the general design and location of buildings as well as the required findings necessary to approve the CUP as identified and outlined in the staff report.

Time: 0:38:51

Chair Targ invited Commissioners to ask questions of staff.

Commissioner Krashinsky referenced Table 1 in the Packet and notice maxed impervious surface was not included. He inquired if that was expected to be increased. Consulting Planner Garcia answered the conceptual plans did not detail the forthcoming impervious surface calculations.

Commissioner Krashinsky invited staff to explain Finding 7. Planning & Building Director Russell explained Finding 7 did not apply to all the projects at the Priory. Historically, in its annual report, the Priory included the number of local Portola Valley students who were attending and historically, the Commission encouraged the school to increase its local attendees.

Commissioner Krashinsky referenced Page 14 of the existing CUP and asked how community use of the athletic facilities would be applied to the new facilities. Consulting Planner Garcia stated the Joint Use Agreement covered a number of the facilities on site but not all of them. In the initial designs, there were no conflicts with the Joint Use Agreement. With the newly proposed plans staff wished to review those plans against the agreement.

Planning & Building Director Russell said staff was seeking feedback from the Commission on what questions they would like answered in future staff reports on the project.

Commissioner Brothers stated even after the site visit she was not 100 percent certain what was being proposed.

Vice Chair Targ understood not all of the plans had been resubmitted and Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was correct.

Vice Chair Targ asked if was a better process to review the project once all the plans were submitted. Planning & Building Director Russell suggested the Commission hear the applicant's presentation and then discuss it. The applicant was interested in having feedback from the Commission and the ASCC early in the process.

Vice Chair Targ remarked in the 2001 and 2021 amendments of the CUP there was an agreement that a noise and traffic plan would be included. There was no reference in the staff report to a noise plan and the traffic plan was to be developed as a mitigation measure in the event of a complaint. Planning & Building Director Russell answered Attachment 10 was the annual report from June 2022 and it was used to evaluate compliance as well as the traffic monitoring report from the fall of 2022.

Vice Chair Targ read the minutes aloud stating that the Commission wanted to see a traffic management plan and restated that it was not included. He questioned how the Commission could approve a CUP if it did not include a traffic management plan. Planning & Building Director Russell agreed a CUP Amendment could not be approved without making a reasonable determination that the project complied with the existing CUP. Vice Chair Targ recommended staff explore it further and return with an answer at a future meeting. Consulting Planner Garcia echoed Planning & Building Director Russell's comment regarding Attachments 10 and 11. Currently, noise monitoring began in the first semester and was being collected. Staff recommended the applicant team provide an update.

Vice Chair Targ noted a monitoring plan was different than a traffic and noise management plan. He referenced Red Page 101 of the minutes for the Planning Commission's meeting of February 2, 2022.

Time: 0:52:28

Vice Chair Targ invited the applicants to share their presentations.

Patrick Ruff, Head of School, thanked the Commissioners and neighbors who visited the site. He believed the proposals helped the school bring its mission to life and updated the facilities to modern times. He stated the Priory is an important piece of the fabric of Portola Valley and the Priory benefited from the town. The goal was to work with the Town and weave the Priory into the community seamlessly.

Carter Warr, CJW Architecture, explained the goal of the site visit and meeting was to solicit feedback from the public and the Commission on the forthcoming projects at the Priory. The site visit included the chapel and an explanation of its expansion, the existing locker room and team rooms, and the new gym. Those three projects were the highest priority to the school and the remaining items were considered minor.

With respect to the chapel, Mr. Warr said the Priory wished to expand the chapel by 738 square feet with an additional 750 square feet for the campus administration building. With that said, under the current CUP, there was no square footage available. The Priory was requesting to borrow square footage from the athletic and residential floor area categories. The renovations would update the chapel and expand the seating area.

With respect to the locker rooms, Mr. Warr remarked the locker room was built for boys and the girl's locker room was substandard. The locker rooms currently were in two separate buildings. The reason to expand and update the locker room was to provide more privacy as well as provide space for an additional team. The original design placed the new locker rooms in an area of campus that was invisible to the community but the location was found to be difficult for construction. Upon reconsidering the location of the locker room, it was discovered that in 1999 and 2000 the area near the track was identified as a suitable area for development. No structure was built because Priory leadership, at the time, was concerned about visibility and that was still a concern. The school had changed drastically since then and now believed that the area could provide a facility that was reflected with modern values. He noted the Priory was amendable to returning to the ASCC for further discussion about the location of the new locker room facility. The location also provided a grade level that was significantly lower than the roadway which would help minimize visual impacts.

Mr. Warr encouraged the Commission, the community and the Town to consider the evolution of the Priory when reviewing projects. He shared historical photos of the Priory and its evolution through the years. In 2016 the red track and the turf field were installed along with the removal of many of the screening trees along Portola Road.

With respect to the existing Conditions of Approval, Mr. Warr mentioned of the 34 conditions, Conditions 3 and 4 addressed numeric standards. Condition 3 pertained to the number of students, teachers and staff. The Priory was not planning on adjusting that condition. Condition 4 addressed the building area, impervious surface and parking. That condition was changed in 2005 and reflected the future growth of the school. The remaining conditions, 5 through 34, addressed the behavior and management of the school. The proposed plans did not impact, hinder or change any of the requirements outlined in those conditions. He mentioned the school was monitoring noise and changed circulation on-site to address traffic concerns.

Mr. Warr believed the proposed project required adjustments to Condition of Approval 4 to allow for expansion of the floor area, expansion of the amount of impervious surface and provide accessibility to parking. He noted zoning of the Priory, under the current CUP, was 205,000 square feet of floor area and the zoning allowed up to 265,946 square feet of floor area.

Mr. Warr concluded that the Priory was seeking feedback on whether the minor projects appeared compatible with the current CUP, did the projects require only adjustments to Condition 4 and what concerns, if any, were there for the major projects.

Time: 1:28:23

Vice Chair Targ invited the Commissioners to ask questions of the applicant.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked the applicant to describe their ideas about connecting the road. Mr. Warr acknowledged that the current circulation pattern had worked well for the school. The idea was to connect Gambetta Lane through the campus by constructing a road below the dorms. This concept was included in the CUP until the 2021 amendment. Mr. Ruff mentioned the change would eliminate internal campus conflicts. Mr. Warr strongly requested the Commission consider and provide input on allowing the road to be placed back in the Master Plan.

Commissioner Brothers wanted to understand the timeline for the projects. Mr. Warr mentioned the Priory was amendable to returning once a month on a preliminary basis. He emphasized the work proposed on the chapel and locker room was the highest priority and wished to begin that work this season. If allowed, the Chapel and locker room would borrow 2,000 square feet from other allocated use categories.

Mr. Ruff asked what was needed to reach entitlement for the chapel and locker room improvements. Also, what concerns were there for the new gym facility?

Commissioner Brothers restated what was the timeline for construction. Mr. Warr answered construction documents were nearly complete for the chapel. Parts of the locker rooms required the movement of a PG&E transformer but other parts could be constructed immediately.

Commissioner Targ asked if there was an issue with breaking up the modifications to the CUP. Planning & Building Director Russell stated it had been discussed many times. Staff advised the applicant to share their long-term plans now to begin the discussion. She said it made sense to allow the Priory to borrow floor area from one category to another because those categories were outdated. The chapel and locker room improvements did not appear to be large issues to the Town nor under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). She acknowledged that the Town and the Priory were still in the exploratory phase.

Vice Chair Targ reasked why the applicant was before the Commission when only two buildings were being discussed and how should the Commission think about the development overall as a whole. He remarked it was important for himself to understand, from the ASCC's perspective, what it would mean to look only at two of the buildings as opposed to the project as a whole. He noticed there had been an increase in student population of about 15 percent over the last 3 years and he wanted to know how much of the proposal was in response to that increase. He referenced Red Page 62 and noticed student enrollment was at 452 with 44 boarders and 408 commute students.

Mr. Ruff remarked that number was incorrect.

Vice Chair Targ stated if that was not accurate then there was a problem because the previous assessment of average daily attendance (ADA) was thought to be 92 to 93 percent of total enrollment which put the population over the total. He clarified his comment pertained to Condition 3. Mr. Warr remarked the maximum allowance was 60 boarders and 435 commute students.

Vice Chair Targ noted that ADA counted as well and inquired if the school complied or not. Was the increase in population driving the expansion? Should the Commission be focused on enrollment and not ADA? He said he was thinking about piecemealing, compliance, what drove the expansion, design impact and what was the totality of the design impact with future changes.

Mr. Ruff clarified the school's current total enrollment was 424 students. The proposals before the Commission were not solely in response to the enrollment increase. He agreed the chapel must be expanded to accommodate more students but the expansion of the athletic facilities was about supporting current students.

Vice Chair Targ agreed that the Priory is a part of Portola Valley and he did not want there to be confusion about his position. He believed it was important to treat all projects fairly and similarly. He stated his comments were shared through the lens of the overall process and fairness. Mr. Ruff appreciated that and believed the proposals addressed the needs of the students.

Time: 1:50:12

Vice Chair Targ announced he must leave and invited Commissioner Kopf-Sill to run the meeting.

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill stated slope greatly impacted floor area and impervious surface calculations. She asked if slope was considered when the floor area was calculated in 2005. Mr. Warr stated at that time the Priory had requested 205,505 square feet in floor area.

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill asked how close was the Priory to the allowable amount of impervious surface square footage on the site. Mr. Warr remarked the school was not in danger of exceeding the allowable impervious surface square footage.

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill asked if the fire truck circle and playground affected the impervious calculation and was the connection road included in the calculation. Mr. Warr answered it depended on what was put in the fire truck and playground space. He could not recall if the road's square footage was included in the impervious calculation.

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill wanted to understand if the school would be in danger of exceeding the impervious surface thresholds if the road was built. Planning & Building Director Russell echoed Mr. Warr's statement that the CUP was based on what the Priory requested and their needs.

Time: 1:57:11

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill announced the Commission would take a 5-minute break and then hear public comment upon return.

Time: 2:04:45

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill opened public comment.

Caroline Vertongen acknowledged the proposal was very complex due to the tremendous changes since 2005. She asked how much did the residents of Portola Valley have to bare the changes, and how can the community and school come to a collaborative proposal. She appreciated the comments from Vice Chair Targ, Commissioners Brothers and Krashinsky. It was very important to understand what was being proposed and the staff report on Page 12 was still being debated. She requested more information on impervious surfaces, traffic and noise mitigation, and she wanted to see the Joint Use Agreement. She asked why more Portola Valley staff were not hired and how the projects overall benefited the community.

Mary Hufty strongly supported having the pass-through road and believed it would be a huge safety improvement for the students.

Kristi Corley appreciated Commissioner Krashinsky's comment regarding public involvement in the process. She believed that condition was included because the school is located on a main road and was visualized by the residents daily. With that said, she asked why the public was not invited to the site visit and encouraged the Priory to hold community tours. Her other concerns were related to drainage off and within the site, trees, traffic circulation and noise.

Time: 2:11:57

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill closed public comment and invited the Commission to share their thoughts.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the public was allowed to visit the site. Planning & Building Director Russell answered several members of the public were included in the site visit but recommended that the applicant provide public tours. Staff would be creating a project web page and would be circulating the project more broadly to the community in the future.

Commissioner Brothers appreciated the site visit. She supported the idea of having a Master Plan and appreciated the comments made regarding segmentation and piecemeal. The applicant's presentation highlighted that the changes proposed for the locker room mainly addressed gender equity and she saw that as a high priority. With respect to the applicant's zoning comparison chart, she found the math associated with 1 acre of housing on 50 acres irrelevant and misleading because housing was different than a school. She acknowledged the proposed gym appeared visually appealing on the drawings as it fronted along the track, but believed turning the frontage of the building by 20 to 30 degrees would minimize the visual impact coming down Portola Road. She found it out of character with the town's aesthetics to have a large building along the road and believed it would reduce the visual entry the track gave to the campus. She supported the changes to the chapel and the proposal for the existing gym.

Commissioner Krashinsky stated everything proposed made sense. For the minor projects, he wanted to see more staff feedback on whether they were compatible with the current CUP. With that said, he wanted the projects to advance if possible. With respect to Condition 4 and the gym, he wanted to have more details from staff and wanted to understand Vice Chair Targ's concerns around CUP compliance. He acknowledged that the school had been focus on traffic and noise and that was highlighted in the staff report. He shared he was confused about the road extension and asked if that fell under Condition 4. Also, he wanted to know more about the Joint Use Agreement with the existing basketball gym and whether that should be applied to the new gym. With respect to concerns, he acknowledged the new gym would be large but believed the massing would be mitigated through the lower grade level and its distance from the roadway. He was not strongly supportive of hiding the building with landscaping and encouraged the applicant to design an attractive building that fit into the landscape.

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill commented that the minor projects made sense and wanted to see a simple Planning Commission process that allowed those projects to be expedited. With respect to floor area, she shared she was not concerned about how the allowable square footage was used and supported allowing them to be fluid. She was thrilled to hear that the improvements to circulation had helped with traffic congestion and mentioned she witnessed its success recently. With that said, she was in favor of installing the connection road and eliminating the loop between the middle school and upper school. She encouraged staff to explore a quick process to allow the road to be constructed. With respect to the new gym, she shared the concern about the size of the building but echoed Commissioner Krashinsky's comments that the building would be below the road and a good distance away. She recommended the applicant pay attention to light pollution coming from the new gym.

Planning & Building Director Russell said there was technical work that had to be done related to CEQA and segmentation. Staff took to heart Vice Chair Targ's comments regarding a fair and consistent process. During the time staff considered the technical aspects of the project, she advised that ASCC be allowed to tour the site and that they review the revised plans. She added that the projects would be returning to the Commission for a discussion in the future.

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(3) Commission Reports

Time: 2:31:16

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill invited Commissioners to share any reports they had.

Commissioner Brothers announced she attended the ASCC meeting when they discussed Woodside Priory's plans. She noted she was not informed if the ASCC had a site tour and she encouraged staff to allow liaisons to attend site tours. Planning & Building Director Russell mentioned ASCC was not

having site tours currently, but when they do the Planning Commission liaison and the Council liaison will be invited.

(4) Staff Reports

Time: 2:32:30

Planning & Building Director Russell announced Town Council would be considering adoption of the Housing Element on May 10, 2023. Town Council would also be providing Staff direction on the Housing Element post-approval process. She mentioned many public comments had been received since the last Planning Commission meeting regarding the Housing Element. She announced Planner Adrian Smith would soon begin having oversight on single-family projects as well as work on Zoning Code Amendments related to the Housing Element. Work on the Safety Element would resume with herself as the lead and staff would be providing an update to the Town Council before bringing the Safety Element to the Commission. Also forthcoming were State changes related to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and Staff anticipated feedback from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) on the Town's ADU Ordinance soon.

Commissioner Brothers asked if the Commission would be considering any of the Housing Element post-approval elements and Planning & Building Director Russell answered yes.

Commissioner Krashinsky inquired what items were coming forward for the next Planning Commission meeting. Planning & Building Director Russell answered there were no projects and predicted the meeting would be canceled.

Time: 2:37:59

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill opened public comment.

Mary Hufty requested that the Commission consider the Safety Element sooner rather than later.

Planning & Building Director Russell said the recommending committees had done their review and staff wanted to spend time with the comments received from the committees. Staff would then provide an update to Town Council.

Kristi Corley asked if the Town had 3 years to implement zoning changes if the Housing Element is adopted. She asked for further details on the changes in ADU laws and noted that the Town's website did not list who the new ASCC Members are. She recommended staff be more direct with what the Housing Element is and provide meetings to educate residents.

Planning & Building Director Russell answered no, zoning changes must be implemented within one year of Housing Element adoption due to the adoption happening after the deadline. With respect to ADU changes, staff had fully analyze the law but would share that information with the public when it became available. She agreed the names of the new ASCC Members should be listed on the website but the Town currently did not have a permanent Town Clerk. With respect to canceled Planning Commission meetings, she said she staffed the meetings herself and did not convene meetings if there were no projects.

Time: 2:44:17

Acting Chair Kopf-Sill closed public comment and moved to adjournment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(5) Planning Commission Meeting of March 6, 2023

Time: 00:08:12

Chair Kopf-Sill inquired if any Commissioners had any substantial changes to the minutes.

Commissioner Brothers [inaudible – off mic and no audio]

Commissioner Krashinsky remarked “femoral creek” should be changed to “ephemeral creek” throughout the minutes. On Page 95 he suggested the Director’s comments regarding Glen Oaks be changed to “the units could be clustered together”. On Page 100, Commissioner Targ, not Commissioner Krashinsky, was the one who suggested the Commission discuss the Housing Element topic by topic.

Vice Chair Goulden found the minutes to be well done and noted the Commission decided not to allow the public to suggest changes to the minutes.

Planning & Building Director Russell clarified public comment must be heard and it was the Commission’s discretion to make changes to the minutes based on public comment or not.

Time: 00:11:47

Chair Kopf-Sill invited members of the public to share their comments on the minutes.

Caroline Vertongen requested her comment be considered against the recording and rewritten to reflect her thoughts. At the time she said the “Portola Valley Building Department” had reduced the Fifth Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) because they understood the unique landscape and the constraints of Portola Valley. With respect to the sentence starting “the staff refused the share the information” in her comment, she explained she was referring to the information regarding Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) which had an available inventory that showed all the affordable housing and housing that had been built in the Bay Area for the Fifth Cycle. It also showed how many units had been built and were not being used.

Chair Kopf-Sill inquired about what page her comment was on.

Ms. Vertongen answered Red Page 89 during oral communication and the correction should be made halfway through her comment. She found it concerning the Commission had not received her email regarding the minutes because she had submitted it before the deadline.

Time: 00:15:05

Chair Kopf-Sill closed public comment.

Commissioner Krashinsky recommended the Commission include Ms. Vertongen’s change.

Vice Chair Goulden remarked the Building Department cannot change ABAG’s numbers.

Commissioner Krashinsky stated that was fine but wanted the minutes to reflect her words, even if they was not correct.

Chair Kopf-Sill asked if the word “the staff” should be changed to “Building Department”.

Commissioner Brothers [inaudible – off mic and no audio]

Vice Chair Goulden remarked this confusion was why the Commission had decided not to incorporate changes suggested by the public.

Commissioner Krashinsky recalled the word “ABAG” was supposed to be changed to “the Building Department”.

Planning & Building Director Russell said in the past, staff was having to listen to the recording and make changes that were not substantive, or changed the nature of the Planning Commission's discussion. The issue was whether that was worth the time or not.

Chair Kopf-Sill believed making the change from "the staff" to "the Building Department" was not a substantive change. She recommended the minutes stay as presented.

Commissioner Brothers moved to approve the minutes of the March 6, 2023, meeting, as amended by Commissioner Krashinsky. Seconded by Vice Chair Goulden, the motion carried 4-0 with Commissioner Targ abstaining.

[The Commission moved up to Item 1]

Time: 00:20:20

ADJOURNMENT [9:44 p.m.]

Commissioner Brothers moved to adjourn. Seconded by Acting Chair Kopf-Sill seconded, the motion carried 3-0.