

PLANNING COMMISSION

SEPTEMBER 6, 2023

Hybrid Meeting – In Person and via Zoom

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Goulden called the Planning Commission special 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, Kopf-Sill, Krashinsky; Chair Goulden
Absent: Vice Chair Targ
Town Staff: Laura Russell, Planning & Building Director; Thomas Geisler, Development Review Technician; Catherine Engberg, Interim Town Attorney

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Time: 00:01:02

Karen Askey, Parks and Recreation Commissioner speaking on behalf of herself, reported the Town had an inadequate amount of recreational facilities and that would continue to intensify as the population increased. In the recent Housing Element Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) the Parks and Recreation Commission strongly disagreed that there would be less than a significant impact on the Town's recreational facilities. The IS/MND did not address recreational facilities or parking. While the Town had many open spaces and trails, those did not cater to all ages. The Parks and Recreation Commission requested the Planning Commission consider enacting a new ordinance that required large development projects to dedicate a portion of land for recreation space that served the entire community. Also, that large developments be required to pay a maintenance cost to cover the facilities. She requested the Planning Commission hold a study session to discuss the matter further.

[unknown female speaker] shared that the Hawthorns were considering placing parking along Alpine Road and were concerned about having parking along a scenic corridor. She expressed concerns about the constraint Karen Vahtra had with meeting with the public. She requested at least five members of various Town Committee members or volunteers from Portola Valley meet with her now instead of later in the process.

Commissioner Krashinsky acknowledged that Carolina Vertongen was correct in the last meeting that the minutes should be corrected to say "Portola Valley Building Department" instead of "ABAG" in her comment. He understood it was not the Commission's practice to make changes to the minutes based on public comments but suggested allowing the public to email him their comments. Then he could reference the recording and suggest changes where appropriate.

Chair Goulden recommended Commissioner Krashinsky discuss the item offline because it was not agendaized. Commissioner Krashinsky agreed.

Commissioner Krashinsky shared he tested the Commission's email address and noticed that the email did go through but it went towncenter.net instead. He was working with Staff to correct the problem. Planning & Building Director Russell explained the email on the website was a generic Planning Commission email and historically any email was forwarded by the Town Clerk to herself. As large projects come through the Town, those projects are assigned a project email to allow Staff to collect the batches of emails. She acknowledged there had been a lot of employment changes in the Clerk's Office and agreed the process had been faulty. She encouraged the Commission to discuss in the future how to handle emails that are submitted that do not pertain to any specific item.

NEW BUSINESS

Time: 00:13:50

DRAFT MINUTES

(1) Implementation of SB330 – Feedback for Committee of Committees Meeting

Chair Goulden shared the Commission was invited to attend a Committee of Committee's meeting to discuss the topic together as well. If the public wanted to share their comments with the Commission, those comments would be shared at the meeting as well as the Commission's recommendation.

Planning & Building Director Russell reported Senate Bill 330 (SB330) went into effect several years ago and was known as the Housing Crisis Act of 2019. While SB330 covered many things, the focus of the Commission's meeting was to talk about the limit of public meetings that could be held for a housing project.

With respect to the basic framework of SB330, Planning & Building Director Russell reported the limit was five meetings per housing development project. A Hearing was defined as "any kind of public meeting, including advisory bodies, decision-making bodies, or subcommittees". Included were study sessions/preliminary meetings and appeal hearings. Not included were developer-sponsored meetings or legislative hearings. She shared that the Town's Trails Committee, Bicycle Pedestrian Traffic Safety (BPTS), Conservation Committee, Architectural & Site Control Commission (ASCC), Subdivision Committee, Planning Commission and Town Council were the bodies that routinely reviewed housing projects with subdivision. There may be multiple meetings with each group per project.

Regarding the Subdivision Committee, she explained it was rarely convened. That body was made up of the Town Planner, Town Engineer, Town Geologist, Building Official, Fire Chief, County Environmental Health, Town Historian, a member of the ASCC, a member of the Conservation Committee, and a member of the Tails Committee. Per the Town's Code, the members must convene and discuss a housing development project with subdivision. Even though they all play a separate role in reviewing the project outside of the Subdivision Committee.

Commissioner Brothers inquired what constituted a subdivision that triggered the convening of the Subdivision Committee. Planning & Building Director Russell explained if a project increased the amount of developable properties triggered the Committee. The Committee was convened for the Stanford Housing Project, but prior to that, it was convened for the Blue Oaks Project.

Planning & Building Director Russell asked the Commission to discuss how to allocate the five meetings. Should any meetings be removed, should meetings be grouped, and how so, and should some bodies have multiple reviews? She shared three possible options and each option reserved the fifth meeting to be for the Town Council in case of an appeal or a final decision. She noted that the Town was moving towards Objective Standards and there would be less discretionary design review.

Planning & Building Director Russell reminded that State Law was very complex, it had nuances and exceptions, and staff was seeking a general approach.

Time:00:27:24

Chair Goulden opened the floor for Commissioners to ask questions of Staff.

Commissioner Kopf-Sill asked if S330 applied to a two-story house or only a multi-family development. Planning & Building Director Russell answered it applied to single-family development and multi-family. She recommended the Commission and the Committee of Committees focus its discussions on large housing development projects.

Commissioner Kopf-Sill asked when SB330 would go into effect and Planning & Building Director Russell restated it had been in effect for several years now.

DRAFT MINUTES

Commissioner Kopf-Sill inquired how SB330 impacted California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) reviews. Planning & Building Director Russell said it was complex and there were few court cases to refer to. The best practice was to assume any CEQA hearing counted as one hearing toward the five.

Commissioner Kopf-Sill asked if continued meetings counted toward the five and Planning & Building Director Russell answered that continued meetings counted as one meeting towards the five. The law made clear the intent was to move housing development projects through the process expeditiously.

Commissioner Brothers understood the Town was not interpreting SB330 as a law that applied only to low and moderate-income housing, as stated in the law itself. Town Attorney Engberg confirmed the law was interpreted to apply to all housing projects both in practice and in California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) guidance.

Commissioner Brothers wanted to understand what constituted a “body” and was the Town’s Committee’s bodies of the Town. She noted that the handbook identified several Committees that were not part of the Town, but asked if all of the Town’s committees qualified under SB330. Town Attorney Engberg stated the definition in SB330 for “body” was drafted broadly and she believed the Town’s Committees qualified under the definition.

Commissioner Brothers pressed if Town Attorney Engberg’s explanation stood even if the Committees were not making specific decisions. Town Attorney Engberg noted the majority of them were recommending bodies and that counted. Commissioner Brothers believed SB330 had a differential impact on the Town.

Commissioner Brothers understood SB330 did not specifically address CEQA and Town Attorney Engberg explained the five-hearing rule did not apply to public hearings that were “required by CEQA”. She agreed it was confusing because technically CEQA did not require any hearings.

Commissioner Brothers asked if the Town Attorney was interpreting that SB330 included CEQA hearings or was there a specific reference. Town Attorney Engberg believed it was listed in SB330 and would provide the exact section later.

Commissioner Brothers inquired if the only way to enforce SB330 was by an aggrieved applicant. Town Attorney Engberg explained it would be enforced by the applicants as well as housing organizations.

Commissioner Brothers commented the Town was small and had many volunteer bodies that provided expertise on projects. Usually, larger Cities and Towns had in-house expertise that advised on projects before they went to decision-making bodies. She wanted to understand how Portola Valley’s volunteer bodies could still advise the decision-making bodies on projects while still complying with the five hearing constraints. Town Attorney Engberg stated the statute did not consider small towns and cities when it was drafted. There were no exceptions in the statute for smaller cities and towns. Planning & Building Director Russell added the technical reviews that were done in-house in larger cities were done by the Town’s consultation team.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked what was the process if a project changed substantially between the preliminary review and the final application. Planning & Building Director Russell stated the five meeting constraints started once the project was deemed complete. State Law was moving towards Objective Standards and projects should not have substantially changed while going through the process. She emphasized that the Town’s process should not impede the approval of a housing project.

DRAFT MINUTES

Commissioner Krashinsky understood any preliminary ASCC meetings would not count towards the five. Planning & Building Director Russell explained that ASCC had three levels of review and they corresponded with the level of completeness of a project.

Commissioner Krashinsky referenced Red Page 5, in the footnote it referenced ministerial projects and he said typically ministerial projects did not have public meetings. Town Attorney Engberg agreed ministerial meetings would not count towards the five.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the Town had followed SB330 since its adoption and Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the proposed guidelines applied to submitted projects and Planning & Building Director Russell said they could apply to submitted projects. She explained there had been discussions with Stanford and the Town about whether SB330 applied to their housing project and the parties agreed that moving forward the project would be subject to five meetings.

Chair Goulden asked when the Stanford Wedge Project comes forward, would the Commission be limited to two meetings? Planning & Building Director Russell answered one or two meetings would be the limit.

Commissioner Kopf-Sill inquired if the project listed in the Housing Element on the corner of Nathhorst and Alpine would be subject to the five-meeting rule. Also, Conditional Use Permit (CUP) projects were subject to SB330. Planning & Building Director Russell believed Opt-In Housing Element projects would be subject to SB330, but there would be separate meetings to establish the program for Opt-in.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the five-meeting rule could be tailored on a case-by-case basis. Planning & Building Director Russell believed there could be a couple of different options the Town could follow if projects fell within specified parameters.

Time:00:54:23

Chair Goulden opened public comment.

Karen Askey, Parks and Recreation Commissioner speaking on behalf herself, asked if feedback received through a survey or a public forum counted as a meeting, or was a tool that could be used to supplement. She asked how the Subdivision Committee would be included in the five meeting rules because they were not listed in the three examples provided by staff.

Nicholas Targ, Vice Chair of the Planning Commission speaking on behalf of himself, asked how neighboring cities were handling the CEQA hearing issue, did the Town expected a legislative proposal to come in under SB330, and how was the 1,000 cubic yard threshold being considered with respect to SB330? With respect to health and safety issues, were those handled outside the SB330 process, and could those lead to additional hearings?

Kristi Corley asked how many conceptual reviews were in the process from the Housing Element list and how many preliminary reviews were completed as of date. She noted the Geological Committee was not listed as an important committee and believed that the committee must be considering projects. She encouraged staff to explore southern California cities and their processes since they were a year ahead in their Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

Carolina Vertongen echoed the comments and the questions raised are very important to understand. She agreed SB330 was open to interpretation and rural towns had completely different processes than

DRAFT MINUTES

larger cities such as San Mateo and Redwood City. She wanted to see the Town use its Committee's expertise over the consultants because often the consultants were not aware of the constraints that were placed on the Town. She appreciated Vice Chair Targ's question because many projects she could remember were deemed CEQA-exempt. After all, staff determined that the project would not meet the 1,000 cubic yard soil threshold. Then when those projects were constructed, they surpassed that threshold.

Time:01:04:50

Chair Goulden closed public comment and asked staff to address the questions raised by the public.

Planning & Building Director Russell believed feedback could be received through various public forums and not count as a meeting and Town Attorney Engberg agreed. With respect to the Subdivision Committee, Planning & Building Director Russell stated they could be part of the five-meeting review. With respect to fire review, projects would always be reviewed by Woodside Fire Protection District (Fire District) and any other normal professional review required by the Town. With respect to Redwood City and Menlo Park and their process regarding CEQA, Planning & Building Director Russell and Town Attorney Engberg concurred they had not explored those cities. Town Attorney Engberg stated in her memo she highlighted several large cities and their process.

With respect to Commissioner Brothers' earlier question, Town Attorney Engberg said the staff's interpretation came from Subsection D of Section 65905.5 where it stated that SB330 did not supersede anything required to be done under CEQA. Staff would do additional research on the matter and supply those answered to the Commission offline.

Planning & Building Director Russell addressed the 1,000 cubic yards of grading threshold and stated that the grading review was not a legislative process and believed a Planning Commission review that included the grading trigger would count as one of the five meetings. With respect to health and safety, normal health and safety reviews would continue, but any outside agency review would be exempt from the five-meeting rule. Planning & Building Director Russell believed map modifications would be considered legislative and not count toward the five-meeting rule. She didn't anticipate any items related to fire safety that would impact the Commission's recommendation SB330. Regarding Ms. Corley's questions, there were zero conceptual reviews and zero preliminary reviews. With respect to the Geological Safety Committee, the Committee was not listed in the Municipal Code as a review body for subdivisions, and in their Bylaws, they were not listed as a reviewer of development projects.

Time: 01:14:14

Chair Goulden opened the floor to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Kopf-Sill stated she wanted there to be more efficiency in government and planning processes as well as there be a strong focus on decision-making. She wanted a process that was efficient but still benefited from public comment and the various Town committees. She believed the long process was cumbersome and many public members lost interest in a project as the process drug on. She suggested the first meeting of the five meetings be a group meeting of the Conservation Committee, BPTS, ASCC, and Planning Commission. That way the groups could talk through the constraints and ASCC and Planning Commission would hear the discussion rather than summarize details provided by staff or the minutes.

Commissioner Brothers agreed with Commissioner Kopf-Sill regarding efficiency but wanted a vibrant process that allowed important from the Town's various committees. Also, the meetings be well publicized and focused meeting. She asked if the Town's committees could review an application prior

DRAFT MINUTES

to it being deemed complete and if that were allowed, that the information be made public. She agreed that several committees would have to hold joint sessions and supported Commissioner Kopf-Sill's recommended approach. All of those meetings should be public meetings. She encouraged staff to explore CEQA's comment period process and how that may be modified to allow the Town to receive public comment without holding a meeting. She absolutely would not include CEQA meetings in the five-meeting rule and there be one meeting left open for the Town Council. For the future, she recommended exploring how the committees are set up and wanted to understand which committees were listed in the Municipal Code.

Commissioner Krashinsky said eliminating the Subdivision Committee meeting made sense and agreed there had to be joint sessions. He recommended the joint sessions be two committees. The first with the Trails and Paths and Bicycle, Pedestrian & Traffic Safety Committees. The second with conservation and the ASCC. The third for planning commission and fourth for Town Council with the fifth and final meeting open to be determined.

Commissioner Brothers asked which committees should hold joint sessions together. Chair Goulden stated there may be more than one option. Town Attorney Engberg observed grouping the Planning Commission with other committees may not be correct in that the Planning Commission was a decision-making body. The Planning Commission's recommendations should be unbiased and meeting with other committees may invite pre-decision statements.

Planning & Building Director Russell noted all the committees listed in the Municipal Code were listed in the Staff Report and were included in the examples.

Commissioner Brothers asked if the ASCC could have joint sessions with the other committees. Planning & Building Director Russell agreed that ASCC was very specific but saw an overlap between ASCC and the Conservation Committee.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if ASCC had the same problem as the Planning Commission in that both bodies were decision-making bodies and they should be separate. Planning & Building Director Russell did not believe the ASCC was considered that way because the projects would fall within the Planning Commission's final authority.

(2) Update on Housing Element and Next Steps

Time: 01:28:45

Planning & Building Director Russell summarized the background of the recent actions taken by Council regarding the Housing Element as well as HCD's comments, as outlined in the Staff Report. She noted in the course of submitting and reviewing the Town's Housing Element, many Housing Element reviewers employed by HCD had left their employment. The Town received a new reviewer, who was a supervisor, and she was able to provide the Town with more definitive advice. The reviewer indicated that the Town's Housing Element was atypical but Planning & Building Director Russell felt that the reviewer understood the Town's constraints. She acknowledged that HCD's letter was strongly worded but understood that a formal letter would use stronger language than a conversation. The reviewer had provided examples and materials to help the Town revise its Housing Element, but the staff was having trouble scheduling another meeting with her. Staff discussed the matter with other jurisdictions and they were in a similar place.

Planning & Building Director Russell shared that the Town's technical team had done a preliminary analysis based on the reviewer's comments. Staff identified five comments with large policy implications and those were outlined in the Staff Report. With the Opt-In Housing Diversification Program, the reviewer had concerns about the interplay between the various housing laws and that the cap may be considered illegal. With respect to zoning and minimum density, staff continued to work on

DRAFT MINUTES

the issue and would return to the Commission for additional discussion. With respect to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU), HCD stated that if ADUs were not constructed or made available at the affordable income level then more accountability must be demonstrated. With respect to Dorothy Ford-Park, HCD wanted the implementation measures to be strengthened. With respect to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), staff was working with the consultants, and Planning & Building Director Russell believed HCD wanted to see the language strengthened.

For the next steps, Planning & Building Director Russell mentioned staff recommended that Council engage with the reviewer in a back and forth process with the HCD reviewer. Staff requested additional support and Council approved a contract with Urban Planning Partners. Staff was working with the consultant on the scope and budget for the new phase of the Housing Element and that was to be discussed by Council at their September 13, 2023 meeting.

With respect to Zoning Code amendments, Planning & Building Director Russell shared the technical team continued to work on the amendments but significant work had been done.

Commissioner Kopf-Sill asked if staff had a target date for resubmittal and Planning & Building Director Russell remarked there was no specific date at this time.

Planning & Building Director Russell reminded the Commission about the timeline and Council's direction regarding the Fire District recommendations (7 plus 13), as outlined in the Staff Report. A draft of the 7 plus 13 was prepared which was reviewed by the Fire District and she believed the document would be released to the public in the coming weeks.

With respect to related updates, Planning & Building Director Russell provided brief comments on the Builder's Remedy, Zoning Code Updates, and the Safety Element, as outlined in the Staff Report. She reminded the Commission and the public that the current version of the Safety Element was still in effect. Staff had expressed to the Council that working on the Housing Element and the Safety Element at the same time was cumbersome. Town Council directed Staff to focus on the Housing Element and the previously stated release date for the Safety Element of October 1, 2023, had been delayed.

Time: 01:52:12

Chair Goulden invited Commissioners to ask questions of staff.

Commissioner Krashinsky said the Fire District had released its draft Fire Ordinances and was seeking feedback on them. He asked if those ordinances were related to the 7 plus 13. Planning & Building Director Russell answered yes, two of the items on the key approaches were related to those ordinances.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the Planning Commission would review the ordinances. Planning & Building Director Russell stated those would not come before the Commission, but the Town Council would be ratifying the Fire District's proposed Fire Code. The Fire District was considering other ordinances within their authority to approve or not approve.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked if the comment regarding the Opt-In Program and the zoning needing to be completed in 3-years was an expected comment. Planning & Building Director Russell explained that HCD had indicated they did not understand how the Town planned to implement the Opt-In Program. Staff explained the program and the HCD reviewer was receptive to the Town's approach.

Commissioner Krashinsky asked how the Zoning Code Amendment's timeline was impacted by the Town not having a certified Housing Element. Planning & Building Director Russell stated the General Plan and the Zoning Code had to be consistent. She predicted the Housing Element and the Zoning

DRAFT MINUTES

Code would be adopted together but expressed it may not happen by the deadline of January 2024. She explained the consequence of not adopting the zoning by January 2024 was the Zoning Code Amendment could no longer be a Program of the Housing Element and instead had to be adopted concurrently. Town Attorney Engberg noted also it furthered the Town's exposure to Builder's Remedy applications.

Commissioner Krashinsky understood the Town would have to wait for HCD certification to adopt the Zoning Code Amendments. Planning & Building Director Russell believed that was correct.

Commissioner Krashinsky understood the Housing Element would return to the Commission after it was revised per HCD comments. Planning & Building Director Russell confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Brothers said she was stymied by the process and the interrelatedness of the pieces. She asked if the Town had thought of a response item-by-item letter to submit to the HCD reviewer to help reduce the number of specific areas of uncertainty. She expressed concern that the current process placed the Town in jeopardy and was concerned revisions would trigger a new list of uncertainties by HCD. Planning & Building Director Russell reminded that the Town made changes to the Housing Element after HCD's first letter which allowed HCD to make additional comments on those new pieces of information. Staff had prepared a matrix of the specific comments with responses and those would be discussed with the HCD reviewer.

Commissioner Brothers asked if there was a way to have that discussion but still allow the Town to make the Zoning Code changes. Planning & Building Director Russell shared it was discussed and staff believed it would add an additional layer of complexity without much benefit.

Commissioner Brothers asked if the reviewer had seen the Town's responses to the comments. Planning & Building Director Russell answered it would happen at the meeting next week. Commissioner Brothers mentioned that some of the HCD comments did not show any recognition of the Town's physical location.

Chair Goulden asked staff to further explain Attachment 2. Planning & Building Director Russell stated it was the original format for the Fire District's seven requested mitigations that was submitted on March 29, 2023.

Time: 02:09:02

Chair Goulden opened up public comment.

Karen Askey, Parks and Recreation Commissioner speaking on behalf of herself, stated she, and several others, submitted comments to the Town Council in early August about the Housing Element and she asked if those letters were shared with the Planning Commission. She said if density is increased, that would increase the total number of units under the Housing Element. She asked if units could be deducted from other areas and would that change be subject to further comments from HCD. She asked if the Town had any Senate Bill 9 projects in the conceptual or preliminary phase. Also, any Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADU) conceptual or preliminary plans.

Rita Comes stated the Planning Commission had 13 scheduled meetings since March and only two were realized. That was unfortunate because the public and the Commission had not been able to consider the Fire Districts 7 plus 13, nor continue the conversation about the Safety Element and move that forward. While she understood the Housing Element was the priority, the other pressing matters must be completed as well. She was disappointed that many folks did not have access and did not see the January 4, 2023 Fire District letter.

DRAFT MINUTES

Caroline Vertongen agreed with Ms. Comes that the public had not seen the 7 plus 13 memo. She had concerns about the budget and whether the Town had the funding to cover the additional work needed to complete the Housing and Safety Element. The new Town Council had made safety a priority. She shared her frustration that many Town committees were constrained by the consultants, their data, and reports that did not reflect the resident's lived experiences. She stated it was very important that the Town adopt the 7 plus 13 and that the Fire Districts memo be shared with the public.

Kristi Corley requested staff explain more about the Opt-In Program and write in how the program will be subject to the many housing laws.

Nicholas Targ, Vice Chair of the Planning Commission speaking on behalf of himself, acknowledged staff's frustration when they received the comments from HCD regarding the Housing Element. Several housing organizations had verbalized or written letters of support for other city's Housing Element and he asked if staff had considered asking them to write a letter of support for the Town. He mentioned the Housing Element was adopted and was in effect at this time but understood there was litigation regarding the CEQA portion of the document. He asked what the current state of the effectiveness of that Housing Element was.

Time: 02:21:06

Chair Goulden closed public comment and brought the item back to the Commission for discussion.

Planning & Building Director Russell answered the public comments regarding the Housing Element that were sent to the Town Council but not the Planning Commission. With respect to density, staff did not comment until further details were explored. With respect to SB 9 units, only one SB 9 application had been submitted and the Building Permit had not been issued. With respect to JADUs, a small handful of folks had indicated they were interested in having a JADU. With respect to the Safety Element being promised in October 2023, Planning & Building Director Russell disagreed it was not promised but more predicted. With respect to Ms. Comes' comments, there was not enough staff to complete the workload. With respect to the Fire District's January 4, 2023 letter, the Fire Marshall requested that the letter be withdrawn and that was why it was not shared with the public. Staff was also surprised by the Fire District's March letter. Staff attached the seven mitigations to the Planning Commission's Packet. With respect to the Opt-In Program, the Town was not allowed to put in place something that could be a reduction or impediment to housing. Staff was trying to construct the Opt-In Program with the intent of the community and not violate any housing laws. She concurred staff was surprised by HCD's comment letter and continued to work with housing organizations to have their support.

With respect to the current status and effectiveness of the current Housing Element, Town Attorney Engberg stated the Town was in legal limbo with respect to the Housing Element. Regarding the IS/MND, that was approved, and to date there has not been filed litigation. The Town and petitioner group had agreed to toll the Statute of Limitation. The current Tolling Agreement went to November 10, 2023.

Commissioner Brothers

wanted a clearer focus and wanted to see the matrix of HCD's comments and the Town's response. She found HCD's comments to be sporadic, and overreaching, and some of them seemed to be already resolved.

Commissioner Kopf-Sill was disappointed it would be harder and almost impossible to have the Housing Element resubmitted by January 2024. With that said, she acknowledged that the Town Council and staff were working hard.

DRAFT MINUTES

Chair Goulden was concerned the Town would lose track of the Willow Commons' concern in that forcing the site to a higher density would impact their assisted living arrangement. Regarding Attachment 2, he stated that was a huge legal conundrum if everything was adopted. Planning & Building Director Russell remarked the Town asked for clarification from the Fire District and they submitted the July 6, 2023 letter which began the discussion between the Town and the Fire District.

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(3) Commission Reports

Time: 02:31:15

Commissioner Krashinsky shared that Commissioner Kopf-Sill and himself attended the San Mateo Planning Commissioner training. The next meeting was to be held on October 30, 2023. Also, he attended the Institute of Local Government Planning Commissioner Training and shared the slides of that presentation with the Commission. He attended several ASCC meetings and shared a summary of those meetings. Two Parks and Recreation Commissioners reached out to Commissioner Brothers and himself to schedule a meeting to talk about the recreational and park facilities in town.

Commissioner Brothers viewed the meeting as a brainstorming session.

(4) Staff Reports

Time: 02:35:29

Planning & Building Director Russell announced she was leaving her position with the Town and her last day was September 22, 2023. John Biggs was identified as the interim Planning & Building Director.

The Commissioners expressed their well wishes to Planning & Building Director Russell and echoed she had been a strong asset to the Town.

Time: 02:37:52

Chair Goulden opened public comment.

Karen Askey, a Parks and Recreation Commissioner speaking on behalf of herself, was disappointed Planning & Building Director Russell was leaving and echoed she had been a tremendous asset to the Town.

Betsy Morgenthaler echoed the comments regarding Planning & Building Director Russell.

Nichols Targ, Vice Chair of the Planning Commission spoke on behalf of himself and shared his comments about Planning & Building Director Russell's departure.

Time: 02:40:13

Chair Goulden closed public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(5) Planning Commission Meeting of May 2, 2023

Time: 02:40:40

Chair Goulden opened public comment; seeing none he closed public comment.

Commissioner Brothers moved to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2023, meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Kopf-Sill, the motion carried 4-0.

DRAFT MINUTES

ADJOURNMENT [10:35 p.m.]

Commissioner Kopf-Sill moved to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Brothers, the motion carried 4-0.