

DRAFT FAIRFAX PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
FAIRFAX WOMENS CLUB
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016

Call to Order/Roll Call:

Chair Kehrlein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Bruce Ackerman
Norma Fragoso
Philip Green
Laura Kehrlein
Mimi Newton
Cindy Swift

Commissioners Absent: Esther Gonzalez-Parber

Staff Present: Linda Neal, Principal Planner
Garrett Toy, Town Manager/Acting Planning Director
Katie Wisinski, Assistant Town Attorney
Michelle Levinson, Zoning Technician
Sean Kennings, LAK Associates, Planning Consultant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

M/s, Fragoso/Newton, motion to approve the agenda.
AYES: Ackerman, Fragoso, Green, Newton, Swift, Chair Kehrlein
ABSENT: Gonzalez-Parber

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Richard Rogler, Banchemo Way, thanked the Town for turning on the flood alarm today. The creek was high and water was almost coming out of the catch basins.

ELECTION OF A NEW CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

M/s, Newton/Swift, motion to elect Commissioner Fragoso as Chair and Newton as Vice Chair.
AYES: Ackerman, Fragoso, Green, Newton, Swift, Chair Kehrlein
ABSENT: Gonzalez-Parber

RESCHEDULING THE JANUARY 19, 2017 MEETING

Town Manager Toy asked the Commission to hold off on this decision until later in the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. **18 Meernaa Avenue; Applicant #16-43**
Request for a Use Permit to install a prefabricated, 52-square-foot hot tub and a 24-square-foot, 97-inch tall sauna, Assessor's Parcel No's. 002-036-20. Residential Single-

family RD 5.5-7 Zone; Mariana Caplan; Christopher Schrader, applicant; owner CEQA categorically exempt per Section 15303(e).

Zoning Technician Levinson presented a staff report.

Chair Fragoso opened the Public Hearing.

There were no comments from the owner or the public.

Chair Fragoso closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- He referred to Resolution No. 16-33, the fifth Whereas, #3, the last sentence, and asked that the words "prior notification" be replaced with a reasonable time period such as 14 days. He did not want any ambiguity.

Chair Fragoso provided the following comments:

- She asked how the hot tub would be drained. Principal Planner Neal stated she thought they had to be drained into the sewer system and could not longer go into the storm drain. The Building Official would make sure this is done properly.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- Miscellaneous condition #3 would cover Chair Fragoso's concern.

M/s, Kehrlein/Green, Motion to adopt Resolution No. 16-33, approving application #16-43 for 18 Meernaa Avenue.

AYES: Fragoso, Green, Kehrlein, Newton, Swift, Chair Fragoso

ABSENT: Gonzalez-Parber

Chair Fragoso stated there was a 10-day appeal period.

2. 2625 Sir Francis Drake Blvd.; Application #16-44

Request for a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Text and Map Amendment, Subdivision Map, Traffic Impact Permit, Design Review Permit, Excavation Permit and density bonus waivers and concessions for number of units, height, covered parking and parkland dedication to allow subdivision of an approximately 20-acre property into three parcels. A 2-acre parcel that will be rezoned Planned Development PDD Zone and is proposed for development with a 54-unit senior housing project and two, 9-acre parcels that will remain zoned for single-family use with Upland Residential UR-7 Zoning; Assessor's Parcel No. 174-070-17; project applicant, Resources for Community Development (RCD). Review of the Project under the California Environmental Quality Act ('CEQA') is being conducted via the preparation and circulation of an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Town Manager Toy made some introductory comments.

Commissioner Swift asked about the overall workflow/process timeframe. Town Manager Toy stated in terms of process, all of the discretionary approvals come to the Commission as one package. The Planning Commission would make recommendations on the "package" to the Council. The Town is well within any timelines but the applicant might have concerns about the financing side.

Chair Fragoso asked if the Town was required to do the review in a 90-day period and does this 90-day period pertain to only the Commission but also the Council review.

Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski stated they were not constrained by the Permit Streamlining Act since the applicants are asking for a General Plan Amendment and a Zoning Text Amendment. Staff does want to move the project along expeditiously.

Mr. Sean Kennings, representing LAK Associates, presented the staff report and made a PowerPoint presentation that included: 1) Project description; 2) Design Review Findings; 3) Mitigated Negative Declaration; 4) Initial Study; 5) Traffic Impact Permit; 6) Existing site conditions; 7) Proposed lot plan; 8) Proposed site plan; 9) Proposed utility plan; 10) Proposed detention basins. He noted the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated on November 30th and the public comment period ends on December 20th. The Initial Study covers 19 areas of review.

Chair Fragoso opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Alisha Cline, Senior Project Manager with Resources for Community Development (RCD), made the following comments:

- She gave a PowerPoint presentation and discussed the history and mission of Resources for Community Development.
- RCD houses over 4,000 residents.
- She noted Victory Village was an affordable development for residents that are making no more than 50% (low income) or 30% (very low income) of the area median income.
- The development would include studios and one-bedroom units.
- Marin Housing Authority would provide rental assistant vouchers.
- The manager's unit would not be income restricted.
- She discussed local preference and fair housing issues.
- She discussed proposed marketing and outreach.
- RCD held a community meeting and got a lot of feedback regarding parking and traffic.
- The proposal includes 39 parking spaces for 54 units (0.7 spaces per unit). This number comes from RCD's experience with senior affordable housing developments and research of Marin County.
- The proposal includes an alternative driveway scenario that would allow for three more parking spaces.
- She discussed the timeline for the development- they would like to start construction in about a year and start renting units a year later.
- Planning Commission, Council and Tree Advisory Committee approvals over the next couple of months will allow them to apply for the rest of the funding in the spring and summer.
- They would like the process to be finished by the first half of March because the next funding application is due in the middle of March.

Mr. Rick Williams, representing Van Meder, Williams and Pollick Architects, made the following comments:

- He discussed the project design.
- He displayed an aerial view of the site.
- He pointed out the existing drainage ditch.
- They held a study session a year ago and provided a number of alternatives. People preferred a scheme that had a larger footprint but reduced the overall height of the building.
- The proposed project contains: 1) An "E" shaped building; 2) Two courtyards; 3) Parking in the back; 4) Deliveries and pick ups (trash, etc.) would occur in the back of the building; 5) The driveway coming out directly to Sir Francis Drake Boulevard; 6) The three-story area of the building would be about 240' from the street; 7) The frontage of the site would be improved

including a sidewalk, handicapped ramps, and curb and gutter; 8) New utilities and storm drain connections; 9) Enlargement of the storm water retention area; 10) Improvement of the ditch along the driveway.

- There would be about a 10% reduction in the overall off-site flow.
- The two-acre site would meet the 200-year storm water requirements.
- He discussed the details of the building plan; 1) The entry lobby is in the center portion of the building; 2) A large porch; 3) A community room; 4) A residentially oriented courtyard with community gardens; 5) Service area in the back; 6) Two elevators; 7) Bicycle parking; 8) An entryway for the residents on the lower level with a walkway that leads to the sidewalk on Sir Francis Drake and the bus stop; 9) A manager's office in the front.
- The only area of the site that would be fenced off would be the two courtyards.
- The landscape plan would include some large trees in the front and a lot of native, drought tolerant species.
- They plan to remove 72 trees- 26 are not in the two-acre site. The other 46 trees would be replaced on a one to one ratio.
- He displayed a slide of the story poles.
- The two-story element in the back allows for a view of the ridgeline across the way from the rear of the property.
- The building steps up the grade.
- He discussed stormwater management elements.
- He stated they took a lot of care with the interior spaces. Each unit has a personalized entry.
- The apartments are predominantly one-bedroom with an open floor plan, hardwood flooring, large, full kitchens, and accessible bathrooms.
- The corridors are well lit with good signage.
- The detailed roof plan includes solar panels and wiring for future approval. The panels would be tight to the roof and at the same slope as the roof.
- There are a number of sustainable features including solar hot water.

Commissioner Swift had questions about the age and eligibility requirements. Ms. Cline stated all residents would need to be age qualified (at least 62 years old) with the exception of a caregiver.

Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski discussed the actions that the Town would need to take to implement the applicant's vision. These actions include: 1) Changing the General Plan Land Use Designation; 2) Subdivision or Parcel Map (into three parcels); 3) Zone Change and Text Amendment; 4) Mitigated Negative Declaration; 5) A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; 6) A Planned Development District (PDD) Ordinance; 7) A Density Bonus Agreement; 8) A Traffic Impact Permit; 9) An Excavation Permit; 10) Design Review. Most of these actions have been envisioned in the Town planning documents for quite a while. The General Plan Amendment would need to be approved prior to any other approvals. The Zoning for any parcel must comply with its General Plan Designation per State law. The current PDD process is quite onerous and the General Plan has directed that this process be amended. This project has requested and qualifies for a Density Bonus under the State Density Bonus Law. This project is offering 100% affordable units and therefore qualifies for a 35% density bonus- or 27 dwelling units per acre. She discussed the exceptions (deviations) and concessions

Chair Frago asked how many units could be built on Lots #2 and #3. Assistant Attorney Wisinski stated the short answer is that they would be zoned UR-7 which requires 7 acres for one single family home. Each lot could have one single-family home.

Commissioner Kerhlein asked Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski to explain the park in-lieu fee. Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski stated one of the approvals is a Subdivision Map to divide the 20-acre parcel into three parcels. Under the Subdivision Map Act the Town may adopt an ordinance

requiring applicants to dedicate parkland for the use of residents in the subdivision. There is a parkland dedication requirement for both the Victory Village site and one for the two other parcels. The applicant can either dedicate land or pay an in-lieu fee to satisfy this requirement. The applicant plans to pay the fee for the two back two parcels. They are asking for two things with respect to the Victory Village site: 1) a credit against the amount of land required to be dedicated, and 2) a waiver with respect to the remaining dedication requirement.

Commissioner Newton referred to Government Code Section 66477 (The Quimby Act) which created dedication language and asked how it applied to the Town ordinance. She is not convinced that the calculation of 8,900 square feet for the Victory Village site is correct and asked how it was calculated. Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski agreed there was a discrepancy- five acres per 1,000 residents of the Town or the proposed subdivision. Staff has used the latter in its calculation. Commissioner Swift asked staff to bring back further clarification on this entire issue.

Chair Fragoso asked if the courtyards, front, and side yards would be included in the parkland requirement. Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski stated that information would be included in the memorandum.

Commissioner Newton asked if it was appropriate for the Commission to review and comment on the Mitigated Negative Declaration since the comment period was still open (closed on December 20th). Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski stated CEQA requires the lead agency (the Town Council) to consider the comments made on the document. The Commission can review and comment on the document prior to the closing of the public comment period.

Commissioner Swift asked if there has been any general discussion about the future of the two nine acre parcels. Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski stated the applicant could address this question. She clarified that the two acres (Lots #2 and #3) are included in this project. Ms. Cline stated there are two possibilities for the back two parcels: 1) Remain as open space; 2) Sale of the back two acres for possible development.

Ms. Cline stated the Town Code provides two alternatives for calculating the acreage to be dedicated- one based on population and one based on the number of units. They calculated 8,900 square feet based on 54 units for multi-family housing. This is square footage that is not already provided as active recreation area in the courtyards. They have calculated the in-lieu fee to be approximately \$15,000. The fee for the back two parcels would be about \$1,100 which would be financially feasible and are prepared to pay.

Commissioner Green asked what the purchase price of the two lots would be. Ms. Cline stated they increased the purchase offer by \$300,000.

Commissioner Newton stated the architect referred to the building as "tight" and she asked if the windows could be opened. Ms. Cline stated "yes". Commissioner Newton stated the restrictions for affordability would remain in place for 55 years and she asked if this was also true for the age restrictions. Ms. Cline stated it would cover the same period.

Commissioner Newton had the following questions: 1) Did the applicants look at options for a third story? 2) Has the application changed since it was reviewed by the Open Space Committee? 3) Did they consider the Visual Resources Map in the General Plan when analyzing the aesthetic view from the ridgeline? 4) Do they identify Sir Francis Drake Boulevard as a Scenic Highway? She has concerns about some of the conclusions in the environmental evaluation. Mr. Kennings stated Sir Francis Drake Boulevard is not a State designated Scenic Highway and there are no designated scenic vistas on the site.

Commissioner Green stated three stories do not necessarily have to be 40 feet high. Mr. Williams stated there is one point on the entire building that is 40 feet- he pointed to the rendering. They stepped the building up in an effort to keep the height down in the front. The eaves will be at 30 feet.

Commissioner Kehrlein asked if they could modify the roofline at that particular element- perhaps have a flat roof element over that portion. Mr. Williams stated a flat roof would give it a strange configuration. Chair Fragoso stated the variety of rooflines gives the building character. Mr. Williams stated if they used a flat roof they would need to build a parapet to hide the mechanical equipment.

Commissioner Swift stated she was concerned about the proposed number of parking spaces since the site is almost a mile from the downtown and not necessarily walkable to downtown services. She asked if RCD's other projects were more centrally located. Ms. Cline stated the other senior developments owned by RCD are in different parts of town and several are served by busses. They have started discussions with Whistlestop about the possibility of a shuttle system.

Commissioner Green asked if they had given any thought to creating retail space (a convenience store) on the property. He asked about visitor parking. Ms. Cline stated they have not considered a retail component since it is not a permitted use. They have included visitor parking in their parking calculations.

Ms. Jessica Green, Fairfax, made the following comments:

- Fairfax residents should have priority.
- She asked if the rents were guaranteed.
- This project is too big for Fairfax and too far from downtown.
- There is not enough parking.

Ms. Eleanor Block, member of the Commission on Aging, made the following comments:

- The Commission is trying to make Fairfax a senior-friendly town. Transportation is key.
- She supports the project.

Ms. Sandy Clair, Village West, made the following comments:

- She is concerned about the scale of the project.
- There is no public parking near the site.

Ms. Marian Weinstein, Oak Tree Lane, made the following comments:

- She asked if the project would be serving Fairfax residents.
- She had questions about the proposed marketing plan.
- She liked the green building aspects of the project.
- The parking is insufficient.
- Transit in that area is inadequate.
- She had questions about Section 8 vouchers.

Ms. Jane Richardson, Madrone Road, made the following comments:

- Seniors need cars and family.
- She did not know why the General Plan should be altered to accommodate this project.
- This project will not solve Fairfax's need for senior housing.
- The project is too big and should be scaled down.

Ms. Stephanie Burns, Mountain View, made the following comments:

- She did not move to Fairfax because it was a leader in affordable housing.

- If you live in Fairfax you need a car. Public transit is not adequate.
- The project puts people in the “back 40” where they are sort of like prisoners.
- There should be more time for public comment on the environmental documents.

Mr. John Remades, Madrone Road, made the following comments:

- He had a question about parking and height requirements.
- It feels like the Town is being “strong-armed” by the design professionals.

Ms. Cynthia Bradley, Dominga Avenue, made the following comments:

- She is 100% in favor of the project.
- The design is beautiful and sustainable.
- They should gather as a community to find alternatives to the automobile.
- They should open up their hearts to people outside of the community.

Ms. Buff Bradley, Dominga Avenue, made the following comments:

- This is a very exciting project.
- It is thoughtful and intelligent.
- She supports the project.

Ms. Amy Goslan, Fairfax, made the following comments:

- She serves on the Council of Christ Lutheran Church.
- She gave a brief history of the project.
- She is concerned about the homeless and the elderly

Ms. Patti Breitman, Rally Court, made the following comments:

- She works with the homeless- many grew up in Marin.
- There is a connection between homelessness and affordable housing.
- This project should be open to anyone who qualifies.
- This project is brilliant- it is the right place and the right time.

Ms. Sue Fox, Canon Village, made the following comments:

- She is happy to have more diversity in Town.
- She is concerned with the overall picture and the possibility of more homes in the area.
- She was concerned about the ecological impacts.

Ms. Gwen Ford, Creek Road, made the following comments:

- She is in favor of the project.
- Her heart goes out to anyone who is an underserved person.
- Fairfax should open its doors and plan smartly to be inclusive.

Ms. Wendy Kallins, Forest Knolls, made the following comments:

- She is an advocate for affordable housing.
- The way to create affordability is to provide a few more units.
- Adding more parking would add more cars and more traffic.
- The transit system on the west end of Fairfax is inadequate and needs to be improved.
- It would be a good idea to have an on-site shuttle.
- This project is not out of character with the surrounding neighborhood- Village West, Canon Village and the apartment buildings. This is a dense area.

Lisle, Fairfax, made the following comments:

- She is excited about the project. It is 100% low income.

- This project typifies what is the best about Fairfax.

Ms. Spirit Wiseman, Canon Village resident, made the following comments:

- She is a realtor and finds it difficult to watch what has been going on with housing in Fairfax.
- She supports the project.

Mr. Jake Rosen, Assistant Project Manager for RCD, made the following comments:

- There is an incredible need for affordable housing in Marin.
- Stable housing has a significant positive impact on older adults.

Ms. Lori Golden, San Anselmo, made the following comments:

- She supports this project. She is impressed with the care and thoughtfulness that has gone into this project.
- Housing is at a crisis point in Marin.

Ms. Diana Purdue, Scenic Road, made the following comments:

- She agreed that changes are needed to the General Plan.
- The General Plan is the cause of this acrimonious situation. It was put together in a backward fashion.
- She asked why anything would be changed to appease Plan Bay Area's notion of what is good.
- The atrocious Victory Village would be victorious only for the developer.
- The project is the shameless face of greed and will usher in the destruction of Fairfax.

Mr. Larry Bragman, Hickory Road, made the following comments:

- He supports the project.
- He is disappointed on how the project is going through the approval stage.
- The process for Planned Development Districts is being circumvented.
- There is an overwhelming need for this type of housing in Marin.
- Approving this project would take pressure off of the rest of the Town.

Ms. Denise Larson, Manor Hill, made the following comments:

- This project is for active seniors. The idea that residents will not need parking is a concern.
- The deal with Whistlestop should be in place before the project is approved.
- The bus service is awful in the west part of Fairfax.
- She is concerned about the application for rezoning and changing the height limit.
- She supports affordable housing but this project is too far from needed services.

Ms. Roberta Anthes, Snowden Lane, made the following comments:

- She supports the project.
- Seniors are the fastest growing demographic in the country and low-income seniors are the neediest.
- The 54 units will help offset the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers required by the State.
- There should be more time for public comment.
- She is concerned about the parking.
- Golden Gate Transit is not reliable and Whistlestop is not the solution- a shuttle service was the solution.

Ms. Delia Gosman, member of Christ Lutheran Church, made the following comments:

- She supports the project. It gives people at-risk a chance to live in Marin.

Ms. Jackie Hoffman, Sequoia Road, made the following comments:

- She is a professional in the affordable housing field.
- She supports the project and RCD.
- There is a price point that needs to be met for this project to be successful.
- There should be adequate transportation alternatives- not more parking.

Ms. Mallory Geidheim, Willow Avenue, made the following comments:

- This is a beautiful project that is very well done.
- She is on the Affordable Housing Committee. They have only met several times.
- The Commission and Council needs to interact with the Committee.
- She is concerned about allowing three stories- it would set a precedent.
- She asked if the third story could be relocated to one of the other parcels.

Mr. Bret Kelly, Tamalpais Road, made the following comments:

- He supports the project- it will help encourage diversity.
- He wished the project were not being driven by a business model.
- The third floor is an issue in terms of the Town regulations but also the building itself. It could be oppressive when someone is in the courtyard.
- A two-story building would add to a feeling of “community”.
- There could be a safety issue if the two driveways come off of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (and not Mitchell Drive).

Chair Fragoso closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission took a 10-minute break at 10:30 p.m.

Chair Fragoso asked the applicant about their funding deadlines. Mr. Cline stated there were two applications due in March- one on March 1st and the other is due shortly after March 15th. She stated affordable housing requires a “layer cake” of funding sources to be feasible.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comment:

- She would like to see more open space preservation.
- She wondered if there could be a split into four parcels instead of three parcels, with one being devoted to open space.
- She would like to see a conservation easement or gift to the Town. Ms. Cline stated that was their first preference. The back portion of the 18 acres is bounded on either side by private property.
- She noted there were prescriptive easements. Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski stated she would discuss this with the Town Manager.
- She was struck by Mr. Bragman’s concern about the streamlining of the process and the appearance that things are not being done in the right order.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- He is also concerned about the process and noted they do have a process in the Town Code that has not been modified yet (Chapter 17.112.020). They have not voted to streamline that process and should be following it.
- He asked about the location of the public garden and was concerned it might be in the shade. Mr. Williams pointed to the garden and noted it would get good solar access.
- He would like to look into the following: 1) Turning the Mitchell Drive prescriptive easement into a recorded contract; 2) Purchasing the two lots, in a partnership with County Open Space or the Marin Municipal Water District, and turning them into whatever they want.

Commissioner Ackerman provided the following comments:

- The design elements are well thought-out.
- He was struck by Mr. Bragman's comments. He is concerned about the time frame.
- There is a lot of support for the project. He would like to make it work.
- It sounds like a big deal to be modifying the General Plan but this is not a substantive modification.

Chair Fragoso provided the following comment:

- It would be worthwhile to try to purchase the two lots and preserve them as open space.

Commissioner Swift provided the following comments:

- She asked if the enhancements to the drainage system and the 10% reduction in storm water runoff would benefit the neighborhood, particularly those at Village West. Mr. Mark Hale, civil engineer, stated the existing storm drain system is somewhat lacking. They looked at the 2-acre parcel and were able to reduce the amount of runoff with the bioretention system in the front. They have allowed for provisions for the 18-acre site if the Town is able to improve the downstream storm drain system in the future. The flow is not life or property threatening- it is more of an inconvenience.
- She asked if water would continue to flow across the road. Mr. Hale stated "yes, but there would be less of it". The problem is the existing inlets- the water does not get into the system to begin with.
- She asked if they would be willing to add more parking. Ms. Cline stated they looked at this- rearranging the 2-acre lot line or reorganizing the lot. Extra parking could negatively impact the storm drainage. These additional spaces would need to be permeable pavement and level. There could also be some financial constraints.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comment:

- She referred to the provision regarding 55 years for affordability and asked if they would be willing to change it to "in perpetuity". Ms. Cline stated she would need to research that question.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- He asked if the manager's unit was low-income, rent-free, etc. Ms. Cline stated the manager's unit is not income restricted. They want to be competitive in terms of hiring this position.

Commissioner Ackerman provided the following comment:

- He likes the enclosed bicycle storage. He asked about bicycle storage for visitors. Mr. Williams stated there would be other bicycle facilities in a visible spot.

Commissioner Kehrlein provided the following comments:

- She stated some of the trees slated for removal look like they could be saved.
- She noted the replacement trees were 15-gallon and stated she wanted larger sized trees. Mr. Peter Arnold, landscape architect, stated smaller trees tend to do better in the long run.

Chair Fragoso stated the following were questions and issues for staff: 1) Clarify the streamline process; 2) Clarify the parkland dedication- which section of the code is applicable?; 3) Clarify the selection process (lottery, etc.) and the marketing efforts; 4) Increase in parking; 5) Height of the project; 6) Covered parking; 7) Clarification on the runoff from the property; 8) The 55 year affordability vs. "in perpetuity" issue; 9) Negotiations for more transit; 10) Feasibility of solar panels.

Commissioner Green provided the following comment:

- The PDD Ordinance (Town Code Chapter 17.112) sets out an onerous procedure.
- He is a streamlining buff. Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski stated the Housing Element calls for the reduction of governmental barriers to facilitate and produce affordable housing. The Town Attorney's office is comfortable with carrying forward an amendment to the process concurrently with this type of project.
- He stated it might make sense to create Town Code Chapter 17.112(a) that addressed PDD Zones for affordable housing projects.
- He could support the requested concessions.
- The parking is generous.
- He could approve the waiver for the open space.

Assistant Town Attorney Wisinski stated the Commission couldn't take some actions but hold off on others- this is a package that is centrally tied to the CEQA review. Staff and the applicants have received good direction about what to bring back.

M/s, Swift/Kehrlein, Motion to continue application #16-44, 2626 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, to the January 19, 2017 meeting.

AYES: Ackerman, Green, Kehrlein, Newton, Swift, Chair Fragoso

NOES: Gonzalez-Parber

MINUTES

3. Minutes from November 17, 2016 Planning Commission regular meeting.

M/s, Kehrlein/Newton, Motion to approve the November 17, 2016 minutes as corrected.

AYES: Ackerman, Green, Kehrlein, Newton, Swift, Chair Fragoso

NOES: Gonzalez-Parber

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no report.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND REQUESTS

Commissioner Kehrlein asked that the following item be placed on the next agenda: 1) Commission representative to the Tree Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 11:55 p.m. Respectfully submitted,

Toni DeFrancis,
Recording Secretary