

FAIRFAX PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
FAIRFAX WOMENS CLUB
THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 2017

Call to Order/Roll Call:

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

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

Commissioners Absent: Esther Gonzalez-Parber

Staff Present: Linda Neal, Principal Planner
Town Attorney Katie Wisinski
Sean Kennings, LAK Associates, Contract Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

M/s, Green/Kehrlein, motion to approve the agenda.
AYES: All

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Suzanne Cheney, Ace Court, referred to the recent proposal to close Bolinas Road and stated that road is a main evacuation route and could never be closed. Chair Fragoso stated that proposal was off the table. Ms. Cheney stated there were no lights on the edge of the park and it was dangerous.

Ms. Kiki LaPorta, Glen Drive, thanked the Victory Village applicants for the tremendous quality and extent of the community outreach they have performed. She thanked staff for the terrific staff reports on this much-needed project.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- 1. Planned Development District (PDD) Proposed Text Amendment**
The Planning Commission will meet to consider and discuss a proposed ordinance revision to Chapter 17.112 ('Planned Development District Zone) of the Fairfax Town Code. The proposed zoning ordinance amendment will implement direction given in the Fairfax 2010-2030 General Plan and 2015 Housing Element update to revise the PDD Ordinance as it applies to three (3) parcels identified as 'housing opportunity sites' in the Housing Element. For these sites, it will establish a streamlined review and approval process. This ordinance amendment will not approve any new projects, it will amend the approval process applicable to housing opportunity sites directed to be zoned PDD.

Town Attorney Wisinski presented the staff report. She clarified the items that would be discussed tonight. She gave a PowerPoint presentation that included the following: 1) What's on the table; 2) Purpose of zoning; 3) PDD Ordinance; 4) Current PDD Ordinance; 5) PDD Ordinance also...;6) Since PDD Ordinance enacted; 7) Land Use Element direction; 8) Take away from General Plan; 9) Opportunity Site No. 1;10) Opportunity Site No. 2; 11) Opportunity Site No. 4; 12) General PDD direction; 13) Take away from Housing Element; 14) Another look at the current PDD Ordinance; 15) What would the new section apply to?; 16) Proposed PDD amendment; 17) Proposed PDD Ordinance; 18) Questions for Planning Commission.

Commissioner Green clarified that they were not amending the entire PDD Ordinance but rather adding a section to deal with these specific sites. Town Attorney Wisinski agreed.

Chair Fragoso clarified that the proposed amendments would streamline the process by eliminating some redundancies but also provide the Town and community an opportunity to see the full plans up front. Town Attorney Wisinski agreed- compressing the timeline puts the onus on the applicant to bring in all the information in the beginning. Chair Fragoso stated the applicant must also do the CEQA review early on, which could make it more comprehensive.

Commissioner Swift referred to the proposed Ordinance, Section 165(c)(2) "General Standards" which allows for deviations to the standards and asked how that compared to the process in the existing ordinance. She referred to the proposed Ordinance, Section (E)(1)(c) and asked for clarification about resubmittals. She also asked about the appeal process. Town Attorney Wisinski stated the Planning Commission is not in a position to adopt development standards that would apply to other zoning districts or this district. The change in the new ordinance recognizes that the Town Council has that authority. Planning Commission determinations can always be appealed to the Town Council and denied applications can be resubmitted within 60 days. This is a holdover from the existing ordinance.

Commissioner Newton stated she did not see any reference to fees, engineer's reports, open space dedication, or performance bond requirements reflected in the proposed ordinance. Town Attorney Wisinski agreed that some of these items are not in the proposed ordinance but are already included in the built-in staff process or in other ordinances. They could also be included in conditions of approval. These elements could be reintroduced in the proposed ordinance. Commissioner Newton asked what would be the timeline for a new project that was submitted after Council adoption of the new PDD Ordinance. Town Attorney Wisinski stated any project qualified to use the streamline process could bring in a single application that included all the necessary steps.

Commissioner Swift asked if there were timeframes for development. Principal Planner Neal stated "no"- variances were good for a year (can request a year extension) but if construction is started then the variance is good for perpetuity. Hillside Residential Development (HRD) permits are the same. They do expire if not activated in two years. There is no expiration of the Use Permit or Design Review process. Chair Fragoso asked about expiration of building permits. Principal Planner Neal stated that was set by the Building Code with inspections required periodically. Town Attorney Wisinski pointed out that this streamlined process only applied to sites identified as opportunity sites to be rezoned PDD.

Commissioner Green stated the PPD zone is a "little community" in and of itself and there should be a performance bond requirement.

Chair Fragoso referred to Section 17.112.060, "Master Development Plan" and stated she would like to list all the submittal requirements.

Chair Fragoso opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Karl Diehl, Toyon Drive, made the following comments:

- The developer and the Lutheran Church have been working on this project for a number of years.
- They have moved forward with the understanding that the zoning amendments would be adopted and they would be subject to the streamline process.
- They should not be subject to the current process- that would be very unfair and prejudicial.

Ms. Suzanne Cheney, Ace Court, made the following comments:

- She is bothered about losing control over the design elements.
- She is opposed to developments that do not fit in to the Town plan and look like they belong in San Jose.
- She does not want three years of dusty construction and noise in her neighborhood.
- There should be ballots for huge developments.

Ms. Pete Santee, Mountain View, made the following comments:

- He thanked staff for the clear presentation.
- He asked if staff has researched how other similar sized towns handle this streamline process.

Mr. Larry Bragman made the following comments:

- The problem is getting everybody in the community back on the same page- not streamlining the ordinance.
- People need to trust the process that this project will go through.
- The existing code gives them the discretion to approve this project on an efficient basis.
- The existing PDD Ordinance has the flexibility they need to consider the requested concessions.
- The size of the proposal is not a prerequisite to come within the PDD Ordinance. PDD's are exempt from requiring a variance from site requirements.
- He would urge caution in amending the code. Residents would be more comfortable going through the existing code.

Mr. Doug Cooper, Fairfax, made the following comment:

- He read a statement from the Marin League of Women Voters in support of the proposed ordinance.

Ms. Roberta Andes, Snowden, made the following comments:

- She has supported the project from its inception.
- She has concerns about the ordinance.
- The project is best served by the original ordinance.
- A lot of people will support the project for 54 units for senior affordable housing but perhaps oppose it if there is a rider attached that includes two other properties.
- She did not want to see the project get hamstrung by the process.

Ms. Diane Hoffman, Porteous Avenue, made the following comments:

- This feels like a "rider" similar to what lazy politicians do.
- The project will eventually be market rate housing.
- Parking is important.

Mr. Chuck Wright, Pine Avenue, made the following comments:

- He works for a large developer of affordable housing.
- There is a housing crisis in Marin County.

Ms. Alicia Cline, representing Resources for Community Development (RCD), made the following comments:

- She supports the removal of Section 2- it takes away the fear that this is going to rezone other sites.
- RCD has submitted as part of the application all deliverables on the Master Planning list.
- They are ready to meet the requirements that are being considered tonight.
- The impact that the streamlining would have on the Victory Village submittal is critical in their ability to move forward.

Ms. Wendy Kallins, San Geronimo Valley, made the following comments:

- She supports the streamlining process.
- Affordable housing developers do not have the resources that for-profit developers have and need the ability to move as quickly as possible.
- This is not some sneaky idea- it is part of the General Plan and Housing Element.
- The Commission is simply carrying out the dictates that have already been decided.

Mr. Robert Pendoley, representing the Marin Environmental Housing Collaborative, made the following comments:

- His group recommends approval of the ordinance for two reasons: 1) The PDD process as currently constituted is an impediment to the development of affordable housing; 2) This provides a more transparent process.

Ms. Rebecca Collins, Monte Vista Road, made the following comments:

- She supports Victory Village and the other two sites for low-income housing.
- The environment is very difficult for non-profits.
- They need to look at the “big picture”.

Mr. David Haskell, Glen Drive, made the following comments:

- He supported the proposed action and the applicant.
- The project is appropriate to the site.
- Preservation is about quality of life and caring about one another.

Mr. Vincent Damico, Arboleda Circle, made the following comment:

- Rules, regulations, ordinances, and laws should be applied equally to everyone.

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

- She wondered why School Street was included in these three projects.
- They are doing the other projects a favor by trying to push everything through so there won't be any review.
- Victory Village could have applied a year ago and now they are stuck.
- The basic General Plan does not need to be changed.

Ms. Kiki LaPorta made the following comments:

- She urged the Commission to proceed with the amendments to the ordinance as proposed by staff.
- The General Plan was passed through a long and arduous public process.
- She urged the Commission to move forward.

Chair Fragoso closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- The current PDD process is onerous.
- The General Plan was adopted in 2012 and details exactly what they are doing.

Commissioner Ackerman provided the following comments:

- Staff indicated there were contradictions inherent in the existing process.
- The proposed amendments would make the process clearer and quicker.
- There is a legal requirement to look at processes specifically for affordable housing.
- The most important issue is the timeline that RCD faces.
- There is a lot of support in the community for Victory Village.
- He did not want to thwart the project by stretching the process out.
- The proposed amendments provide more transparency. There is a value to a process where everything is seen at the same time.

Commissioner Kehrlein provided the following comments:

- She asked staff if the proposed amendments would eliminate any steps. Town Attorney Wisinski stated they would be consolidating steps and moving forward the presentation of all of the information required under the existing ordinance. The proposed ordinance does take away some redundancies.
- The identified opportunity sites are somewhat different than the sites listed in the existing PDD Ordinance because they are less than the required 5 acre minimum parcel size.
- By front-loading the application the developer has the opportunity to solve issues that might not be apparent during the preliminary development process. This could create a better project.
- This is a more holistic process.

Commissioner Swift provided the following comment:

- She asked staff what would preclude an applicant under the existing code from coming in on “Day One” with what would be the equivalent of the Precise Development Plan. Principal Planner Neal stated they can do that but they still need to go through all the steps.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She would rather take an approach that fixes the elements of the overall PDD Ordinance. She passed out an alternative proposal and proposed language.
- They could add a section to the existing ordinance that would allow for streamlining for the three opportunity sites.
- She asked about the language in the General Plan referred to by several speakers regarding rezoning and the lack of review. Town Attorney Wisinski stated the language is as follows: “No discretionary review besides confirming compliance with objective design standards will be allowed on the site after rezoning”. This means that they can not be required to come in and get a Conditional Use Permit but the Town reserves the right to review design against whatever criteria is adopted.
- Her alternate proposal could be limited to the Victory Village site and not apply to the other two sites (School Street and Olema). Each General Plan Program talks about them separately. Town Attorney Wisinski stated they are not in a position to frame individual approval processes for each parcel in Town identified to be rezoned PDD. This could be construed as “spot zoning”- applying different standards to different parcels. They need to evaluate the proposed ordinance amendment on the strength of its own merits and not its ultimate impact on a single project.
- She had a question about General Standards Section (C)(2) of the proposed ordinance and whether or not they need to be bound by the standards, etc. of the zoning district most similar in nature. Town Attorney Wisinski stated the language parrots the language in the existing process which staff does not want to throw out.

- She would like to go through the proposed ordinance with a “fine toothed comb”.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- He supports the streamlining changes as presented.
- It is a good idea to make these changes for these limited projects.
- He suggested some language modifications to the proposed ordinance including requiring a performance bond and encouraging solar, green building methods, and a reference to Downtown Fairfax relative to transit issues.

Chair Fragoso provided the following comments:

- They are mixing “apples and oranges”- there are some projects that should not be submitting a Final Precise Plan with the first application.
- Some projects need to go through the step-by-step process.
- She can understand setting these sites aside since the development standards have been approved.

Commissioner Swift provided the following comments:

- She agreed with the comments made by Commissioner Newton- that code section needs review.
- They should be incorporating the PDD into the entire code. Chair Fragoso stated that would be very time consuming- they are trying to come into compliance with the General Plan.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- They have the ability to look at the PDD Ordinance holistically.
- She would like to take everything out of the existing ordinance, create a whole new section, and add things back in. This accomplishes what the General Plan directs them to do.
- She would like to boil the three-plan process down to a two-plan process.
- She wants to move along quickly

Commissioner Ackerman the following comments:

- They are also trying to let the Victory Village Project happen.
- He agreed with Commissioner Newton that the existing PDD Ordinance has a lot of problems. It makes sense to change it. Chair Fragoso reiterated that if they start changing other sections of the PDD Ordinance they will be moving in a direction contrary to the direction they have received from the Town Council.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- He agreed that they need to change the existing ordinance overall. This is not the time and place to do it.
- They need to lay a foundation for affordable housing developments to actually happen.

Commissioner Swift provided the following comment:

- She is willing to take the time tonight and follow Commissioner Newton’s suggestion.

Chair Fragoso provided the following comments:

- She thought it was unrealistic.
- They should take care of the business at hand.
- She has concerns about the late meetings.

Town Attorney Wisinski recommended a short break while she reviews the ordinance to see if there was a way to incorporate the concerns of Commissioner Newton and Swift. She passed out home made cookies.

The Commission took a 10-minute break at 9:40 p.m.

Chair Fragoso asked for a show of hands from the Commission in favor of postponing the discussion regarding item #1 and beginning the discussion on item #2. The Commission decided to discuss item #2 and come back to item #1.

STUDY SESSION ITEMS

2. 2626 Sir Francis Drake Blvd.; Applicant #16-44

Study Session on parkland dedication issues and density bonus matters with regard to the proposed Victory Village Project, which seeks a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision Map, Traffic Impact Permit, Design Review Permit, Excavation Permit to allow subdivision of an approximately 20-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. No formal action will be taken on the project at this meeting, which will focus on parkland dedication and density bonus issues.

Town Attorney Wisinski presented a staff report and a PowerPoint presentation that included the following: 1) Status update; 2) Parkland dedication; 3) Quimby Act; 4) Calculation and application of ratio; 5) Subdivision Ordinance Section 16.24.100(B)(10); 6) Density bonus law; 7) How it works; 8) How to qualify; 9) "Density bonus"; 10) "Concessions" and "incentives"; 11) Calculating concessions/incentives; 12) Denying requested concessions; 13) Remedies; 14) Waivers I; 15) Waivers II; 16) Parking reductions; 17) Parking for senior projects; 18) Countering reduced parking ratios.

Chair Fragoso opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Alicia Cline, representing Resources for Community Development (RCD), made the following comments:

- She clarified the timing of the grant funding. They missed the March funding deadline and are looking at the next funding round that will occur in June. They would need local approvals in order to compete for funding.
- She gave a PowerPoint presentation that included the following: 1) Resources for Community Development; 2) Density Bonus- Request; 3) Parkland Dedication; 4) Transportation Strategies; 5) Proposed Site Plan; 6) Building Height; 7) View of Residential Courtyard; 8) Frontage Improvements; 9) Stormwater management; 10) Story Pole View from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard.

Rick William, architect, made the following comments:

- He discussed some of the refinements that were made based on the discussions from the last meeting.
- The proposed site plan has not substantively changed.
- They have added four parking spaces for a total of 43.
- He pointed to the area of the building that would be three stories.
- He discussed the courtyard which would include a community garden.
- He discussed the stormwater management improvements.

Ms. Suzanne Cheney, Ace Court, made the following comments:

- She asked if citizens would still have access to the “meditation center”.
- She was concerned about people making a left hand turn onto Sir Francis Drake.
- She noted that many local residents park in the church parking during rain events.
- She was concerned that allowing three stories would set precedence.

Denise, Scenic Road, made the following comments:

- Traffic and parking have gotten very bad over the last ten years.
- There will be a lot of visitors and delivery vehicles coming to Victory Village that will need parking. Putting in a few more space and perhaps less landscaping could make a difference.
- She has concerns about what will happen to the other two acres.
- Allowing an exception to the height limit will set precedence.

Chair Fragoso closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission continued its discussion of item #1.

- 3. Planned Development District (PDD) Proposed Text Amendment**
The Planning Commission will meet to consider and discuss a proposed ordinance revision to Chapter 17.112 (“Planned Development District Zone”) of the Fairfax Town Code. The proposed zoning ordinance amendment will implement direction given in the Fairfax 2010-2030 General Plan and 2015 Housing Element update to revise the PDD Ordinance as it applies to three (3) parcels identified as ‘housing opportunity sites’ in the Housing Element. For these sites, it will establish a streamlined review and approval process. This ordinance amendment will not approve any new projects, it will amend the approval process applicable to housing opportunity sites directed to be zoned PDD.

Town Attorney Wisinski stated she has reviewed the suggestions made by Commissioner Newton. She suggested the ordinance revisions start all applicants who qualify for the streamline process at Step 2, the Master Development Plan, and allow at the time of applying for a Master Development Plan a simultaneous application for a Precise Plan. She presented a PowerPoint of the ordinance and the Commission discussed the suggested revisions.

Chair Fragoso opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Rick Williams, architect, made the following comments:

- They have already submitted an application, gone through the environmental review process, and he wanted to make sure that the project they have already submitted qualifies for whatever “wording” the Commission comes up with so the project won’t trigger another 30 day review process. He did not want to have to throw out all of the work that has already been done and return to “square one”. Town Attorney Wisinski stated the current application includes a request to be rezoned PDD which requires the submission of information. The Commission could make a strong recommendation to the Council that the information submitted satisfied the requirements.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She referred to the first part of the PDD Ordinance, Section 17.112.10, “Purposes” and noted some of them do not dovetail with the attempt to streamline the process. She recommended the addition of a paragraph. Commissioner Green agreed and stated they need to identify and carve out the opportunity sites identified by the General Plan.
- Town Attorney Wisinski made a few revisions to the General Requirements Section.
- She suggested some revised wording related to the 5 acres or more requirement.

- She suggested some revised wording relative to the timing of the Tentative Map and Precise Development Plan.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- He suggested some revised wording to the Residential Density Policy Section.
- He suggested some revised wording to the Master Development Plan Section.

Chair Fragoso left the meeting at 12:15 a.m.. She noted her support of the Council recognizing that this applicant has submitted the information necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Master Development Plan.

Town Attorney Wisinski made a revision to the wording regarding the submittal of legal documents relative to the dedication of open space.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- He suggested some revised wording to the Master Development Plan Section including the ability to waive fees.
- He had questions about the process and timing for submittals to the Town Engineer.
- He suggested some revised wording to the Master Development Plan; Town Engineer's Report Section.
- He suggested the deletion of Section (B).

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She referred to Master Development Plan, Final Planning Commission Action Section and stated it gets tricky because it refers to the Preliminary Development Plan. She suggested the words "if required" be added.

Commissioner Green provided the following comment:

- He suggested wording to the Master Development Plan: Approval Criteria, Standards and Procedures, (D), that would carve out the qualifying sites.

Town Attorney Wisinski referred to the Master Development Plan: Approval Criteria, Standards and Procedures, (F), and suggested revised wording. Commissioner Newton stated she did not want to delete this subsection altogether. Town Attorney Wisinski stated the wording was subjective. Commissioner Newton stated she would like to delete subsection (G).

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She referred to Master Development Plan; Town Council Action and noted one of the citations were incorrect.
- She asked for clarification of a term used in (C) (1)- "state of development schedule". Commissioner Green suggested eliminating the words "state of". Commissioner Newton suggested adding a requirement that a Master Development Plan include a schedule. Town Attorney Wisinski recommended deleting this subsection.

Town Attorney Wisinski referred to Master Development Plan; Town Council Action, (3)(a), and stated it should be deleted. This interim step had no value. She revised subsection (4) and added the words "as approved" in the place of "as filed".

Town Attorney Wisinski referred to Master Development Plan; Modification of Plan Section and changed it to subsection (A) and added subsection (B) stating that qualifying sites were not subject to this section. She stated subsection (A) needed to be revised in the future.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- He referred to Precise Development Plan; Application, (A) (1), and suggested some revised wording. Commissioner Newton also suggested some revised wording to this subsection.

Town Attorney Wisinski asked Principal Planner Neal if this step has been required for a single-phased PDD. Principal Planner Neal stated there has never been a single-phased PDD.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She referred to Precise Development Plan; Application and suggested adding a subsection (D) to address exemptions for qualifying sites. Commissioner Green added some wording to this new subsection.
- She suggested some additional wording to subsection (A) (1) and revised wording in (A) (3).

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She asked the representative from RCD if the Victory Village submittal addressed the items in the Precise Development Plan Section. Ms. Cline stated she thought so. Commissioner Kehrlein noted some of these items would be including in the Building Permit phase.

Ms. Cline made the following comments:

- She was not concerned about the content of what the Commission is doing tonight.
- She was apprehensive about the timing.
- The Council would be considering the Victory Village project in May and June. This leaves zero “wiggle room”.

Commissioner Kehrlein provided the following comments:

- She sees the Precise Development Plan as being similar to the Building Permit process. There could be code changes or stipulations from the Fire Department, etc. The Commission needs an opportunity to review any possible scenario.

Commissioner Green provided the following comments:

- He referred to Precise Development Plan: Application, and stated perhaps this whole section should not apply to a qualifying site. Commissioner Ackerman agreed.

Town Attorney Wisinski clarified that the consensus of the Commission is that qualifying sites do have to submit for a Precise Development Plan but they can do it concurrently with the Master Development Plan. The Commission discussed whether the applicant should pay two fees and Principal Planner Neal stated the Council could set some type of combined fee.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She referred to Precise Development Plan; Open Space Dedication and Maintenance and suggested the following wording be added to subsection (A): “To the extent permitted by law..”.

Commissioner Swift provided the following comments:

- She referred to Precise Development Plan; Open Space Dedication and Maintenance and had a question about (C). She suggested some revised wording.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She referred to Precise Development Plan; Performance Bond and stated no changes need to be made to this section due to financing/lending requirements and assurances. Commissioner Green suggested revised wording to subsection (A).

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She referred to Terms of Approval and suggested revised wording to (A).

Town Attorney Wisinski referred to Appeals and added some language to (A).

Commissioner Swift provided the following comments:

- She referred to Appeal and had a question about the 10-day appeal period.

Commissioner Newton provided the following comments:

- She referred to Appeal and suggested some revised wording to (B).

Town Attorney Wisinski stated she would include in the resolution language indicating that to the extent that there are any pending applications seeking rezoning to PDD for a qualifying site and if those pending applications have submitted the information required under the amended ordinance they shall be acknowledged as having satisfied the requirements of the Master Development Plan/Precise Plan submission and shall continue along the process.

Commissioner Swift wanted to make sure the Council received both the revised and the original PDD ordinance. Town Attorney Wisinski stated staff would make sure the Council receives everything that was in tonight's packet.

M/s, Kehrlein/Green, Motion to recommend that the Council adopt the PDD Ordinance as revised tonight.

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

ABSENT: Gonzalez-Parber, Chair Fragoso

DISCUSSION ITEMS

None

MINUTES

4. Minutes from December 15, 2016 Planning Commission regular meeting.

It was the consensus of the Commission to continue the December 15, 2016 minutes to the next meeting.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There were no reports.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND REQUESTS

Commissioner Kehrlein was concerned that the Tree Committee received an application for the Victory Village project prior to any Planning approvals. Town Attorney Wisinski stated there was a procedural reason for this. Commissioner Newton asked for an update at the next meeting.

Commissioner Swift volunteered to serve on the panel, as the Commission representative, that would be interviewing the Planning Director candidates. The Council appointed several at large members last night.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 1:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Toni DeFrancis,
Recording Secretary