

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

MINUTES
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 9, 2016
CORTE MADERA TOWN HALL
CORTE MADERA

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Peter Chase
Vice-Chair Phyllis Metcalfe
Commissioner Dan McCadden
Commissioner Tom McHugh
Commissioner Nicolo Caldera

STAFF PRESENT: Adam Wolff, Planning Director
Phil Boyle, Senior Planner
Dough Bush, Assistant Planner
Joanne O’Hehir, Minutes Recorder

1. OPENING:

A. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

B. Pledge of Allegiance – Chair Chase led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. Roll Call – All the commissioners were present.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT – NONE

George Topor commented on the parking requirements regarding the proposed Restoration Hardware project. He said the gravel lot would be needed for parking if The Village shopping center expanded, and commented on outdoor space and FAR requirements.

Jane Levinsohn, 32 Tamal Vista Boulevard, brought Valentines cookies to share.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR – NONE

4. CONTINUED HEARINGS – NONE

5. NEW HEARINGS

A. 74 SONORA WAY, DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT NO. DR 15-034 FOR THE PROPOSED ADDITION OF 380 SQUARE FEET TO THE EXISTING SECOND STORY OF A SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING. THE PROPOSAL CONFORMS TO ALL SETBACKS AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (Senior Planner Phil Boyle).

1
2 Senior Planner Boyle presented the staff report. Mr. Boyle explained that the project
3 consists of a 380 square foot addition to the second story of an existing home. He said
4 that design review is necessary due to the significant change to the architecture and
5 visual mass of the existing structure. Mr. Boyle said the addition will be above the
6 garage and consists of a master bedroom and bathroom. He noted that the current FAR
7 is 23%, the proposed FAR would be 25% and that the maximum allowable would be
8 40%. He noted a minor correction relating to the height in the staff report and said that
9 the proposed height will be 22 feet, which is well below the maximum allowed of 30 feet.

10
11 Mr. Boyle discussed the site and said that the development pattern of a two-story home
12 with a two-car garage is consistent with the neighborhood. He noted there is an
13 increase in lot coverage with a small addition to the front porch and that the parking
14 requirements will be met. Mr. Boyle used slides to show the elevations and confirmed
15 the story polls have been installed more than 2 weeks prior to the meeting.

16
17 Mr. Boyle discussed neighborhood outreach, noting that letters have been received
18 from the neighbors at either side of the property. He said that a neighbor to the east
19 side has raised concerns, today, and that he met the neighbor and applicant on site to
20 discuss the issues.

21
22 Mr. Boyle identified three other dwellings in the neighborhood that have built second
23 story additions above the garage. He said that staff believes the project is consistent
24 with both the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, and is also consistent with the
25 Town's design review findings. He said that exterior lighting is not proposed and that
26 the standard condition of approval will be added with regard to exterior lighting. Staff
27 recommends the Planning Commission approves the project by adopting the resolution
28 with the attached conditions of approval.

29
30 Brigitte Shank, Project Architect, explained her approach to the design. Ms. Shank
31 noted that the front of the addition is stepped back from the garage so as not to give a
32 looming impression. She said they have made porch modifications to make the
33 entrance more recognizable from the street, and that they have considered the views
34 and privacy concerns of their neighbors, noting that they have directed the views
35 towards the back of the property into the yard.

36
37 In response to Vice-Chair Metcalfe, Ms. Shank said the colors of the materials will be
38 consistent with the main dwelling, which they discussed.

39
40 Carl Krawitt, Applicant, discussed the reasons they want to enlarge their home with a
41 second story addition. Mr. Krawitt noted that they will be adding skylights and solar
42 panels.

43
44 Commissioner Caldera noted there is a minor error in an elevation on the plans.

45

1 Commissioner McHugh and Mr. Krawitt discussed the windows on the east elevation,
2 including the bathroom and closet windows. Mr. Krawitt said they wish to respect the
3 privacy of the neighbor to the east.

4
5 Ms. Shank and Chair Chase discussed the window design, which Ms. Shank said is
6 consistent with the style of the dwelling. She noted that the solar panels are on the roof
7 plan.

8
9 Chair Chase opened the public comment period.

10
11 David Buechrer, 78 Sonora Way, discussed his privacy concerns. He said they have
12 large windows at the back of their house and enjoy the indoor/outdoor space they
13 afford. Mr. Buechrer discussed his concern that the new addition will cause a privacy
14 issue by allowing the occupants a view of their patio and into their dining room. Mr.
15 Buechrer said he wants to maintain the feel inside his home.

16
17 In response to Commissioner McCadden, Mr. Buechrer confirmed they are concerned
18 that the applicants will be able to see into their house and that they want to ensure their
19 feeling of privacy is maintained.

20
21 In response to Commissioner Caldera, staff provided details of the east elevation.

22
23 Mr. Boyle confirmed that the new window facing the backyard is of concern to Mr.
24 Buechrer. Commissioner McCadden thought that an interior view of the house would
25 not be visible from the new window. Vice-Chair Metcalfe said that it is unlikely anyone
26 would deliberately look out of the window at the angle necessary to view the neighbor's
27 yard and household interior.

28
29 Ms. Shank and Chair Chase discussed the shower and closet windows. Chair Chase
30 suggested that obscure glass could be used for the lower half of the windows, since he
31 said the project design would need to change significantly if the window design is
32 changed, and he noted that there are several trees that obscure the view of that part of
33 the home. In response, Ms. Shank provided materials to the commissioners that
34 showed the neighbor's addition cannot be seen unless a person is in the very north
35 corner of the bedroom looking out of the window. Otherwise, Ms. Shank said that a view
36 of the applicant's backyard is the main view, noting that a very small slice of the
37 neighbor's home could be seen. She said she does not believe a view of the interior of
38 their home will be afforded and that they believe they have mitigated any privacy issues

39
40 In response to Commissioner McHugh, Ms. Shank said that she estimates that the view
41 of the neighbor's property will be 6 inches – 12 inches wide and noted that the property
42 is 30 – 40 feet away.

43
44 In response to Vice-Chair Metcalfe, Mr. Buechrer said that they remain concerned about
45 the line of site, despite the discussions.

1 Chair Chase closed the public comment period.
2

3 Vice-Chair Metcalfe said that it is a good application, which fits the neighborhood. She
4 said that she likes the colors as long as the exterior cladding is not too dark. Vice-Chair
5 Metcalfe suggested landscaping to provide more privacy for Mr. Buechrer's property. In
6 response, Mr. Wolff said that staff recommends the commissioners' request the
7 submission of a landscape plan if necessary.
8

9 Commissioner McHugh said that he echoes Vice-Chair Metcalfe's comments. He
10 agrees that there is no problem with the application and the approach seems
11 reasonable to achieve the applicant's objectives. Commissioner McHugh said he is
12 sympathetic to the neighbor's concerns, but that the neighborhood is tightly built with 5
13 feet to 6 feet side yard setbacks, so not every portion of a home enjoys as much privacy
14 as one would hope. He said the potential impact is from a relatively narrow band of site
15 line at certain times of the year and suggested the neighbor's privacy concerns could be
16 addressed with window coverings or additional plantings. Overall, Commissioner
17 McHugh said the project seems a good fit and that the amount of intrusion into the
18 adjoining property is not unreasonable.
19

20 Commissioner Caldera said he is in agreement with Commissioner McHugh's
21 comments.
22

23 Commissioner McCadden said the house will be pretty and elegant, noting that the
24 architect has done a good job designing the front porch. Commissioner McCadden said
25 he does not believe there will be any line of site issues for reasons he explained.
26 Commissioner McCadden said that the applicant has gone to great lengths to
27 accommodate their neighbors and that the two windows on the elevation are well
28 thought out.
29

30 Chair Chase said he is in agreement with Commissioner McCadden that the addition is
31 a very good design. He said that, while a direct view problem does not exist, he would
32 consider a request that obscure glass is used for at least the bottom half of the shower
33 window and bedroom closet window.
34

35 **MOTION:** Motioned by Commissioner McCadden, seconded by Commissioner
36 Caldera, to approve Design Review Permit No. DR 15-034 for the proposed
37 addition of 380 square feet to the existing second story of a single family dwelling
38 as designed and recommended by staff at 74 Sonora Way:
39

40 **AYES:** Metcalfe, McHugh, Chase, McCadden, Caldera
41

42 Mr. Boyle read the appeal rights.
43
44

45 **A. 30 PRINCE ROYAL PASSAGE, DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 15-035**
46 **FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 704 SQ. FT. SECOND STORY AND A**

1 REMODEL OF THE FIRST STORY OF AN EXISTING SINGLE STORY
2 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE (Assistant Planner Doug Bush).
3

4 Assistant Planner Bush presented the staff report. He discussed the project, which he
5 said consists of a proposed new second story addition and remodel of the lower floor in
6 a neighborhood of single story dwellings. Mr. Bush said the lots are generally
7 rectangular with little or no slope and he noted the subject lot is not in a flood zone.
8

9 Mr. Bush discussed the existing elevations and said the proposed addition would result
10 in a 1,764 square foot dwelling and a garage. He discussed the style of the home, which
11 he noted is typical of the area, and said that the exterior of the lower floor level will
12 remain unchanged. Mr. Bush noted that the chimney will be removed to allow the
13 second story to be centered over the first story.
14

15 Mr. Bush noted that windows are not proposed on the south elevation, and he
16 discussed the proposed windows on the north elevation, including a bathroom window.
17 He discussed the west elevation, noting that the glass doors of the den will be changed
18 to larger sliding glass door windows, and sliding door windows will be added to the living
19 room.
20

21 Mr. Bush said there are no changes to the setbacks or lot coverage. However, he noted
22 the FAR will be increased by 11% and the height will increase from 17 feet to 22 feet
23 and 4 inches. Mr. Bush said the parking requirements are met.
24

25 Mr. Bush identified other homes in the vicinity with second story additions, and he
26 discussed the site plan. He said the second story addition has been stepped back from
27 the rear, sides and front of the main house, which he discussed. Mr. Bush said that
28 some shading is expected to the property located towards the north in the winter
29 months, which staff does not believe will be significant.
30

31 Mr. Bush discussed the privacy and view concerns received from the neighbor at the
32 rear at 25 Pacific Queen Passage. He noted that letters of support have been received
33 from the adjacent neighbors and a further three from neighbors across the street. Mr.
34 Bush said that staff has encouraged the applicant to discuss the project with their
35 neighbor at the rear but that they have not been able to reach agreement. He said that
36 staff is suggesting the rear fence line is planted with privet to provide screening and that
37 staff is recommending approval of the project with the findings.
38

39 Colin O'Connell, homeowner, provided background information on his home. He noted
40 that the FAR is maxed out, and that they have taken their neighbors' concerns into
41 consideration. Mr. O'Connell discussed the privacy issues at the rear and suggested
42 that they plant privets. He provided photographic materials of privets to the
43 commissioner.
44

45 Maureen Jochum, Project Architect, discussed the project. She said their goal is to build
46 a second floor addition that is compatible with the main dwelling, and that the stair case

1 has been located without the need to significantly change the first floor. Ms. Jochum
2 discussed the addition, noting that it has a continuous ridge parallel to the house and
3 that the ridge is relatively low. She explained that they are expanding the office and
4 “popping back” the master bedroom to gain additional space without the need to raise
5 the entire second floor. Ms. Jochum discussed the gable roofs and features, which she
6 said provide articulation on the street side and rear elevation. She noted that the second
7 floor is located centrally on the first floor and that the step-backs are therefore
8 significant. Ms. Jochum said that the window locations and massing respect the
9 adjacent neighbors’ sunlight and privacy and that the design enhances the existing
10 property. She said they have minimized the height and bulk of the second story and
11 have suggested planting privet at the rear of the fence line to provide screening.

12
13 Vice-Chair Metcalfe said that it is unlikely the second story will loom over the property at
14 the rear, given that the height will be increased by only 5 feet 7 inches. She said that the
15 applicants have accomplished an addition that is within the FAR; that the architect has
16 done an excellent job in designing an attractive home and that she does not see how
17 changes can be made with the exception of the rear windows.

18
19 In response to Commissioner McHugh, Ms. Jochum said she has not discussed the
20 design with the neighbor but that they have considered raising the sill height of the
21 staircase window. She noted that the bedroom windows need to meet the egress
22 requirement and so the sill heights cannot be changed.

23
24 Chair Chase and Ms. Jochum discussed the amount of space between the rear property
25 line and the master bedroom windows.

26
27 Chair Chase opened the public comment hearing.

28
29 Joel Dreskin, 25 Pacific Queen Passage, said he has lived at his home for 20 years and
30 that the proposed addition will affect his property more than any other in the
31 neighborhood. Mr. Dreskin said the addition will be very present and permanent, and
32 that he does not want a large shrubbery planted at the back. He discussed the effect of
33 the addition on the value of his home, and he said that other homes with second floor
34 additions are located along the bay, so that there are no neighboring properties at the
35 back that will be effected. Mr. Dreskin said that he does not want a second story in his
36 back yard, a window or a 9 feet high privet fence. He said he learnt about the addition
37 after the story polls had been erected, and that he would have liked the opportunity to
38 discuss the project with the applicant beforehand. Mr. Dreskin noted that photographic
39 materials have been included showing a view of the addition from his back yard.

40
41 Chair Chase closed the public comment period.

42
43 Commissioner Caldera said the project is well executed and makes sense but that he
44 understands the neighbor’s concerns. He said the second story will be a permanent
45 mass and that he believes the applicant should have discussed the project with Mr.
46 Drisken. Commissioner Caldera believes this is still possible and Chair Chase noted

1 that the process does not stipulate what a property owner must do in terms of
2 contacting their neighbors. Commissioner Caldera said that a solution or mitigation
3 measure might have resulted had there been discussions and that he does not agree
4 that the second story will not significantly impact the neighbor.

5
6 Commissioner McCadden said that the addition has been well designed and is
7 balanced. He said the applicants have worked hard to design a second story addition
8 that is only 7.5 feet higher than the existing dwelling and that the height remains well
9 below the maximum of 30 feet. Commissioner McCadden said the property owners
10 have a right to additional square footage and that the only way they can increase the
11 size of their home is to build upwards or build into the setbacks. He said there is no
12 solution to the problem, but they have kept the bulk and mass low. Commissioner
13 McCadden said that a good job has been done in terms of context and house design.

14
15 Vice-Chair Metcalfe said that the project is a good design, that it fits in with the
16 neighborhood, and that the applicants have minimized the height at 5 feet, 7 inches,
17 and the setbacks reduce the mass. She noted that it is not part of the code to meet with
18 the neighbors, and she commented on the neighbor's late knowledge of the project.
19 Vice-Chair Metcalfe said the dwelling cannot be expanded on the ground floor and that
20 the addition appears to be the least imposing design. She said the mass should not be
21 overpowering, noting that it has deep setbacks. She asked the applicant to consider a
22 different rear bedroom window design.

23
24 Commissioner McHugh said he would echo much of what has been said by his
25 colleagues. He said the design is sensitive to mass and height impacts and he noted
26 that the second story is lower and the rear setback greater than the code stipulates.
27 Commissioner McHugh noted that many homes in the neighborhood and in Corte
28 Madera have 6,000 – 7,000 square foot lots and that many dwellings are located close
29 to their neighbors. He noted that the architect has mentioned the need for bedroom
30 windows to meet a certain height. Chair Chase confirmed the bedroom windows cannot
31 be made smaller and Commissioner McHugh summed up his comments by saying that,
32 given the constraints of the property, the applicant has been sensitive to their neighbors
33 in what they are allowed to build under the code.

34
35 Chair Chase noted that the distance between the applicant's property and the property
36 behind is significant but said that it is incumbent upon the applicant to provide
37 screening, and not the neighbor. He noted that privet is not a fast-growing plant but that
38 it will provide screening, which he discussed. Chair Chase said the second story will not
39 loom over the neighbor's rear yard, and that second stories occur and are part of the
40 growth of the town. He said the addition is right for the location, the right shape and
41 height. He said that a resolution to the window locations do not exist, since they need to
42 be a certain size. He said that a different style of window in a different place might affect
43 the design.

44
45 Commissioner McCadden said that people need to live in houses and that obscure
46 glass does not favor the occupants. He said that second stories happen and that the

1 commissioners cannot fix the problem of the occupants looking out into neighboring
2 yards. Commissioner McCadden noted that the house cannot be expanded on the first
3 floor and that the addition has been well designed.

4
5 Mr. Drisken said that he did not favor a privet fence, which he thought would not be a
6 solution and might even be worse.

7
8 **MOTION:** Motioned by Commissioner McCadden, seconded by Vice-Chair
9 Metcalfe, to approve Design Review Application No. 15-035 for the construction
10 of a new 704 sq. ft. second story and a remodel of the first story of an existing
11 single story single-family residence at 30 Prince Royal Passage as designed and
12 recommended by staff.

13
14 **AYES:** Metcalfe, McHugh, Chase, McCadden

15 **NOES:** Caldera

16
17 Mr. Bush read the appeal rights.

18
19
20 **6. BUSINESS ITEMS**

21
22 **A. 11 MADRONO AVENUE: STUDY SESSION REGARDING A DESIGN REVIEW**
23 **AND VARIANCE APPLICATION FOR A MAJOR REMODEL AND THIRD**
24 **STORY ADDITION (Senior Planner Phil Boyle).**

25
26 Senior Planner Boyle introduced the project and the study session process. He
27 explained that the study session is for a design review and variance application project
28 for a significant remodel and facelift of an existing home. The proposed 1,200 square
29 foot addition would result in a 4,400 square foot home on completion. He said the
30 existing height is 23 feet and the proposed height would be 30 feet, while the proposed
31 addition into the front setback would be ±50 square feet.

32
33 Mr. Boyle noted that the discussions will not result in a decision, but that their intent is
34 to provide the applicant feedback on the proposal and also for members of the public to
35 comment upon the project.

36
37 Commissioner McHugh and Mr. Wolff discussed how the setbacks are established for
38 odd shaped properties. Mr. Wolff noted that Christmas Tree Hill has flexible setbacks,
39 which he discussed, and said that staff has researched other Town codes. He said
40 there appears to be a variety of ways to determine the setbacks, one of which relates
41 to the street and the frontage. Mr. Wolff discussed a previous application for the
42 property where a determination had been made for a 20-foot front setback around the
43 frontage of the property, which staff believes should be adhered to. Mr. Boyle
44 discussed the 1991 application for an addition, which added some square footage
45 within the setback area. He said that the applicant has presented two options for the
46 setback.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Heidi Richardson, Project Architect, clarified the position of a site on a slide presentation and noted that the total square footage mentioned by staff includes the garage. Ms. Richardson discussed three issues on which they are requesting feedback: Whether or not the variance/setback request is supportable; if the third floor addition meet's the Town's guidelines and to hear comments on their design concept. She said the property owner has spoken to all his neighbors in the cul-de-sac, who all support the project.

Ms. Richardson discussed the variance request, noting that they are asking for additional space in the setback and that they have included findings in the application. She noted that, if the commissioners determine the area is a side yard setback, a variance would not be required because a 5 foot setback is sufficient.

Ms. Richardson discussed the third floor addition, noting they have not exceeded the lot coverage and will be below the FAR. She said the position of the addition makes allowances for the view corridor of the uphill neighbor, and she explained the massing, which she said they have pushed back away from the cul-de-sac. Ms. Richardson said that it is logical to add the addition to the top of the existing footprint.

Ms. Richardson discussed the documents they have submitted and also presented an exhibit relating to the materials and renderings, which she discussed. Ms. Richardson noted that the siding and windows need to be replaced, and that the homeowner needs a larger living and dining area with a separate guest suite for relatives. She said the design maximizes the views of Mt. Tamalpais and that they believe they have met the Town's design guidelines.

In response to Commissioner McCadden, Mr. Pribuss, Architect, used the plans to show how they have calculated the height. He said they have modest ceiling heights of 9 feet and that the project will remain under 30 feet in height. Mr. Boyle confirmed the method of calculating the height is correct.

In response to Commissioner McCadden, Mr. Boyle discussed the floor area that does not count towards FAR.

Chair Chase commented on the design being very contemporary, and he discussed the glazing with Mr. Pribuss with regard to Title 24. Mr. Pribuss said they have designed a significant overhang and included a solid wall.

In response to Chair Chase, Ms. Richardson discussed the design. She said they believe the wood, glass and bronze design fits the neighborhood, noting that the homes above have 70s style balconies. She said they have addressed the slope by tucking in the addition, only part of which comprises of a third story. Ms. Richardson said they have tried to be sensitive to the hillside location, and noted that there is a variety of house designs in the area.

1 Mr. Pribuss discussed screening elements, including oak trees, and the reasons they
2 were encouraged to choose the location for the addition, which relates to an additional
3 right-of-way on the property. Mr. Pribuss discussed the neighbors' view corridor with
4 Chair Chase.

5
6 Commissioner McCadden and Mr. Pribuss discussed a view from a neighbor's pool
7 deck that might be affected. Commissioner McHugh thought the view impact would not
8 be significant and Mr. Pribuss noted that the neighbor has submitted a letter of support.

9
10 Chair Chase said the project is ambitious, that it will be a significant change to the
11 neighborhood and is unusual. He discussed his concerns about homes with glass walls
12 and ceiling heights that light up neighborhoods, and noted that this home can be seen
13 from across the valley. Chair Chase asked that the applicants to address the lighting if
14 they so wish.

15
16 In response, Ms. Richardson said they have incorporated the glass so that the
17 occupants can take advantage of two spectacular views. She said they could explore
18 options for shading and railings, and noted they have not shown trees on the
19 elevations. Chair Chase suggested they submit a landscape plan and include exterior
20 deck lighting in the plans. He said that the small section of the house that is in the
21 setback should be mitigated further by the distance of the road.

22
23 Commissioner McCadden discussed Chair Chase's concerns that there will be too
24 much glass and that perhaps another design should be considered. In response, Chair
25 Chase said that solutions exist by way of different types of glass, including non-
26 reflective. He discussed visibility and noted that there are merits in keeping the design
27 if lighting impacts can be mitigated.

28
29 Vice-Chair Metcalfe said the design is magnificent but she expressed concern the
30 lighting does not meet night sky requirements. She suggested adding scrims, shades
31 and/or timers, which she discussed.

32
33 Vice-Chair Metcalfe discussed the variance and suggested the front and side yard
34 setbacks could be changed. In response, Mr. Boyle discussed the reasons why
35 variances are necessary, which relate to the unusual shape of a lot, and he said that
36 staff feels that a variance can be supported, noting that the commissioners must make
37 the findings. Mr. Wolff discussed the reasons staff believes the variance request should
38 be considered in the same way a variance request for a front yard setback was
39 considered by the Planning Commission in 1991. He noted that the lot is unique and
40 would make a good case for a variance. Mr. Wolff said that staff is not comfortable with
41 disregarding a previous planning commission's decision by avoiding a variance.

42
43 Commissioner McCadden said that a variance should not be troublesome. He said the
44 scale is not large, the conditions are unique, and there are no close neighbors. Based
45 on what has been presented, Commissioner McCadden thought the project could be
46 supported.

1
2 Commissioner Caldera said that he is in agreement with Commissioner McCadden's
3 comments, and that the design is elegant and rational as proposed. However, he
4 expressed similar concerns as Chair Chase with the glazing, which he noted is a large
5 part of the design.

6
7 Commissioner McCadden commented on the unique design. However, he agreed that
8 the home could light up the surrounding area, which he hopes is a problem that can be
9 solved during the process.

10
11 In response to Commissioner McHugh, the homeowner confirmed he has spoken with
12 his downhill neighbors that will be particularly affected by light emission from his
13 property. He said they do not have many windows facing upwards and that he has
14 letters of support from 2 out of the 3 neighbors.

15
16 Chair Chase opened the public comment period.

17
18 Jane Levinsohn said the proposal is exciting and that there are many light protection
19 treatments that could solve the light emission issues. She said that she likes the
20 design.

21
22 Commissioner McCadden said the height meets the code and Commissioner McHugh
23 asked that the height is verified

24
25 Vice-Chair Metcalfe suggested the applicant works with a lighting engineer, noting that
26 lighting issues would be easier to deal with at the start of a project.

27
28 Chair Chase said he applauds the design efforts and their bold design. He said that a
29 landscape plan is needed for the downhill portion of the property, and that exterior
30 lighting should be included on the plans if they intend using such lighting. Chair Chase
31 commented on interior lighting and glass being a problem and said that UV protection
32 does not exist and that shades will be needed. Chair Chase said he has not seen solar
33 panels on the plans and asked that they are included in the design or a solar
34 evaluation is submitted. He noted that an ordinance does not exist to enforce the
35 requirement.

36
37 Mr. Wolff confirmed that these have been preliminary discussions based on the
38 information presented to the commissioners at this time. He noted that materials
39 samples will be needed.

40
41
42 **B. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 23, 2016 PLANNING COMMISSION**
43 **MEETING**

- 44
45 i. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS
46 FOR A NEW 185-ROOM DUAL-BRANDED MARRIOTT HOTEL,

1 INCLUDING A 78-ROOM SPRINGHILL SUITES AND A 107-ROOM
2 EXTENDED STAY RESIDENCE INN. APPLICATIONS INCLUDE A
3 PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, ZONING ORDINANCE
4 AMENDMENT, NEW PRELIMINARY AND PRECISE PLANS
5 (INCLUDING DESIGN REVIEW), AND A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
6 AT 56 MADERA BLVD.

- 7 ii. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO ADD THE HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL
8 ZONING DISTRICT(C-3) AS AN APPLICABLE ZONING DISTRICT
9 WITHIN THE MIXED-USE COMMERCIAL LANDUSE DESIGNATION
10 (PAGE 2-21 OF THE CORTE MADERA 2009 GENERAL PLAN) AND
11 ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO REMOVE A CONDITIONAL
12 USE PERMIT ALLOWING WITHIN THE HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL
13 ZONING DISTRICT (C-3), *RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN LOCATIONS AND*
14 *AT DENSITIES DETERMINED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO*
15 *CONFORM TO THE GENERAL PLAN.*
16

17 Mr. Wolff and Vice-Chair Metcalfe discussed the tentative agenda. Mr. Wolff noted that
18 it is not a discussion item, but is intended to let the commissioners know what projects
19 are pending. He noted that staff will provide the commissioners with the active project
20 list. Vice-Chair Metcalfe said that the Town Attorney had been clear that Council
21 Members could only comment on whether or not an item should be on the agenda. She
22 made a suggestion about the item's placement on the Planning Commission Agenda.

23 24 **7. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS**

25 **A. REPORTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REQUESTS**

26 27 **i. Commissioners**

28
29 Vice-Chair Metcalfe reported on the Town Council meeting, where she said the gravel
30 parking lot was discussed. She said that a status report on the Restoration Hardware
31 project was provided.

32
33 In response to Vice-Chair Metcalfe, Mr. Wolff said he will follow up on the proposed joint
34 meeting between the Town Council and Planning Commission.

35
36 Chair Chase commented on the need to ensure the processes involving Restoration
37 Hardware and the gravel lot should be made as public as possible. Commissioner
38 McHugh said he has reviewed materials concerning the gravel lot and Mr. Wolff
39 suggested he review previous minutes for more information. He noted that discussions
40 should wait until a public meeting.

41
42 In response to Commissioner Chase, Mr. Wolff confirmed that Macy's have submitted
43 an application for a Preliminary Plan. He said it could be agendized as a discussion
44 item.

1 Vice-Chair Metcalfe made a suggestion for the Business Items section of the agenda.
2

3
4 **ii. Planning Director**

5
6 1. Update on Tamal Vista East Corridor Study
7

8 Mr. Wolff provided an update on neighborhood outreach. He said input has been
9 received from the Chamber of Commerce and Casa Madera Housing Association. Mr.
10 Wolff discussed future meetings, noting that a charrette has been scheduled on April 6th
11 to discuss policy guidelines.
12

13 Commissioner McHugh requested staff provide information on the bicycle and
14 pedestrian path project as part of the Tamal Vista East Corridor discussions.
15

16
17 **B. MINUTES**

18
19 **i. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 26, 2016**
20

21 **MOTION:** Motioned by Vice-Chair Metcalfe, seconded by Commissioner
22 McHugh, to approve the minutes of January 26, 2016.
23

24 **8. ADJOURNMENT**
25

26 A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at
27 10:25 p.m.
28