

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
MARCH 8, 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
Doug Bush, Assistant Planner
Judith Propp, Town Attorney
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

3. CONSENT CALENDAR – NONE

4. CONTINUED HEARINGS

A. CORTE MADERA INN REBUILD PROJECT, CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER INFORMATION PRESENTED BY STAFF FOR POTENTIAL CIRCULATION IMPROVEMENTS ADJACENT TO THE CORTE MADERA INN PROJECT SITE, INCLUDING ENHANCEMENTS TO BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE ALONG TAMAL VISTA BOULEVARD. (Planning Director Adam Wolff).

Planning Director Wolff presented the staff report. Mr. Wolff explained that the purpose of the discussions is for the commissioners to provide direction to staff and the applicant regarding streetscape improvements on Tamal Vista Boulevard. He noted that, as a result of these discussions, the applicant might wish to make changes to the areas of the project that relate to Tamal Vista Boulevard.

1
2 Mr. Wolff explained that the presentation is about appropriate streetscape
3 improvements in relation to future plans to improve Tamal Vista Boulevard. He provided
4 background information on previous hearings, which he noted is in the staff report, with
5 regard to the hotel frontage along Tamal Vista Boulevard. Mr. Wolff explained that the
6 Town is in the midst of a study of the road regarding improvements for bicycle and
7 pedestrian circulation.

8
9 Mr. Wolff said that the commissioners have expressed concern at the previous hearings
10 about the way the applicant should address the Tamal Vista Boulevard streetscape. He
11 said the applicant has provided a section of the road's condition and that they are
12 proposing to eliminate the utility poles. Mr. Wolff explained that the commissioners
13 should determine the adequacy of the applicant's proposed 5'9" sidewalk next to the
14 existing roadway.

15
16 Mr. Wolff discussed staff's concern with the proposal in relation to the Town's draft
17 pedestrian and bike plan. Mr. Wolff said that a study was commissioned by the Public
18 Works Department to assess the current conditions and what could be implemented
19 through a restriping program, and what should be planned for the future, such as street
20 reconfiguration. He said that Parisi & Associates have conducted an existing conditions
21 analysis, which he discussed.

22
23 Mr. Wolff said that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (BPAC) were given
24 conceptual plans and they determined whether the existing road conditions could
25 accommodate bike lanes. They also examined the plans in relation to the Corte Madera
26 Inn's plans should they go ahead. Mr. Wolff noted that correspondence has been
27 provided by BPAC.

28
29 Mr. Wolff discussed Concept A for Tamal Vista Boulevard improvements, which he
30 noted is explained in the staff report. He said the curb line could be retained and a 6
31 foot, Class 2 northbound bike lane could be installed, which he said would be a short-
32 term solution, and would require restriping and re-slurrying. Mr. Wolff said that BPAC
33 believe the applicant should be required to install and finance the bike lanes as part of
34 any redevelopment.

35
36 Mr. Wolff discussed BPAC's ideal road plan, which would be to accommodate north and
37 south bike lanes protected by a buffer. Mr. Wolff said this would entail significantly
38 moving the curb line without eliminating on-street parking and less so if on-street
39 parking could be eliminated.

40
41 Mr. Wolff clarified aspects of the two conceptual plans, including a center turn lane, in
42 response to Commissioner McHugh,

43
44 Mr. Wolff went on to discuss sidewalks, noting that there is potential for improvement,
45 which he discussed. He provided examples of sidewalk conditions on Tamal Vista
46 (including the current sidewalk outside the Corte Madera Inn), Wornum Drive and

1 Doherty in Larkspur, which he noted is of a significant size. He said the commissioners
2 should consider a suitable design option for the project, noting that staff believes that a
3 minimum sidewalk width of 8 feet would be appropriate along with a minimum four foot
4 planted buffer. As a result of these discussions, Mr. Wolff said the applicant might
5 consider amending their site plan.

6
7 In response to Vice-Chair Metcalfe, Mr. Wolff discussed the difference between a Class
8 2 bike lane and a Class 3 bike lane. He said that a Class 2 bike lane has a painted
9 stripe lane on the roadway, while a Class 3 bike lane is painted with sharrows, so bikes
10 ride along with vehicles on the right hand side. Mr. Wolff noted that that such lanes are
11 not wide enough to provide a bike lane and that this type is proposed in the draft Bicycle
12 and Pedestrian Plan.

13
14 Vice-Chair Metcalfe noted that bikers were using the sidewalk on Doherty in the
15 photograph and Mr. Wolff said that staff would ascertain the legality of bikers using that
16 sidewalk.

17
18 Vice-Chair Metcalfe discussed the importance of protecting walkers from cyclists and
19 said she would favor a buffer.

20
21 Commissioner McHugh and Mr. Wolff discussed BPAC's optimal plan for bike lanes in
22 relation to the proposed sidewalk by the applicant. Mr. Wolff discussed the range of
23 width staff would consider suitable for a sidewalk and buffer.

24
25 In response to Commissioner Caldera, Mr. Wolff commented on correspondence
26 submitted and they discussed the width of a buffer. Chair Chase and Mr. Wolff
27 discussed the variety of buffers. They discussed the two-way bike path on Wornum,
28 which Mr. Wolff confirmed is not an optimal size. Mr. Wolff said BPAC's plan is optimal,
29 and that the commissioners are requested to consider a design they consider suitable.
30 He said that staff considers a minimum of 8 feet to be a suitable width for the sidewalk.

31
32 Chair Chase opened the public comment period.

33
34 Jane Levinsohn, 32 Tamal Vista Boulevard, discussed the problems she experiences
35 backing out on to the south-bound section of the road and she said she does not
36 believe that bikes and cars should share the road. Ms. Levinsohn said she does not see
37 a lot of bike activity on the streets and she asked that slurring takes place after any
38 cabling and pipes have been underground. She said she is not pleased with the
39 whole plan.

40
41 Ted McKay, 36 Madera Boulevard, questioned the connection between improvements
42 to a public roadway and the Corte Madera Inn project, which he said is a private
43 development. He asked if the developer is going to pay for the road improvements and
44 said he believes the plan should be rethought.

45

1 Peter Orth, Medowsweet, asked if the discussions relate to the moratorium corridor and,
2 if so, whether the applicant is being asked to emulate the design. Mr. Orth noted that
3 creating bike lanes depends on grant funding and that he would rather the emphasis is
4 placed on pedestrian, rather than bike safety. He said he is confused with the plans.

5
6 Cindy Winter, Greenbrae resident, commented on the BPAC meeting. She agrees with
7 staff that it is not enough to design sidewalks to the minimum safety standard and that
8 sidewalks should be safe and inviting to walkers without cars whizzing by a foot away.
9 Ms. Winter asked for bike lanes, buffers and curbs in the roadway design and she said
10 that roads were originally built for bicycles.

11
12 Cheryl Longinotti, BPAC, said there was general consensus at their meeting that a
13 minimum horizontal buffer between the bike lane and moving traffic is important. She
14 agrees with Ms. Winter that a minimum sidewalk width is not sufficient for safety. Ms.
15 Longinotti discussed fatalities in relation to a 30-mile an hour speed limit on Tamal Vista
16 Boulevard, and concluded by saying a planting strip and sidewalk that together are
17 wider than the minimum 5 feet should be required.

18
19 Lucinda smith, 46 Alta Way, said she would like information on how the upgrades are
20 being financed. She said there appeared to be a lot of work and expense involved.

21
22 Karen Gerbosi, 111 Parkview, asked for clarification about how much of the design is
23 BPAC's wish and how much is needed.

24
25 Chair Chase closed the public comment period.

26
27 In response to Commissioner Caldera's question about what they hope to achieve as a
28 result of the discussions, Mr. Wolff said that the commissioners have been asked to
29 consider improvements to the public street by the developer. He said the
30 commissioners should consider whether the applicant's proposal for street
31 improvements is adequate and, if not, the commissioners should discuss what they
32 would consider acceptable. Mr. Wolff noted that their decision affects the applicant's
33 proposed parking design. Furthermore, he noted that the Town is engaged in long-term
34 plans for the Tamal Vista corridor with regard to bicyclists, pedestrians and traffic
35 circulation, which should be factored into the commissioners' discussions.

36
37 Mr. Wolff explained that the short-term plan would be to leave the curb in place and plan
38 for a Class 2 bike lane, whereas the long-term plan might be to move the curb in order
39 to achieve more ideal road conditions that would allow for north and south bike lanes
40 with a more attractive, functional sidewalk on the east side. Mr. Wolff also commented
41 on future possible plans for a north-south greenway, which he noted are theoretical at
42 this point.

43
44 Chair Chase explained that the intent of the Town is to create an efficient corridor and
45 that the commissioners' aim is to make enhancements. He said that the proposal for a
46 5' 9" sidewalk does not address the long-term improvements and that he believes BPAC

1 have set goals that are appropriate. Chair Chase explained that the commissioners
2 need to come up with an appropriate dimension for the bike path and review the
3 information from the consultant and BPAC, whom he noted act in an advisory capacity.
4 Ultimately, Chair Chase said the aim is to improve Tamal Vista.

5
6 Vice-Chair Metcalfe discussed the difficulty of asking for a wide sidewalk before
7 planning a bike lane. In response, Chair Chase noted that the width of the street is
8 known and that there are recommendations for the design of the east side of the road
9 that they could follow.

10
11 Commissioner McCadden said that the goal is to provide options for the developer who
12 needs a decision, since those options will determine his application. He noted that the
13 main concern is to determine if north and south bike lanes can be accommodated, in
14 addition to a sidewalk. Commissioner McCadden said this is an opportunity to
15 determine the design of the corridor and noted that the street outside the hotel is not in
16 good condition. He said he would favor a design similar to Rose Lane.

17
18 Commissioner McCadden thought that the applicant could be accommodating, given
19 that they are requesting a higher FAR than the code allows. He said that it would be
20 possible for parking on the property to be moved back in order to dedicate more space
21 to a sidewalk. Commissioner McCadden noted that the developer is not responsible for
22 the bike lane and that he would recommend a 12' 6" sidewalk, which should set a
23 precedent along Tamal Vista.

24
25 Commissioner McHugh said the proposal put forward by the applicant for the Tamal
26 Vista cross section is inadequate. He said that he could not overstate the importance of
27 bicycle and pedestrian use on Tamal Vista Boulevard, particularly as the
28 Wornum/Tamal Vista intersection is already performing at an F level. Commissioner
29 McHugh discussed the long-term need for a safe route for bicycles and pedestrians
30 between Town Center and locations further north. He believes that a design akin to
31 Doherty Drive by Rose Lane would be desirable, which he said is a good example of
32 streetscape conditions.

33
34 Commissioner McHugh said that a Class 3 southbound bike lane is inadequate and
35 that, to encourage maximum utilization, people need to move in both directions. He said
36 that, if the idea is to create a safer environment and relieve vehicle traffic conditions
37 along the corridor, people must be allowed to get through the Wornum and Madera
38 section. Commissioner McHugh said it will require some give from the applicant of the
39 Corte Madera Inn project and that it would need to be pieced together by other property
40 owners along the east side of Tamal Vista, which he discussed in relation to the Tamal
41 Vista corridor study.

42
43 In response to Vice-Chair Metcalfe, Commissioner McCadden clarified his
44 recommendations for a sidewalk design. Mr. Wolff commented on using tonight's study
45 to aid in long-term planning for the corridor in relation to setbacks and regulations for
46 other sites.

1
2 Chair Chase reopened the public comment period.

3
4 The applicant, Mr. Grialou, said he understood the direction that has been given but
5 questioned the suggestion of continuing the sidewalk around the hotel property. There
6 was general consensus that the sidewalk should continue down Tamal Vista towards
7 the Ameritrade building.

8
9 Chair Chase closed the public comment period and Mr. Wolff noted that the purpose of
10 the discussions is to provide direction to the applicant. Following further discussion,
11 there was general consensus that an 4'6" planted buffer, 8-foot sidewalk, and 3-foot
12 landscaped area is desirable (15'6" total). Mr. Wolff clarified that the Commission's
13 direction intends to work with the existing curb in place.

14
15 Chair Chase announced a 10-minute break at 9:25 p.m. and Commissioner McHugh
16 recused himself.

17
18 **5. NEW HEARINGS**

19
20 **A. 502 CHAPMAN DRIVE, DESIGN REVIEW AND VARIANCE PERMIT NO. 13-**
21 **014 FOR A NEW 3,215 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY RESIDENCE (Senior**
22 **Planner Phil Boyle).**

23
24 Senior Planner Boyle presented the staff report. He explained that the application is for
25 design review and a variance for a new single family home and attached garage. Mr.
26 Boyle discussed the size of the dwelling and garage, and noted that a materials board is
27 available for review. He also noted that letters of support from nearby neighbors have
28 been provided as attachments to the staff report.

29
30 Mr. Boyle recalled the study session in August 2015 when an overview of the project
31 was discussed. Mr. Boyle made a correction to the staff report with regard to a wall
32 height. The proposed FAR is 23% and the maximum allowed is 40%. The proposed
33 building height would be 30 feet. The proposed project conforms to all development
34 requirements except the retaining wall is proposed to encroach into the front setback.
35 Changes the applicant was asked to consider at the study session are discussed on
36 page 3 of the staff report. The proposal includes the removal of trees and the
37 installation of new trees and boulders to reduce the potential impact from cars veer off
38 Chapman Drive.

39
40 Mr. Boyle discussed the proposed upper floor, which he noted would be at street level,
41 and the lower level, which he said would have three bedrooms, one bathroom and a
42 family room. Decks are proposed for both levels at the back of the property. He added
43 that additional articulation has been proposed to the north walls, windows have been
44 added and a portion of the building has been stepped outward to break up the massing.
45 He discussed the previous design of the rear elevation, which had tall supports on the

1 upper deck, and that similar features have now been added to the deck below, along
2 with a bellyband to break up the massing. He referred to slides showing the elevations.

3
4 He said that, given the orientation of the home and its location, staff does not
5 anticipate significant light and privacy impacts, and he noted that no objection letters
6 have been received. The applicant has included a gray water system at the request of
7 the commissioners.

8
9 Mr. Boyle went on to discuss the variance, noting that the special circumstance is the
10 steepness of the lot. He said the neighborhood would benefit from a variance for the
11 retaining wall, which will allow the house to be set further down on the property to
12 minimize visual impacts from Chapman Drive. Staff is able to make all of the findings
13 for design review and the variance and that a resolution to this effect has been
14 attached.

15
16 Craig McLean, Applicant, said they have made an effort not to impact their neighbors
17 and that they have designed a home that is large enough for their family and which will
18 be consistent with other homes in the area. Mr. McLean noted that other homes on
19 Chapman Drive have steep downward driveways and they have added more plant
20 material since the last meeting and have lessened the massing of the retaining wall and
21 northern wall of the dwelling.

22
23 Mr. McLean discussed the design, including the bellyband, and said they added more
24 exterior windows to break up the massing. He discussed the rear elevation, noted that
25 they have mirrored the deck supports on each floor and have stepped out the upper
26 floor over a portion of the lower floor to add interest. He also discussed the vegetation,
27 noting that the trees and plants will be native species and fire safe.

28
29 Mr. McLean noted that Michael Watkins, licensed engineer, is present, and said they
30 believe they have executed a good design.

31
32 In response to Vice-Chair Metcalfe, who commented favorably on the improvements,
33 Mr. McLean confirmed the neighbors at 516 Chapman support the project.

34
35 Mr. Watkins discussed the support mechanism of the decks in response to
36 Commissioner Caldera.

37
38 Commissioner McCadden and Mr. McLean discussed the projected start time of
39 construction in relation to the hillside location. Mr. Watkins discussed best practices that
40 they would adopt. Mr. McCadden suggested that construction begin earlier than the
41 suggested date of June 1st because grading could take longer than expected.
42 Commissioner McCadden suggested granting longer construction hours and Mr. Wolff
43 noted there is a condition of approval that limits construction hours further than the
44 noise ordinance.

1
2 In response to Chair Chase, Mr. McLean said the retaining wall color would be dark
3 stucco. He added that the wall has some lighting, which will not be visible from the
4 street.

5
6 Vice-Chair Metcalfe said she would favor staff determining the hours of construction.

7
8 Chair Chase opened the public comment period.

9
10 Tim Porter, 544 Chapman, discussed his concerns about the amount of construction in
11 the area. Mr. Porter discussed other concerns relating to tree removal relating to Mr.
12 McLean's property and another property. He said the neighbors have become used to
13 seeing a leafy, green corner, which he asked the commissioners to bear in mind. Mr.
14 Porter also discussed potential landslide problems. Overall, he said that he is happy to
15 support the project and noted that the applicant has room for construction vehicles on
16 his property. He identified another property (516 Chapman) that could not
17 accommodate construction vehicle parking when it is under development.

18
19 In response to Chair Chase, Mr. Porter said he was not able to interpret the landscape
20 plan well.

21
22 Dan Phipps, 495 Chapman, said that his property is across the street from Mr. McLean's
23 property, and that he is concerned about tree removal and lack of screening. He asked
24 that more trees be planted at the front of the property in a bare area by the driveway.

25
26 Chair Chase closed the public comment period.

27
28 Vice-Chair Metcalfe said the changes and improvements suggested by the
29 commissioners at the study session have been accommodated and that the remaining
30 issue with the neighbor can be worked out.

31
32 Commissioner Caldera concurred with Vice-Chair Metcalfe's remarks.

33
34 In response to Commissioner McCadden, Mr. McLean said they would not be removing
35 a 40-foot pine tree to the south of his property because it is on a neighbor's property.
36 Commissioner McCadden said that there are extenuating circumstances that would
37 allow a variance, and that he approves of the retaining wall and driveway design, which
38 will make the house less visible from the street.

39
40 Chair Chase said he could make the findings for the variance.

41
42 Mr. Boyle suggested an added condition of approval that the height be verified at the
43 time of framing inspection. Chair Chase was in agreement.

44

1 Commissioner McCadden discussed grading time lines and Mr. Boyle said that staff
2 recommends the common timeframe of April 15th through October 15th, which he
3 discussed. Mr. Boyle noted that a soils report would be provided at the building permit
4 stage.

5
6 **MOTIONED:** Motioned by Commissioner Caldera, seconded by Vice-Chair
7 Metcalfe, to approve Design Review and Variance Permit No. 13-014 for a new
8 3,215 square foot, two-story residence with the additional condition that a survey
9 is conducted at the appropriate time to confirm the roofline conforms to a height
10 of 30 feet at 502 Chapman Drive:

11
12 **AYES:** Metcalfe, Chase, McCadden, Caldera

13 **ABSENT:** McHugh

14
15 Mr. Boyle announced the appeal rights.

16
17 **B. 359 CHAPMAN DRIVE, APPEAL of THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S**
18 **APPROVAL OF DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 15-019 - TO**
19 **CONSTRUCT A 465 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE STORY ADDITION AT 359**
20 **CHAPMAN DRIVE – PL-16-11-AP (Senior Planner Phil Boyle)**

21
22
23 Senior Planner Boyle presented the staff report. Mr. Boyle explained that the application
24 is an appeal of a decision made by staff approving a Design Review Application for a
25 465 square foot addition to a single-story residence. Mr. Boyle said that the current
26 height is 11 feet and the proposed modifications would result in the highest point of the
27 residence being 17 feet 6 inches. He noted that the height adjacent to the appellant
28 would be approximately 13 feet. Mr. Boyle said that the design review application met
29 all the requirements of the R1 District, and he summarized the staff level design review
30 process.

31
32 Mr. Boyle said that staff worked with extensively with the applicant and the appellant to
33 reach a compromise. Staff drafted proposed conditions, which were sent to both parties,
34 which included a reduction in the roof pitch to reduce the bulk of the structure. He
35 confirmed the applicant had been amenable to the suggestion, and also to the
36 suggestion of an 8-foot fence to be installed in the area that is most affected to alleviate
37 privacy issues for the appellant. Mr. Boyle noted at that appellant still had concerns
38 about the project. However, since staff could make all the required Design Review
39 Findings, the project was approved in accordance with the Town's Design Review
40 planning process.

41
42 Mr. Boyle discussed the grounds for the appeal, including impacts to the appellant's
43 views and a negative impact to the value of the home and quality of life. Furthermore,
44 Mr. Boyle noted that there had been no other complaints from nearby neighbors. He
45 discussed the action the commissioners could take, which would be to confirm staff's
46 decision, reverse or modify staff's decision.

1
2 Commissioner Caldera and Mr. Boyle discussed the existing proposal. Mr. Boyle
3 confirmed that two new windows are proposed on the first floor.

4
5 In response to Vice-Chair Metcalfe, Mr. Boyle said that staff did not take measurements
6 of the shed height since it is not part of the proposal. He confirmed that the story poles
7 have not been changed to reflect the proposed condition as recommended by staff to
8 lower height the pitch of the roof, which Vice-Chair Metcalfe noted would have been
9 helpful.

10
11 Jennifer Larson, Appellant, said that photos of the project do not reflect what she will
12 see from her living room and she provided her own photographic materials to show the
13 impact on her property at 355 Willow. Ms. Larson provided background information on
14 the purchase of her home, noting that she would not have purchased the property had
15 there been a large wall in front of the living room window.

16
17 Ms. Larson said the proposed addition would affect her quality of life, which contravenes
18 the General Plan. She used a slide presentation to show that her neighbor will still be
19 able to maintain his views and asked that he consider building at the back of his
20 property. Ms. Larson discussed the reasons she believes the project does not meet
21 other policies in the General Plan.

22
23 In response to Commissioner Caldera, Ms. Larson confirmed that the addition's mass is
24 her main issue.

25
26 Michael Chammout, Applicant, said that the commissioners have visited the site; that he
27 has followed the process and that he and Ms. Larson discussed the addition before she
28 purchased her home.

29
30 Vice-Chair Metcalfe and Mr. Chammout discussed the proposed windows on the north
31 elevation, which Mr. Chammout noted would match the existing window elevation. He
32 said they could be removed if it helps the appellant.

33
34 In response to Chair Chase, Mr. Chammout discussed the reasons why it is unfeasible
35 to relocate the addition, which relate to the expense of relocating the plumbing and
36 mechanical systems. They discussed mechanisms for lowering the roof height with Mr.
37 Chammout noting that a hip roof is a more obvious choice to be symmetrical with the
38 main house roof.

39
40 Chair Chase opened the public comment period.

41
42 Peter Hensel, 128 Willow, discussed the view issue in relation to the findings and the
43 importance of views. He said that Ms. Larson's whole house was constructed around
44 the view.

45

1 Peter Orth, Meadowsweet, said the staff report is not accurate and that Ms. Larson's
2 views will be significantly impacted. Mr. Orth believes a fence would not mitigate the
3 view impacts and he noted that people in the town generally have one main view from
4 their house.

5
6 Richard Willis, 74 El Camino, commented on the importance of an outlook, and he
7 discussed a homeowner's right to a view in relation to the code. Mr. Willis said the
8 proposed addition breaks the rules.

9
10 Nicole Litchfield, 102 Edison, said she bought her home for similar reasons to the
11 appellant, which she discussed. Ms. Litchfield said she supports the appeal and that
12 she would not stay in her property if another homeowner blocked her view. She
13 discussed photographic materials to illustrate the problems affecting the appellant's
14 quality of life and property value.

15
16 Tina McArthur, realtor, discussed the view from the appellant's bay window and said
17 that the addition will substantially interfere with that view. Ms. McArthur noted that the
18 house was sited on the property to capture the ridgeline and greenery. She
19 acknowledged there are remodeling projects all around but the proposed addition is
20 extreme and affects the value of the appellant's home and should not be granted. Ms.
21 McArthur commented on the desirable real estate market and the value of the
22 appellant's home being limited if the structure is built.

23
24 Chair Chase closed the public comment period.

25
26 Ms. Larson said that it is not right for one person to take away another's view for their
27 financial gain and enjoyment. She said the comments made by the applicant are
28 untrue.

29
30 Commissioner McCadden commented on the proposed addition in relation to what the
31 code allows. He noted the project respects the setbacks and that a variance is
32 unnecessary, albeit the lot coverage would be maximized. Commissioner McCadden said
33 the bulk and mass are generous, but are not excessive. He asked staff if they could
34 offer further guidance in relation to the appellant's view issues.

35
36 Mr. Wolff explained that the findings broadly define views, and that the General Plan is
37 clear about balancing view issues with an owner's right to develop their property. He
38 said it is staff's experience that there will always be some impact, and what is judged to
39 be significant is sometimes difficult. Mr. Wolff acknowledged that the appellant's view
40 will be impacted by the proposed project but that in staff's view, additional views still
41 remained. He explained that the commissioners often must determine when a project is
42 considered to cause a significant view impact.

43

1 Counselor Propp discussed the commissioners' task, which she said is to affirm, reverse
2 or modify staff's findings.

3
4 Chair Chase commented on projects affecting neighbors and that, as a resident, he has
5 experienced impediments to his view and property. He said that there is little that can
6 be done about a property developer's rights, but that a design can be modified.

7
8 Mr. Boyle made a clarification regarding the story poles, which he said reflect the plans
9 and not the condition to reduce the roof pitch.

10
11 The commissioners discussed the modification to reduce the roofline, which Chair Chase
12 thought might have a minor affect.

13
14 Commissioner Caldera said he believes the proposed addition significantly impacts the
15 appellant because their view might be blocked by at least 50%. He said he does not
16 feel comfortable saying the effect will be minimal and the appellant should have to live
17 with it.

18
19 Commissioner McCadden said he supports staff's decision because the applicant could
20 have requested a significantly taller and larger building and, instead, they have limited
21 the size. He said that his personal evaluation is that the appellant's views will be
22 affected but that they could be impacted more significantly, noting that every project
23 affects someone's views in the main. Commissioner McCadden said there is no right
24 answer but that the project meets the Town's development standards.

25
26 Vice-Chair Metcalfe said that both sides need to compromise and she suggested a
27 significant design change that might be palatable and still afford the appellant a view.

28
29 Chair Chase said the impact is significant and should be addressed. He acknowledged
30 such problems are town-wide, and said that the applicant could grow a bamboo hedge
31 that blocks the appellant's view without redress. Chair Chase said he agreed with Vice-
32 Chair Metcalfe's comments that the floor plan could be modified and the roof pitch and
33 height could be lowered to be acceptable to the appellant.

34
35 Mr. Chammout explained the reasons why he disagreed with the commissioners'
36 proposed adjustments.

37
38 Counselor Propp explained that the application could not be withdrawn, that the
39 commissioners must make a decision and that both the applicant and appellant have
40 appeal rights.

41
42 Commissioner McCadden said the proposed changes are onerous and difficult and
43 might cause undue modifications that do not make a significant difference.

44

1 Commissioner Caldera said he believes that changes to the proposal are needed and
2 Commissioner McCadden said he would affirm staff's decision with roof modifications.

3
4 Counselor Propp noted that the Planning Commission does not retain jurisdiction and
5 should not continue an ongoing discussion. She said the public hearing could be re-
6 opened to hear further comment but that the commissioners need to make one of the
7 three decisions already discussed, continue the hearing or ask if the parties are willing
8 to reconsider the design. Counselor Propp said the requested modifications would have
9 to be specific.

10
11 The commissioners discussed modifications to the proposed design and consensus
12 was reached about the maximum height and extent of the addition.

13
14 **MOTION:** Motioned by Commissioner McCadden, seconded by Vice-Chair
15 Metcalfe, to approve Resolution No. 16-009, modifying the Zoning
16 Administrator's approval of Design Review Permit No. 15-019, thereby allowing
17 the construction of a 465 sq. ft. addition to the existing single family residence at
18 359 Chapman Drive, with the following conditions:

- 19
20 1. The maximum height of the addition will not exceed 12' 6";
21 2. Appropriate plantings to the northern edge of the property will be installed,
22 not to exceed the height of the addition's eaves;
23 3. The length of the addition on the west side will be reduced by 1 foot;
24 4. The windows on the north side of the addition can be moved horizontally but
25 not vertically, or can be removed at the Applicant's discretion.

26
27 **AYES:** Metcalfe, Chase, McCadden, Caldera
28 **ABSENT:** McHugh

29
30 Mr. Boyle read the appeal rights.

31
32 **7. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS**

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

- 34
35 **i. Commissioners**
36 **ii. Planning Director**

37
38 Due to the lateness of the hour, the commissioners and Planning Director did not
39 provide reports or make any announcements.

40
41 **B. Next meeting will be CMI at its entirety.**

- 42
43 **i. Tentative Agenda Items for March 22, 2016 Planning Commission**
44 **Meeting**

45

- 1 1. **CORTE MADERA INN** – CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING TO
2 CONSIDER APPLICATIONS BY RENESON HOTELS, INC., FOR A
3 NEW 185-ROOM DUAL-BRANDED MARRIOTT HOTEL, INCLUDING
4 A 78-ROOM SPRINGHILL SUITES AND A 107-ROOM EXTENDED
5 STAY RESIDENCE INN. APPLICATIONS INCLUDE A PROPOSED
6 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, ZONING AMENDMENT,
7 PRELIMINARY PLAN, PRECISE PLAN, AND CONDITIONAL USE.
8

9 **B. MINUTES**

10 **i. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of February 23, 2016**

11 **MOTION:** Motioned by Vice-Chair Metcalfe, seconded by Commissioner
12 McCadden, to approve the minutes of February 23, 2016:
13

14 **AYES:** Metcalfe, Chase, McCadden, Caldera
15

16 **ABSENT:** McHugh
17

18
19
20 **8. ADJOURNMENT**

21
22 A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at
23 12:15 a.m.
24
25
26
27