

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING, TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY, DECEMBER 18, 2013,
SCHOOLHOUSE, TOWN CENTER, 765 PORTOLA ROAD, PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028

Chair Von Feldt called the Planning Commission regular meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Kristiansson called the roll.

Present: Commissioners Arthur McIntosh, Nate McKitterick and Nicholas Targ (arrived late); Vice Chair Denise Gilbert; Chair Alexandra Von Feldt

Absent: None

Staff Present: Tom Vlastic, Town Planner
Karen Kristiansson, Deputy Town Planner
Craig Hughes, Town Council Liaison
Leigh Prince, Town Attorney

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

On the eve of his last meeting on the Planning Commission, Commissioner McIntosh reflected on his years in Portola Valley. He said his family's reasons for moving here were like everyone's – the beauty, the quiet, open space, great schools. Professional pursuits in the real estate investment business led him to become interested in planned communities, which in turn led to the Planning Commission. Over the years, he said the experience changed his perspective of what this community's about and expanded his horizons. Stepping out of the box, he was able to work with a lot of people he might never have met otherwise. He said he felt a lot of satisfaction from what the Planning Commission has achieved for the community, ranging from approving simple grading permits to deliberating on a new Town Center.

Commissioner McIntosh said he also particularly appreciated the people he's worked with, including the extraordinary Town staff and employees, who are very committed, especially helpful and always exhibiting marvelous attitudes. He said he thinks of Mr. Vlastic and his predecessor, George Mader, more as brothers than consultants, and "a mainstay forever" whose contributions are hard to calculate. He also said he found volunteers on the Planning Commission, the ASCC and the Town Council extraordinarily competent and committed. Everybody cares, he said, and they care about the community. He said he found his experience on the Planning Commission gratifying, enjoyable and educational, and considers the Town a marvelous example of democracy in action at its most fundamental level.

Commissioner McKitterick said that Commissioner McIntosh's absence will be noted and the presence of the Town Center that he played such an important role in bringing to fruition will always be a reminder of his contributions.

Mr. Vlastic thanked Commissioner McIntosh for all his help not only interacting on various projects and the Town Center, but the practical view he's always brought to the decision-making process, balancing all sides fairly to the great benefit of the community and those who have been affected by the decisions.

Virginia Bacon said that she also wanted to thank Commissioner McIntosh and say that, as a neighbor, she appreciated his contributions.

Chair Von Feldt noted that Commissioner McIntosh will now have his Wednesday nights back for the first time in 14 years.

REGULAR AGENDA

- (1) Preliminary Review: Proposed Amendment to Conditional Use Permit (CUP) X7D-161, AT&T Mobility, 4115 Alpine Road

Chair Von Feldt recused herself because she lives closer than 500 feet to the subject property and left the dais, handing the gavel over to Vice-Chair Gilbert.

Mr. Vlasic, referring to the December 12, 2013 staff report, noted that this item was originally scheduled for the Planning Commission's preliminary review with the ASCC at a site meeting on December 9, 2013. With a Planning Commission quorum lacking, that joint meeting will be rescheduled as a continued preliminary review on January 15, 2014. Mr. Vlasic said one neighbor uphill of the site, who has expressed concerns about the visual impacts and activities at the facility, apparently will be able to make his property at 50 Bear Gulch Drive available during that meeting. Mr. Vlasic also expects AT&T representative David Haddock, who is based in Sacramento, to be at the January meeting. Mr. Haddock is working on project input from ASCC, particularly focused on responding to questions Commissioners asked and making plan adjustments they requested.

As Mr. Vlasic explained, due to problems with service at the AT&T facility, some emergency activities have been underway at the site for the past several weeks, with encroachment permit authorization by the Public Works Director. He added that AT&T has been informed that the Town is becoming concerned with the scope of the effort.

The specific things ASCC attended to at its site meeting, Mr. Vlasic reported, included encouraging a redesign of the ground-based equipment so that it doesn't require fencing and doesn't interfere with the growing vegetation that AT&T planted as required by as a condition of its original CUP. The ASCC also requested that AT&T make the antenna proposed on the pole less obtrusive than the one there now, and make some other adjustments to minimize the potential visual impacts.

Considering the legal limitations on what the Planning Commission can do with regard to wireless facilities, Acting Chair Gilbert asked whether the Commission's review is basically limited to items that would affect the aesthetics of the installation. Mr. Vlasic said that if it were a new site with a new service base, the Town would have more latitude, but in this case, the answer would be yes, particularly because AT&T isn't proposing to expand to any additional service areas but primarily is upgrading from 4G to LTE service. The two antennae on the pole now, which are 4G-based, would remain until the user transition to LTE service is complete. This transition, Mr. Vlasic added, is industry-wide. To summarize, at this point the focus is on design aesthetics, clarification of improvements and addressing recurring maintenance issues, which have become almost a nuisance.

In response to Commissioner McIntosh, Mr. Vlasic said AT&T has not yet responded to some of the points the ASCC raised, such as relocating some of the ground facilities and changing the size or shape of the proposed T-bar. The AT&T engineers are discussing the adjustments. Mr. Vlasic said he believes the ground-based changes and controlling the amount of "spaghetti" coming out of the antenna are straightforward. How far the antenna can be pulled in may be more difficult.

Alexandra Von Feldt, Creek Park Drive, said that since the AT&T facility has been located at 4115 Alpine Road, the invasive weed called *Dittrichia*, often carried in by construction vehicles, has been popping up more and more at that site due to the increased activity. Measures to control this weed may need to be considered.

Commissioner McIntosh said that as long as the applicant addresses the issues raised by the ASCC, he did not think there was much more to say.

Commissioner McKitterick, noting that the proposal represents an important upgrade to cellular service on Alpine Road, said the ASCC seems to be on the right track in its comments regarding the visual impacts, including the fencing. He said he doesn't fully understand the rationale for weekend work on maintenance. Mr. Vlasic said this work would typically be done during the night if the Town ordinances allowed it, and carrier analysis (not only AT&T) indicates that cellular traffic is considerably higher during the week. Maintenance is therefore less disruptive on weekends, when cell usage is lower. Mr. Vlasic said the Public Works Director was asked to authorize the weekend work, because AT&T contends that fixing the problems they are having constitutes an emergency. Commissioner McKitterick said that if the Public Works Director is satisfied, he is also satisfied.

Acting Chair Gilbert said the discussion at the December 9, 2012 meeting, included in the staff report, covered the gamut of aesthetic issues and the Town would need to wait for AT&T's response. Mr. Vlasic said Commissioners would receive an updated report prior to the January 15, 2014 meeting.

(2) Continued Study Session: 2014 Housing Element Update [7:50 p.m.]

Chair Von Feldt returned to the dais.

Ms. Kristiansson noted that the December 12, 2013 staff report includes four possible changes to the second-unit program and also describes the public outreach efforts the Town has taken, including postcards that went out last week, website updates and e-notifications. She said it would help tonight for Commissioners to further refine and prioritize the second-unit program ideas, choose two or three to present in the draft Housing Element, and identify items and issues to send to the ASCC for feedback. Discussion of the Housing Element is tentatively on the ASCC agenda for January 13, 2014 and any recommendations from the ASCC would be reported to the Planning Commission at their January 15 study session.

Ms. Kristiansson summarized the four possible second-unit program changes:

1. Offer residents a selection of pre-approved pre-fabricated green second units, with different design and size options, which would not require specific ASCC review. Ms. Kristiansson said it could take a year or two to obtain and finalize a set of pre-approved designs and develop performance standards to address issues that the ASCC would typically consider – e.g., siting, lighting, parking, etc.
2. Allow larger second units, up to 900 or 1,000 square feet, either on lots where they are currently allowed (basically lots of at least one acre in the one-acre zoning districts throughout Town) or on lots of two or more acres (primarily located in Westridge and Oak Hills neighborhoods).
3. Allow an additional second unit on larger properties (perhaps 3 or 3.5 acres or larger), which would enable them to have two second units, at least one of which would be attached. Ms. Kristiansson indicated that most parcels of this size would be located on the western hillsides or the Westridge neighborhood.
4. Allow attached second units on smaller lots, possibly with a floor-area maximum less than the current 750 square feet, with independently accessible onsite parking required. Possible locations might include Woodside Highlands, Wyndham Circle or Brookside Park as well as Portola Valley Ranch. Ms. Kristiansson said that representatives of the Ranch's homeowners' association (HOA) said that the HOA discussed the latter idea when a member of the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee brought it up at an HOA meeting last spring. They agreed they did not want to pursue making changes to their CC&Rs to allow second units at this time.

Ms. Kristiansson said another idea discussed at the December 4, 2013 meeting, the idea of providing a floor-area discount as an incentive to encourage more second-unit production, might be considered in combination with any of these options.

Ms. Kristiansson said she hopes the results of the county-wide affordability study will be available for discussion at the next Planning Commission study session, which is scheduled for January 15, 2014. In addition to any second-unit updates, the inclusionary housing program and state density bonus law discussions will be on the agenda for that meeting. Vice Chair Gilbert asked Ms. Kristiansson to highlight areas that might be subdivided and thus subject to inclusionary housing provisions for the next study session.

Chair Von Feldt invited public comment, and said that she would list questions to be addressed by staff afterward.

Craig Hughes, Wayside Road, asked what latitude HOAs have to apply rules that would exempt them from allowing programs that would help the Town achieve Housing Element goals.

Bill Volk, 199 Brookside Drive, said that he and his wife have some concerns about the new California building code adoption as it relates to patios and requires enclosure down to the ground.

Virginia Bacon, Golden Oak Drive, said Commissioner Targ made an important point at the December 4, 2013 Planning Commission meeting, when he noted that that the Town is trying to accomplish two goals – meeting the Town’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers and moving toward our vision of what we’d like to see the Town look like in the future. Ms. Bacon said these goals can be hard to separate because many of the suggested remedies touch on Portola Valley’s longer-term vision. For example, she said that awarding bonuses for second units would increase density, and the density question is a bigger issue that deserves more consideration than near-term objectives. The 85% rule in current ordinances already gives property owners choices for ancillary structures, she said. She also suggested considering how duplexes differ from attached second units. Ms. Bacon made several other points:

- Allowing basements beneath second units might be a way of increasing the size without increasing density
- Septic systems, which require limits on water use, also often need extensive drain fields and leach lines that would limit property area for development of second units
- She’s requested information from West Bay Sanitary District about the location of sewer lines throughout Town, which could help us better determine where potential exists for second units
- Having more than one utility access point on a property could help reduce the cost of developing second units

Ms. Bacon stated that the consequences of larger, maxed-out properties must be considered, and it should be determined district by district how many lots there are, how many homes are already at their maximums, and how close to capacity we are. She said that overall, more information about the Town’s housing stock is needed to be able to make intelligent decisions about how to move forward. Without it, “we’ll be throwing darts in the dark.”

Bud Eisberg, Wyndham Drive, who served on the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee, said the Committee talked about Portola Valley’s 750-square-foot second-unit maximum vis-à-vis several similar communities: Woodside (1,500 square feet for rentals), Monte Sereno and Hillsborough (1,200 square feet) and Los Altos Hills (1,000 square feet). He stated we should consider second-unit size in the context of the fact that the Town needs moderate-income units. Addressing Mr. Hughes’ point, Mr. Eisberg said Committee members considered distributing affordable housing throughout the community important enough to have included that point in the Mission Statement they drafted. Mr. Eisberg said he’s disappointed to hear that a large group of homeowners might be unwilling to modify their Covenants, Codes and Restrictions (CC&Rs) to accommodate second units.

Kevin Webster, Westridge Drive, who has lived in Portola Valley since 1960, said that in keeping with the Town’s heritage as a rural community, it has no duplexes, apartments or condos, and he doesn’t see why there should be any. He expressed concerns about transforming single-family parcels into multi-family parcels. He said he lives next door to a property with a second unit that was built as a mother-in-law house, but subsequent property owners have used it as a rental unit, and he does not see this as in the nature of Portola Valley. He said he was also concerned about the possibility of a duplex on the former Shorenstein estate, which is across the street, and the additional traffic that would result from development of the property.

With no other speakers coming forward, Chair Von Feldt closed the public comment period and asked Ms. Kristiansson to respond to the questions:

- HOA and CC&Rs: Ms. Kristiansson said that she would check with the Town Attorney, but per her understanding, HOAs are limited by state law in what they can do with their CC&Rs, and provided they comply with state law, CC&Rs can be more stringent than their home jurisdiction. Mr. Vlasic said in the past, CC&Rs were typically required with the subdivision process to achieve certain objectives consistent with Planned Unit Development (PUD) provisions. The Town enforces only the PUD, not the CC&Rs. What’s unique about The Ranch, he said, are the design of the homes and properties and the parking layout. The PUD set forth a specific development pattern. Although the anticipation with the PUD was that only a primary residence would occupy each lot at The Ranch, he said, it does not rule out having a dialogue with the HOA if the Town wants to pursue it. In any case, he said, the Town would still have to look in detail in terms of siting

and architectural requirements and parking provisions. Commissioner Targ added that CC&Rs could not be contrary to the public interest, and he would leave it others as to whether a change in Town ordinances could drive a modification to CC&Rs.

- Building Code: Ms. Kristiansson said questions about the the recently adopted Building Code, such as requirements related to patios, should be directed to Deputy Building Official Gary Fitzer.
- Basements beneath second units: Ms. Kristiansson said she did not think any regulations prohibit building second units with basements. Mr. Vlastic added that the basement could not be used to exceed the 750-square-foot maximum, even if the basement space doesn't count as floor area. The Town could amend the regulations to allow exceeding the maximum size of a second unit with the basement area included, he said, but that might result in all second-unit applications including basements because it would enable property owners to exceed the second-unit size without counting it toward floor-area limits.
- Overview of second-unit stock: Ms. Kristiansson said the data could be mapped, but it would be time-consuming and may not provide much more information than is already apparent on the Town's Zoning Map. She said the Town has 160 to 170 legal second units, all located on lots of at least one acre. Going to the Zoning Map, she pointed out the one-acre zoning districts, primarily Westridge, Oak Hills and the western hillsides.

Vice Chair Gilbert said it may not be important for the current Housing Element update, but over the long term, mapping out locations of second units might be useful in understanding the limits on the Town's capacity for second units before density becomes an issue. Ms. Kristiansson said a rough count about ten years ago indicated that there were somewhere around 1,000 lots in Town are large enough to accommodate second units, so the 160 to 170 second units are located on only a small percentage of that total. Topographical issues could prevent construction of second units on some of those lots, Mr. Vlastic said, but to adequately analyze site conditions to produce a more accurate picture would be time-consuming. Going from a base of approximately five to six permits being issued annually, he said the measures to encourage more second-unit production aren't likely to open the floodgates, and even increasing the allowable floor area wouldn't do so.

Commissioner McIntosh said the basement idea is interesting, in terms of improving existing basements to qualify them as second units, although he thinks most properties have no basements. In terms of The Ranch, there might be dialog over a period of years about bringing in a small number of second units, since some members of the community may be interested in having second units for caretakers. This would need to be handled with care, however, because the Ranch had been carefully designed for parking and traffic, and an influx of second units would make it a very different place.

Commissioner McIntosh asked how many of the 32 homes at Blue Oaks have second units. He also asked why tandem parking would not be permitted for second units on smaller lots. Mr. Vlastic said probably at least 30% of Blue Oaks lots contain second units. Ms. Kristiansson said other communities require onsite independent parking for second units in areas where street parking is tight, and prohibit tandem parking because it defeats the purpose of second-unit occupants having independent access to parking.

Chair Von Feldt reminded Commissioners that during their December 4, 2013 study session, they talked about prioritizing what they might try to do in the Housing Element update now, while also setting out steps that look forward to what we may explore to achieve longer-term goals. Working with The Ranch might be one of the areas to explore more.

In deciding which of the options to pursue, and how to flesh out the details of those options, Commissioner McIntosh advised that it's important to be cognizant that we don't want overshoot the target in producing second units, so we get what we need to meet (but not exceed) our RHNA obligation. Commissioner McKitterick agreed.

Chair Von Feldt then invited Commissioners to review the four items and try to reach consensus on priorities:

1. Pre-approved green pre-fabricated green second units

Commissioner McKitterick asked whether this could be handled through the existing process, perhaps by simply referring people to a list of companies that provide such units. Ms. Kristiansson said the Town has received no such applications so far, but they are getting more popular in other communities, and the pre-approved designs to minimize the level of review might jump-start use of pre-fab second units here. Mr. Vlasic added that one reason we haven't seen many pre-fab structures in Portola Valley is likely that the Town doesn't have simple sites, and the expense of preparing a site can more than offset the savings in using a pre-fab structure. To address that issue, the Town may want to develop a framework that deals with some of the factors a property owner would have to take into account.

Commissioner McIntosh said the issue he struggles with is that most people building new homes would not be interested in pre-approved designs that aren't congruent what they're doing. Chair Von Feldt concurred, but noted that there may be merit in having the pre-approved pre-fab green unit option for situations in which the unit would complement existing homes.

Commissioner McIntosh agreed, suggesting that might be a solution for properties on Golden Oak Drive, for example, and there might be enough such properties in Town to make this option worth studying further. Ms. Kristiansson said most of the applications for second units tend to go with new homes, but there has also been an increase of applications for new second units to go with existing homes.

Commissioner McKitterick also said he would be concerned about waiving ASCC review of second units in favor of staff-only approval, because every site is different and no notice would be provided to neighbors. Mr. Vlasic said there may be ways, such as informal review by ASCC subcommittees, to streamline the process without losing track of key issues and achieve the goal of adding a few more units to help meet the Town's RHNA obligation.

Commissioner Targ suggested a Stanford graduate student concentrating on certain aspects of sustainability might spend a semester undertaking a study on this, which may lead to a program for Portola Valley and also a potential business opportunity.

If the Planning Commission wants to pursue it, Ms. Kristiansson said the pre-fab option might go in the draft Housing Element update as something we want to study. She said that based on the concerns raised, she doesn't think we could go much farther than that by the May 2014 deadline. Commissioners concurred with her suggestion.

2. Allow larger second units

Commissioner McKitterick said he would like this as a priority item, in part because he believes this was a recommendation of the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee. He was influenced by the comparables from other communities, and Carter Warr commenting at the December 4, 2013 Planning Commission meeting that he thought allowing larger second units would encourage increased second-unit production. Commissioner McKitterick suggested moving maximum second-unit square footage from 750 to 1,000. Commissioner McIntosh agreed and said that the question is whether the additional 250 square feet should be allowed "free," without counting towards the Town's floor area limits.

The floor area part of the question aside, Chair Von Feldt said that for her, the larger second units (1,000 square feet) should be tied to lots larger than two acres. The other commissioners agreed.

As for the "bonus" space, Chair Von Feldt asked for thoughts on whether or not the extra 250 square feet should count toward the floor area maximum. Considering the ramifications, Commissioner McIntosh said that if the extra space isn't included in the floor-area count, it in effect would increase the floor-area limit on parcels of two or more acres, enhancing property values for those property owners who would take advantage of it. However, 250 sf would generally be a small percentage increase, and so it would not bother him. Mr. Vlasic said that most new homes are around 5,500 or 6,000 square feet, so it would be a small

percentage increase. He said that it's hard to know whether offering a bonus would encourage people to take advantage of it because not everyone pushes to the upper limit. He also said that allowing a larger second unit – whether the additional space is treated as a bonus or counted against the existing floor-area maximum – seems that it would be worth the effort, and the Commission could come back to provide incentives if people don't take advantage of it.

Commissioner McIntosh said the bonus probably isn't necessary at this stage, because to meet the RHNA obligation, the Town needs only to add four additional second units over a three-year period. Vice Chair Gilbert said we may want to boost second-unit production a bit more than four over three years. Ms. Kristiansson emphasized that the numbers will depend on the results of the affordability study.

Chair Von Feldt suggested waiting to see how much other initiatives affect second-unit production, and reconsider the bonus if it appears necessary after a couple of years. In response to Commissioner McKitterick, Mr. Eisberg confirmed that the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee discussed floor-area bonuses as a means of encouraging second-unit production, but there was not a consensus.

Commissioner Targ said if the additional 250 square feet would mean exceeding floor-area limits, the Town might consider viewing the additional space as a conditionally approved use to avoid making it a matter of right. Ms. Kristiansson commented that a CUP might be somewhat more onerous than the Commission would want to require, but the bonus decision could rest on ASCC making certain findings to accomplish the same purpose. Considering the objective of streamlining the process, Mr. Vlasic said it would be better to simply allow larger second units on the larger parcels, and if the response to that measure doesn't seem to have any effect, go back and consider the floor-area bonus question. He said that with new construction, architects can come up with plenty of creative solutions and design to accommodate larger second units without exceeding floor-area limits.

Commissioners agreed that allowing 1000 sf second units on lots over 2 acres in size without a floor area bonus should be incorporated into the draft housing element update.

3. Allow additional second units on larger properties

Commissioner McKitterick said factors such as parcel size and whether the additional units are needed to meet RHNA numbers should be taken into account, but that said, he favors the idea of allowing two second units provided that only one of them could be rented out. Commissioner McIntosh said that this would be difficult to enforce, and Commissioner Targ added that if only one could be rented, it would not help with the housing numbers. Commissioner McIntosh agreed, noting that if the parcels would have to be at least 3.5 acres and one of the units would have to be attached, he did not think there was a need to restrict rental of the units. He also pointed out that with a minimum parcel size of 3.5 acres, the maximum number of additional second units possible would be 29. Besides the 29 properties in Westridge, Ms. Kristiansson noted that there are others on the western hillsides and a few more scattered throughout Town, so there may be 50 or so in total.

Chair Von Feldt questioned whether changing the Town's standards in this way would be worthwhile given the relatively small number of parcels that would be affected. Commissioner Targ said he didn't think approving additional second units on larger properties would be incentive enough to make a difference, and he's not sure about how it would look – whether cozy or crowded. Chair Von Feldt said she imagined it would look pretty much the same from the street either way, because one unit would be part of the main house. Mr. Vlasic agreed, pointing out that homes already also have multiple access points, so even a separate entrance for an attached second unit wouldn't be unusual from a design point of view. Commissioner McIntosh said the process would be only slightly more complicated than what the ASCC already does.

Commissioners concurred that this item should remain among the options to explore.

4. Allow attached second units on smaller lots

Commissioner McKitterick advised against pursuing this option at this time, except for longer-term discussions with the Ranch. Commissioner McIntosh said that would make sense to the extent that the Ranch is willing to discuss it. Other Commissioners also agreed.

In summary, Chair Von Feldt said Commissioners seem to coalesce around two programs to pursue for this Housing Element cycle (allowing larger second units on parcels of two or more acres, and allowing an additional second unit on parcels of 3.5 acres and more) and include discussion about further exploring two other programs (pre-approved green designs and second units on smaller parcels). Commissioner McKitterick said that for purposes of what the Planning Commission submits to the Town Council, it would be helpful to have ASCC's input on allowing larger second units and additional second units. Commissioner McIntosh and Chair Von Feldt said they'd like to have the ASCC's feedback on all four options.

In terms of public outreach, Commissioner McKitterick said he doesn't consider postcards effective, but PV Forum postings would be. Vice Chair Gilbert suggested that when the Town posts meeting notices for the coming week on the Forum, it might help to provide more color about the Planning Commission's study sessions on the Housing Element. Because Forum readers may not be inclined to dig into the agendas, Commissioner Targ suggested separate postings that are subject-matter related rather than meeting-related.

Commissioner Targ noted that on paper, Portola Valley seems to have more housing than it does people. He said he, and perhaps others, would find it helpful for future planning to have more data to better evaluate housing needs and work on a longer-term vision that aligns with the facts.

Ms. Kristiansson advised that while the Planning Commission has been focusing on the programs section of the Housing Element, behind the scenes, staff also has been assembling material for the section of the element that contains demographic data. This section will come to the Planning Commission as soon as it's ready, she said, and it may contain most of the information Commissioner Targ wants to see. In response to Commissioner McIntosh, she confirmed that the 2010 Census shows fewer residents in Town than the 2000 Census did.

COMMISSION, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS [9: 14 p.m.]

Commissioner Targ said he has heard concerns about the new fence on the former Shoreinstein property, and he wanted to ensure that the Town is aware of the situation. Ms. Kristiansson said that Town staff has been talking with the property owners and their attorneys and asked for a plan to remedy a nonconforming fence that has been installed and resolve other questions. Mr. Vlastic said he has also been in contact with concerned neighbors. In response to Commissioner McIntosh, Ms. Kristiansson said the new owners purchased the property in July 2013.

Ms. Kristiansson asked Commissioners to send notes to Town Clerk Sharon Hanlon confirming their desire to continue as Planning Commissioners for 2014.

The next Planning Commission meeting will be on January 15, 2014.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [9: 18 p.m.]

Commissioner McIntosh moved to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2013 Planning Commission meeting. Seconded by Vice Chair Gilbert, the motion carried 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT [9:20 p.m.]

Alexandra Von Feldt, Chair

Karen Kristiansson, Deputy Town Planner