



TOWN OF TIBURON
Tiburon Town Hall
1505 Tiburon Boulevard
Tiburon, CA 94920

Action and Approved Minutes - Regular Meeting
Tiburon Planning Commission
August 11, 2010 – 7:30 PM

ACTION MINUTES TIBURON PLANNING COMMISSION

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL **At 7:30**

Present: Vice Chair Frymier, Commissioner Corcoran, Commissioner Doyle, Commissioner Tollini

Absent: Chairman Kunzweiler

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS **There Were None**

Persons wishing to address the Planning Commission on any subject not on the agenda may do so under this portion of the agenda. Please note that the Planning Commission is not able to undertake extended discussion, or take action on, items that do not appear on this agenda. Matters requiring action will be referred to Town Staff for consideration and/or placed on a future Planning Commission agenda. Please limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. Testimony regarding matters not on the agenda will not be considered part of the administrative record.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS **Frymier Elected Chair; Corcoran Elected Vice-Chair**

COMMISSION AND STAFF BRIEFING

Commission and Committee Reports
Director's Report

PUBLIC HEARING

1. SOUTH SIDE OF TRESTLE GLEN BOULEVARD BETWEEN TIBURON BOULEVARD AND UPPER JUNO ROAD: TRESTLE GLEN CIRCLE CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN REVIEW OF A PROPOSAL FOR THE CREATION OF FOUR BUILDING SITES ON A 14.46 ACRE PARCEL; PD #18A; FILE #40901; Trestle Glen Terrace, LLC, Owner; IPA, Inc., Applicant; Assessor's Parcel No. 039-061-91 [DW] **Meeting Conducted and Recommendations Made**

MINUTES

2. PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES – Regular Meeting of July 14, 2010
Approved as Amended 3-0

ADJOURNMENT **At 9:50 PM**

a081110

PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED MINUTES NO. 1001
August 11, 2010
Regular Meeting
Town of Tiburon Council Chambers
1505 Tiburon Boulevard, Tiburon, California

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Vice-Chair Frymier called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Vice-Chair Frymier, Commissioners Corcoran and Tollini

Absent: Chair Kunzweiler, Commissioner Doyle

Staff Present: Planning Manager Watrous, Town Attorney Danforth, Director of Community Development Anderson (8:15), Associate Planner Tyler and Minutes Clerk Levison

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None

COMMISSION AND STAFF BRIEFING: None

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

ACTION: It was M/S (Corcoran/Tollini) to elect Commissioner Frymier as Chair. Motion carried: 3-0.

ACTION: It was M/S (Frymier/Tollini) to elect Commissioner Corcoran as Vice-Chair. Motion carried: 3-0.

MINUTES:

2. PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES – Regular Meeting of July 14, 2010

Commissioner Tollini requested the following corrections to the minutes:

- Page 4, 1st paragraph, 4th line - change “acknowledge” to “acknowledged”
- Page 5, 1st paragraph, 2nd line – “less **than** significant”

ACTION: It was M/S (Corcoran/Tollini) to approve the minutes of July 14, 2010, as amended. Motion carried: 3-0.

PUBLIC MEETING

1. TRESTLE GLEN CIRCLE CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN; File #40901; Trestle Glen Boulevard between Tiburon Boulevard and upper Juno Road; Conceptual Master Plan to Create Four Building Sites on a 14.46 Acre Parcel; Trestle Glen Terrace, LLC, Owner; IPA, Inc., Applicant; Assessor's Parcel No. 039-061-91

Planning Manager Watrous presented the staff report, stating the owner of this vacant 14.46 acre parcel has submitted an application for a Conceptual Master Plan review of proposal to divide this vacant parcel into four lots. He provided a brief background of the site, including review of a previous Precise Development Plan for the site by the Planning Commission in 2000 and an application submitted by the current property owner in 2008 for a Precise Development Plan to subdivide the property into three lots, with two lots accessed from Silverado Drive and the third from Trestle Glen Boulevard. Due to the potential controversy regarding this and other site planning issues, Staff recommended that the applicant withdraw the Precise Development Plan application and instead submit for a Conceptual Master Plan review. The Conceptual Master Plan was subsequently submitted with the four-lot subdivision, with two accessed from Silverado and two from Trestle Glen Boulevard.

Mr. Watrous summarized the development parameters for each of the four proposed lots. He noted that the conceptual plans for the houses on all four lots are probably representative of the type of construction that would be expected for each lot, given the building envelope constraints and house sizes proposed. Mr. Watrous discussed the planning issues have been raised by the design of the proposed project, including traffic and access issues for both Silverado Drive and Trestle Glen Boulevard, issues of neighborhood compatibility, the location of a significant ridgeline on the site, visibility of the proposed homes and the amount of grading needed for the project.

Mr. Watrous stated that no formal action on the proposed Conceptual Master Plan was required from the Commission that evening, but the Commission was expected to provide input to the applicant regarding the merits of the conceptual project design, including vehicular access from Trestle Glen Boulevard, Silverado Drive, or both; appropriate number and general location of homes on the site; appropriate floor area limits and envelope sizes for homes; avoidance of, or enhanced setbacks from, the significant ridgeline on the site; and adequacy of proposed open space.

Mr. Watrous stated that Town Staff feels that a more appropriate project design would include only one access point from Trestle Glen Boulevard with three homes that are closer in size to those approved for Tiburon Court. He said that this project design would be consistent with the development pattern on this side of Trestle Glen Boulevard, would lessen the visual impacts of the currently proposed larger home, and leave much of the upper portion of the property as visual open space. He stated that the single access point from Trestle Glen Boulevard would eliminate traffic through Silverado Drive and Little Reed Heights neighborhood and would avoid any additional strain on the intersection of Stewart Drive and Tiburon Boulevard. He added that Staff believes that a three-lot project with smaller homes and Trestle Glen Boulevard access would be most compatible with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Vice-Chair Corcoran asked if the Town has the same governance over private roadways as it does public and if the Town Engineer would provide an assessment in terms of safety and visibility. Mr. Watrous stated that private roadways are evaluated in the same manner as public and must meet the same safety standards and evaluations; much of that would occur through the

CEQA process and traffic evaluation for any design. He noted that in its conceptual form, the design has not yet been evaluated to that extent.

Vice-Chair Corcoran inquired about the size of secondary building envelopes for the Tiburon Court project. Mr. Watrous could not specifically confirm size, but said that they were substantially smaller than what is proposed here.

Vice-Chair Corcoran asked how this project would proceed if not all of the identified issues were resolved at this time. Mr. Watrous said that it would be the applicant's option to hold another hearing on the Conceptual Master Plan in front of the Town Council, but the intent of this process is to guide them in preparing an acceptable Precise Development Plan application.

Art Giovara, owner, reviewed his family's history and stated that he purchased this property three years ago and intends to live in the home on Lot 3. He said that the two parcels along Trestle Glen Boulevard were at one time zoned for sixty-eight homes and are now zoned for approximately eight. He said that he had been working on this project for nearly three years, met with the Planning Commission and staff numerous times, met with the neighbors and hosted a community meeting on the project.

He reviewed the letters received from the public and agreed that access from Juno Road is dangerous, but he noted that visibility from the proposed access point is better than from the other side of the road. He stated that traffic from two additional homes would not significantly exacerbate the traffic situation. He acknowledged privacy concerns and said that he had made considerable changes to the design in order to minimize those impacts. He stated that the home on Lot 3, while large, would be set back approximately 150 feet from the street. He also noted that concerns over light spillage from the proposed tennis courts were unfounded, as he had no intent of installing lighting there, as were concerns about noise emanating from pool parties, as only a lap pool was proposed.

To concerns regarding views, Mr. Giovara stated that the top portion of the hill would be left alone. He acknowledged concerns regarding the construction phase of the project and noted that recent brush clearing on the site with large equipment did not seem to present any significant inconvenience to any surrounding neighborhoods. He stated that he did not intend to move any dirt offsite, meaning that heavy equipment travelling through the neighborhood would be kept to minimum, and that he envisioned limiting construction access to Trestle Glen Boulevard only.

Mr. Giovara objected to a letter submitted by a planning consultant that he said appeared to have been partially written by Mr. White, a property owner with whom he is engaged in a legal dispute. He questioned the consultant's statement that Silverado Drive is substandard and its measured width, and objected to the letter on the grounds that it was misleading in its information and was not signed by the all of its authors.

Mr. Giovara noted that his legal access to Silverado Drive has been questioned by many and he stressed that he was not trying to force any property owners into granting him something he was not entitled to. He stated that this road easement is mentioned in the subdivision map and ultimately the courts would need to decide the issue.

Scott Hochstrasser, environmental planning consultant for the applicant, reviewed the site's zoning history. He said that 73% of the cut and fill grading for the proposed project would be for

landslide repair required by the Town's policies. He said that the remaining grading for the project clearly represented an effort to minimize grading. In terms of ridgeline setback, he noted that the homes along Stewart Drive and Redding Court above the site are clearly on top of the ridge but this project would set homes 75 feet or more from the ridgeline. He said that they are open to increasing the setback for the building envelopes, if needed. He stated that the plan was consistent with General Plan policies. He was involved in the Tiburon Court project which was ultimately approved for three homes with large basements, essentially totaling up to 5,900 square feet of livable space in each home. He said that this decision signaled to developers that the Town wants larger homes on larger lots and two of the four homes proposed as part of this project would be exactly in line with what was approved for the property next door. He conceded that the home on Lot 3 might be inordinately large and could be considered an estate lot, although he noted there is no zoning definition for that term.

Mr. Hochstrasser stated that the development had been specifically clustered to extend from the existing neighborhood approved for Tiburon Court. He said that Lot 4 would be situated entirely on a slide area and the home's foundation would actually become a stability element of that slide repair. He stated that the home on Lot 3 would not loom over the Belveron neighborhood, noting that the elevation changes and setback from the street. He concurred with Mr. Giovara that certain public comments were misinformation and asked that the Commission not prejudice its views of the project based on the question of legal access at Silverado Drive. He also noted that Mr. Giovara had received a letter from the neighbors' attorney stating that the purchase of an easement there may well be negotiable. He stated that many letters attempt to pick this proposal apart piece by piece, but he said that that could be done with nearly every approved project in Town. He stated that the Commission's responsibility for each project was to strike a balance between the developer's objectives and the goals and policies of the Town's General Plan and zoning regulations.

Miles Berger, architect, stated that this plan was developed to feather new development into existing neighborhoods and he demonstrated this would be accomplished on the plans. He discussed the conceptual home designs and how the homes would complement the existing terrain and neighborhoods.

Chair Frymier asked Mr. Berger to discuss the reason for the differences in architectural styles for the proposed homes. Mr. Berger said visibility from the upper to lower homes and vice versa is limited and therefore continuity between the two portions of the site was not necessary. He said that the similarity in home design of Point Tiburon was part of what makes that project look so massive. His idea was to break up this continuity, thereby reducing the apparent visual mass.

Chair Frymier noted that the proposed garages would be larger than the average size in Tiburon, particularly the 2,100 square foot garage for Lot 3. Mr. Berger hoped that the proposed setbacks would limit the visibility of the garages to a significant extent. He explained that Mr. Giovara's plan was to house agricultural equipment, wine barrels, etc. in the garage and not an inordinate number of vehicles. He also said that this was not a critical feature in terms of design and admitted that regardless of what is discussed all homes would eventually be subject to the normal constraints of the design review process.

Chair Frymier asked for more information about grading and fill, particularly, why so much soil would be relocated onto Lot 3 and how much this would increase the elevation of the house on that lot. Kevin Maas, civil engineer with Adobe Associates, Inc., explained that the proposed

home would have a multi-level design, with some portions below the natural grade and others above grade. He said that the homes would be excavated into the hillside to a fair extent in order to construct a roadway leading to the upper two lots while still minimizing retaining walls. He stated that this excavation would create a significant amount of loose dirt and, rather than hauling it through town, the thought was to place that material on Lot 3. He stated that the auto court on the northern end would be approximately eighteen feet above natural grade.

Chair Frymier thanked the public for their correspondence and then that the Commission had read all comments submitted to date, reviewed the plans, visited the site from several vantage points, and viewed the site from different points in town. She asked that tonight's comments be limited to new information rather than what has already been submitted. She reminded the public that the Commission's role is to provide a recommendation that will establish a foundation for any subsequent Precise Development Plan that may or may not come forward. She reviewed the key areas of focus as stated by staff, asked that comments address these points specifically, and opened the hearing to public comment.

Becky Pringle said that in an effort to establish an efficient format for this evening, neighbors had agreed on one official representative each from the neighborhoods of Reed Heights, Belveron Gardens, and Trestle Glen Terrace.

Jan Vazquez, planning consultant, stated that she represents property owners of Silverado and Comstock Drives, as well as the neighborhoods of Little Reed Heights and Tiburon Knolls, and she had authored the letter referenced by Mr. Giovara. She provided the Commission with a letter from the title company, which she said substantiated Mr. White's claims regarding access from Silverado Drive. She stated that the General Plan Land Use element which described this particular property says that it has poor access, steep slopes, a significant ridgeline, and high visibility, all of which combine to make achievement of the maximum density unlikely. Of these constraints, she said that the most difficult one for the applicant to address and make an argument for General Plan consistency relates to slopes, particularly the policy that strongly discourages development on slopes exceeding 40%, which are found on Lots 1 and 2. She questioned whether the Commission would be able to make a finding of General Plan consistency and approve a Precise Development Plan with this design, and noted that the applicant's own description of the property acknowledged that the plan cannot comply with the Town's slope policy. She noted that the General Plan includes policies that state that open space is highly valued and its preservation should be given the highest priority. Viewed from eastbound on Tiburon Boulevard, she said that the story poles are very evident and give the impression of continuous development across the hillside. She said that the portion of land to be dedicated as open space is not the most visible portion of the property.

David Wood cited significant drainage issues emanating from underground springs on the hillside behind his property and draining down to Trestle Glen Terrace. He said that Trestle Glen Terrace has experienced major issues with those springs undermining the condition of the road, which is private and must be maintained at the expense of the homeowners. He said that the proposed home on Lot 1 would significantly and negatively affect drainage further, advised that piped-in storm drains would be necessary for the project, and he asked what sort of bond the developer intended to secure to ensure against additional damage. He stated that he owns a landscape easement that blocks Mr. Giovara's access from Comstock Drive, which was sold specifically to assure that there would be no nearby development or access from any of the cul-de-sacs. He said that he was not opposed to development of the site but wanted to see it done in a

manner that would blend in with the surrounding neighborhoods and does not put homeowners at risk. He concurred with the recommendation of the Staff report, which identified three homes accessed from Trestle Glen Boulevard as the preferred alternative.

Al McGee stated that this project could affect nearly 10% of the Town's population. He said he spoke with Mr. Giovara several years ago regarding the project and characterized him as unfamiliar with land use and development in Marin County. He said that he offered Mr. Giovara several suggestions at that time, which he had not opted to pursue. In early 2007, Mr. Magee distributed a survey to homeowners on Silverado Drive and not one single response supported the plan proposed here. He concurred with the Staff recommendation and said that any development here should be moderate in scale and accessed from Trestle Glen Boulevard only.

John Kern said that he was the last civil engineer to perform work on Silverado Drive, and that by all standards this is a substandard road. He stated that during the undergrounding of utilities on Silverado Drive, the Town Manager advised him to authorize the placement of a PG&E transformer in its current location at the end of Silverado Drive because the Town had no plans to ever punch that road through. He said that Silverado Drive has a 14% grade, increasing nearly 200 vertical feet in only three blocks. He said that the road is so narrow that with vehicles parked against the curb on either side, the center travel way is limited to less than eight feet in width and does not accommodate larger vehicles or emergency access. He said that the Stewart Drive/Tiburon Boulevard intersection is the worst in town and cautioned against adding more traffic to this intersection.

Karen Halsey said that this proposal has united the efforts of Belveron East, Tiburon Knolls, and Reed Heights. She said that each neighborhood would like to see the ridgeline preserved and believes that the property can be responsibly developed with a single access point from Trestle Glen Boulevard. She said that the community had met with the applicant to discuss their concerns, but many feel that those concerns have not been addressed by this proposal. She was concerned that the applicant might not develop the remaining lots beyond their infrastructure and pads, and that the situation could mirror that of a parcel in Belvedere where the property was destroyed but never developed. She requested a project with singular access off Trestle Glen Boulevard that would include safety improvements for the entire neighborhood.

Enrique Sotomayor disagreed with the applicant's contention that a temporary construction road to access building pads for Lots 1 and 2 would alleviate construction impacts on neighbors due to the connection of utilities through Comstock Drive. He concurred with the Staff recommendation regarding access from Trestle Glen Boulevard, stating that the development as designed would create significant impacts to the residents on Silverado Drive for years to come.

Richard Petrick said that he approached Larkspur's former Planning Director, Jan Vazquez, because he felt the Commission was owed someone who could speak at their own level. He said that he and Alan White organized the community, raising money as a group to hire Ms. Vazquez to prepare her argument. He said that he did not believe Mr. Giovara is a part of the neighborhood and had never seen anyone polarize a community so quickly.

Chair Frymier reiterated the key points that Staff had identified for tonight's discussion and asked the public to limit comments to those specific issues.

Margot Geitheim discussed traffic safety issues of Trestle Glen Boulevard. She said that the proposed development would turn Belveron East into a ghetto by essentially blocking the Juno Road exit. She said that neighborhood property owners deserve better in terms of traffic and safety.

Margarita Perry said that she has lived on Silverado Drive since 1998 and in that time, has witnessed many major near misses at the blind curve coming up the hill. She said that drainage and landslide issues are the primary concerns when considering the steep slope of Lots 1 and 2. She said that she has spent an exceptional amount of money on hydrologists over the last two years in an attempt to deal with drainage issues emanating from an eroded storm drain on her property and she asked who would deal with the drainage and other issues if the owner only builds the house on Lot 3. She said that landslides are well documented all through the hills of Silverado Drive and the hillside on the site will not be able to contain the runoff from this development. She strongly agreed that development access should be limited to Trestle Glen Boulevard and that homes should be restricted to the lower portion of the lot where there are fewer drainage issues.

James Renney read excerpts of comments provided by several of his neighbors. He noted that in contrast to Trestle Glen Boulevard, Silverado Drive is a narrow, blind-curve road that is often impassible for larger vehicles. He said that this situation has worsened as the neighborhood has grown and would only be compounded by traffic from new development. He said that he too is concerned with neighborhood safety and that access from Trestle Glen Boulevard was clearly the safer and preferred alternative.

Leal Buck invited the Commission to view the impacts indicated by the story poles for Lot 1 from her living room. She said that with an existing 40% grade behind her home, an additional 30 vertical feet of building would dominate her environment. She also cited drainage issues as a significant concern.

Linda Fong said that she and her neighbors feel that the proposed access through Silverado is inappropriate and fraught with logistical issues. She said that she had heard no opposition to access from Trestle Glen Boulevard and concurred with the Staff recommendation.

Alan White said that he could not support this project and instead supported the Staff recommendation. He said that while the question of legal access from Silverado Drive is something for the court to decide and cited the opinions of a title company regarding the easement. He said that the proposed home sizes were massive and not in conformance with the surrounding neighborhood as a whole, and as a result the project would not be fair to the community. He said that use of the proposed construction road was unclear and, if meant to reduce traffic, he asked why it would be removed following the completion of Lots 1 and 2. He felt that this development attempts to maximize revenue at the expense of neighboring homes and the Town itself. He believed that project design recommended by Staff would be advantageous to both the developer and the community.

Randy Greenberg said that the maximum density (four homes at this site) is not an entitlement and is almost never achieved on slopes over 40% or properties with significant ridgelines and visual prominence. She stated that neighborhood compatibility regarding house sizes is Town policy, not wishful thinking. She said that the proposed building envelopes are too large, which is inconsistent with the intent of envelopes to limit the areas of development on a lot. She said

that an important aspect of open space is its visual quality and that while some existing homes are situated on ridgelines, their development prior to the implementation of these policies does mean that the policies should be abandoned for present development. She stated that the maximum density is not feasible at this site, the undeveloped ridgeline should be protected, and the applicants should return with smaller building envelopes for each lot.

Marti Andrews felt that Mr. Giovara did not listen to the neighbors' concerns at the July 8th meeting. She said that the amount of grading alone would suggest that the proposed plan was not appropriate for this site. She voiced support for a project with one or two moderately sized homes with access from Trestle Glen Boulevard and asked that their placement and design respect neighbors and protect the ridgeline.

Becky Pringle said that the primary areas of concern were the access off Silverado Drive and, home size relative to the surrounding area. She said that the conceptual house designs provided by the applicant did not relate to what neighbors would see from their own property. She supported the Staff recommendation for fewer and smaller homes.

Mr. Hochstrasser stated that he listened carefully to all comments and it seemed clear that the Staff recommendation was the overriding preference. He asked the Commission to consider under what conditions it would approve a project for three homes, with two as proposed and the third reduced in size. He also asked if the applicant submitted a plan for two homes on estate-type lots what level of environmental review would be required.

Commissioner Tollini asked the applicant's engineer to review the proposed drainage plan. Mr. Maas said that the overall intent is to utilize current drainage patterns and described the conceptual drainage improvements for the project. He said that the intent would be to utilize best practices throughout the site, which could include cisterns for water collection and reuse as well as methods to detain the downward flow rate, and that these design characteristics have the potential to reduce runoff to less than current levels.

Commissioner Tollini requested an overview of the building process and timeline. Mr. Giovara confirmed that it was his intent to build the house on Lot 3 and to sell the remaining lots with building pads in place. Given the current economic climate, he said that it was difficult to accurately predict when any of the homes would be built.

Mr. Berger clarified that as part of the development plan, access roads to each site would be created but the building sites would be left in their natural state with no building pad. He noted that the required slide repair and drainage improvements would be made to each site in addition to the road improvements. He said that there was no specific timetable to construct the homes.

Chair Frymier closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Tollini said that she supports the idea of a three-lot development with Lots 1 and 2 brought onto the lower portion of the site. She said that she could possibly support a project with four smaller homes depending on their placement or a project with two larger estate-style homes. She suggested an additional option, which would relocate Lot 2 to Lot A, to be accessed from Silverado Drive or ideally from Trestle Glen Boulevard. She felt that this alignment would make the upper two sites less visibly prominent. Regarding traffic, she cautioned against the "raise the drawbridge" approach and said that she did not believe that adding access to two

homes from Silverado Drive would materially exacerbate the existing conditions on that street. However, she preferred to see access located further down the hill, as recommended by Staff as the Stewart Drive intersection with Tiburon Boulevard is tricky and Silverado Drive is somewhat narrow. She said that would like to see traffic improvements to the area, including a stop sign at the intersection, a bicycle lane, and sidewalk that would support the connectivity to Tiburon Boulevard. She found it reasonable to compare proposed home sizes to the Tiburon Court project and said that she had no issue with basement or subterranean area, and aboveground, a floor area of 4,300 square feet should be a guideline. She said that she could conceivably support a three-lot design with one slightly larger home that would be well placed, tastefully designed and dug into the hillside. Her overriding impression at present was the visual prominence of Lots 1 and 2 on the ridgeline. She stated that she agreed in general with the Staff recommendation.

Vice-Chair Corcoran concurred with much of Commissioner Tollini's comments and said that there seemed to be considerable consensus amongst neighbors. He said that a three-home design would be appropriate, with perhaps two homes located on Lot 3 and one on Lot 4. He said that the size of the homes on Tiburon Court would be a good benchmark, and that the size of the house proposed for Lot 3 in particular was excessive in this area. He believed that reducing the home sizes would solve a good portion of the problems associated with slope and grading. He felt there was much to be said for Mr. Hochstrasser's and Mr. Berger's reputation in working with difficult developments such as this and believed that they could work with the applicant to develop a design that meets everyone's needs. He thought that Juno Road was the appropriate access point to the site, with a wider opening there and perhaps a turnout. He felt that it was important to restrict the size of the secondary building envelopes, particularly on Lot 3, and to prepare a landscape plan that would reassure neighbors the homes would not have a looming visual effect. He said that he would like to see all development done closer to street level with Trestle Glen Boulevard and would prefer no development at all on the area of Lots 1 and 2.

Chair Frymier concurred with her fellow Commissioners and supported the Staff recommendation for three homes on Lots 3 and 4 combined and eliminating development on the area of Lots 1 and 2. She said that she was open to other alternative project designs, but generally believed the location of the site would be best served by three homes on the lower portion. She did not think that either one or two estate lots would be appropriate for this property. She voiced concerns regarding the temporary road and said that she would like a more definitive construction schedule and specific recommendations on restoration of the site following its removal.

ADJOURNMENT:

The Planning Commission adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

CATHY FRYMIER, CHAIR
TIBURON PLANNING COMMISSION

ATTEST:

DANIEL WATROUS, SECRETARY