

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

A P P E A R A N C E S:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Los Gatos Planning Commissioners: | Melanie Hanssen, Chair Jeffrey Barnett, Vice Chair Kylie Clark Kathryn Janoff Reza Tavana Emily Thomas |
| Town Manager: | Laurel Prevetti |
| Community Development Director: | Joel Paulson |
| Town Attorney: | Gabrielle Whelan |
| Transcribed by: | Vicki L. Blandin (619) 541-3405 |

1
2 P R O C E E D I N G S:

3
4 CHAIR HANSSEN: We can move on Item 3 on our
5 agenda, and Item 3 is review and recommendation of the
6 Draft Objective Standards to the Town Council.

7 Just as a reminder for the Commission, we'll have
8 a Staff Report, but we did see this item previously and
9 sent it back for revisions based on comments that we had
10 and comments from the public, so we're seeing the revised
11 draft. I will turn it over to Staff to give us a Staff
12 Report.

13 SEAN MULLIN: Thank you. Before you tonight is
14 the continued review of the Draft Objective Standards for
15 recommendation to the Town Council.

16 On June 22nd the Planning Commission reviewed the
17 first draft document and provided input to Staff on
18 recommended modifications. Following that meeting, Staff
19 and our consultant, M-Group, considered the direction from
20 the Planning Commission and prepared a revised draft
21 document.

22 The revised Draft Objective Standards continues
23 to be organized into two sections: Site Standards and
24 Building Design. The revised draft includes a new Key Terms
25

1 section providing definitions for terms used in the
2 document. Many of the Objective Standards have been
3 updated, several new standards have been added, and
4 diagrams throughout the document have also been updated.

5 In addition to the revised document, Staff
6 prepared a redline document showing all of the changes made
7 to the previous draft.

8 Staff also prepared a summary of the revisions
9 made and responses to comments received from the public and
10 the Planning Commission. These documents are included as
11 exhibits to your Staff Report this evening.

12 An Addendum and Desk Item have been distributed,
13 including input from Planning Commissioners and additional
14 public comment received after publishing of the Staff
15 Report.

16 Staff, along with our consultant, look forward to
17 the discussion this evening and are available to answer any
18 questions.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that. Just to
20 recap, we did get comments in both the Addendum and Desk
21 Item from Vice Chair Barnett, and we also got comments from
22 Ms. Quintana.

23 I'd like to ask if any Commissioners have
24 questions for Staff? Commissioner Clark.

1 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. I actually wanted
2 to set the stage by thanking Staff. I had my original
3 packet with all my notes alongside the new standards when I
4 was reviewing it, and it was incredible how well all of it
5 was reflected in the new standards, so thank you for all of
6 your hard work.

7 CHAIR HANSEN: Thank you for that. Any other
8 questions for Staff from Commissioners? Okay, I think we
9 should go ahead and take public comments, and then we can
10 have your Commission discussion about whether or not it's
11 good enough to recommend to go forward, so I'd like to see
12 if any members of the public would like to speak on the
13 Draft Objective Standards and you have up to three minutes.
14 If you'd like to speak, please raise your hand.

16 JENNIFER ARMER: Chair, it does look like we've
17 got at least a couple of people who would like to speak, so
18 we're going to start with Rob Moore. Go ahead, you have
19 three minutes.

20 ROB MOORE: Thank you. Good evening, Chair
21 Hansen and members of the Planning Commission. My name is
22 Rob Moore and I'm speaking purely in a personal capacity
23 tonight.

24 I'm here to voice my support for the Objective
25 Standards and thank both the Commission and Staff for

1 working so hard to put these together. I feel that these
2 Objective Standards will do a lot to streamline the
3 planning process while ensuring high-quality projects.

4 I've actually been talking with hundreds of folks
5 throughout the Town every week, and whenever they bring up
6 concerns about the building process I tell them that this
7 document is in the works. It may be hard to believe this,
8 but without fail this prospect of Objective Standards is
9 incredibly exciting to them, and these Objective Standards
10 are exciting to me as well.

11
12 Thank you all for your service to the Town and
13 have a great rest of your meeting.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that, Mr. Moore. Do
15 any Commissioners have questions for Mr. Moore? I don't see
16 any. All right, it looks like we have another hand up as
17 well.

18 JENNIFER ARMER: Yes, I will allow Bess Wiersema
19 to speak. Go ahead, you have up to three minutes.

20 BESS WIERSEMA: Good evening, Commissioners, my
21 name is Bess Wiersema, Studio 3 Design. I know several of
22 you from many years past, and some of you are new. Welcome
23 to the Commission, I guess. I know it's a big job.

24 I'm here tonight to represent your local
25 architects. We have reviewed the document and met on the

1 side to help try to figure out how to best support the Town
2 in streamlining the process for permitting, but also allow
3 for Design Guidelines and Objective Standards that actually
4 would provide a positive built environment for the Town.

5 This group of architects includes Gary Kolhsaat,
6 Louie Leu, Tom Sloan, Jay Plett, Bill Cross, Terry Martin,
7 Bob Flury, Jennifer Kretschmer, and Tony Jeans. We're all
8 people you have probably seen projects from before and can
9 recognize both Single-Family and Multi-Family around town.
10

11 We do have concerns about what we see in the
12 draft documents that are relatively significant and we
13 respectfully request that this be continued, and that you
14 lean on your local architects and designers to help define
15 details that are applicable to the Town and community that
16 we all love, work in, and service.

17 We feel that this document creates a rule of
18 thumb that can be used by everyone for essentially design-
19 by-numbers, like paint-by-numbers, which means you end up
20 with a picture that looks exactly like what the diagram
21 defines.

22 We're also very concerned that several of the
23 items within each of the categories are not relative to
24 actually a positive Town-built environment as well as
25

1 reflect local standards for other communities that are
2 similar to size and scale to ours.

3 We're concerned that the diagrams shown in this
4 become reality, because they are limiting in terms of form
5 and proportion. We respect the fact that you're trying to
6 streamline the process by objectifying subjective and
7 design standards, however, that's not the definition of
8 design, and I'm sure you all know that and that's part of
9 what you review constantly on all types of projects.

10 Trying to objectify guidelines and subjective
11 rules is ultimately the definition of something that I know
12 everyone wants to do, because we're trying to make it
13 easier for people to understand what to design to get
14 passed and make it easier for you to support or not support
15 a proposal, and we respectfully request that you respect
16 the fact that there are items that are already part of the
17 permit process that we step through from a design capacity.
18 We have peer reviews, Larry Cannon, etc., and we have to
19 take public comment on projects, just as you witnessed
20 before, and a robust conversation around them.

21 Many of the architectural features suggested only
22 reflect traditional detailing and architecture. How will
23 more modern elements be classified and who judges if a
24 proposed element meets this definition? The danger being
25

1 that only traditional architecture will meet these
2 qualifications, and that is not necessarily relevant for
3 Multi-Family.

4 According to Item 4.6b, 60% of building façade
5 facing a street has to have fenestration. In some instances
6 a contrast of solid versus open, i.e. fenestration...

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: Ms. Wiersema, Ms. Armer has her
8 hand up. I believe your three minutes are up.

9 BESS WIERSEMA: I guess my final thing would be
10 we are willing to be available to answer questions, and
11 have gone through and taken each section, categorized it,
12 and have some concerns or options we'd be willing to share.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that. I can ask if
14 any Commissioners have questions for you at this time?

15 Commissioner Clark.

16 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you so much for being
17 here. I know that you very well may not have an answer to
18 this question, but I think that creating Objective
19 Standards, as you pointed out, is really tricky, because
20 you want to be encouraging creativity while also ensuring
21 consistency in everything, so I was wondering if you know
22 of any examples of Objective Standards that you think do a
23 better job at addressing some of your concerns?
24
25

1 BESS WIERSEMA: Specific Objective Standards and
2 Multi-Family or Single-Family Residential?

3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, like any other cities,
4 or anything like that?

5 BESS WIERSEMA: Yes, I know Gary Kolhsaat has
6 done an analysis, and for instance in the standards that
7 you guys are trying to put individual recreation area
8 requirements are much larger than most typical condo and
9 apartments built locally. One hundred and twenty square
10 feet of outdoor area per unit is not consistent with our
11 neighboring townships and cities, and much larger. That's
12 just one example of many.

13
14 I think what we have a grave concern about as
15 architects and designers is that attached diagrams and
16 quantification based on a point system is really only going
17 to create a design-by-numbers, and who and how determines
18 what those points are and what qualifies as those?

19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett.

21 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Can you provide an estimate
22 of when the architects could provide some written input to
23 the Commission along the lines that you're talking about,
24 provide all that information for our consideration?
25

1 BESS WIERSEMA: Sure. I'm happy to go back to the
2 group. I was nominated to represent everyone tonight,
3 because people had different things with back to school,
4 but I'm happy to collectively put everyone on a group email
5 to Sean and Ryan and Jennifer and figure out what might
6 work for you guys as well as us from a timing perspective.

7 We lamented in our most recent get together that
8 the special meetings and research sessions that occur often
9 occur during the middle of the day with a lot of us not
10 being able to step away from clients and the work that we
11 do in order to accommodate that, so maybe we could also put
12 some time suggestions together to present something in a
13 capacity that is useful to you.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think you answered the
15 question, and so we would definitely encourage you to, as
16 quickly as possible, because this effort has been going on
17 for over a year now.

18 BESS WIERSEMA: No, we understand. We understand.
19 In the background, and just as a reminder, we are the ones
20 who actually have to deal with implementing this and
21 dealing with it alongside continuing to run our businesses
22 so that we can support the Town. We understand it's been
23 going on. We also have been dealing with a shifting and
24 changing Building Department and process and procedure for
25

1 everything, and we appreciate your consideration of
2 everything that we step through as local business owners as
3 well from a timing and efficiency standpoint.

4 We also have a concern that perhaps these Multi-
5 Family ones are going to trickle down into Single-Family
6 rules of thumb in terms of objectifying subjective
7 guidelines.

8 CHAIR HANSSEN: So now you're not answering my
9 question and you're (inaudible) into comments. I'm sorry,
10 but we do have to limit everyone to three minutes, so we
11 appreciate that, and we do encourage you to provide
12 additional comments in writing. Thank you.

14 Is there anyone else that would like to speak on
15 this item? It looks like there is one more hand up.

16 JENNIFER ARMER: Yes, we have interest from Lee
17 Quintana. All right, Lee, you should be able to speak.

18 LEE QUINTANA: I would encourage you to consider
19 meeting with the architects of the Town.

20 I like Objective Standards as a good way to speed
21 up processing of projects, but I think that standards have
22 to be easily understood by everybody who sees them, and I
23 would agree with Bess that the illustrations in these
24 Objective Standards do tend to make one think that all
25 these buildings are going to be absolutely symmetrical and

1 absolutely square and triangular and all face the street,
2 and that's going to be pretty damn boring.

3 But I do think we need Objective Standards, but
4 I'd also like Staff to explain what these particular
5 standards apply to and why they're being developed, because
6 it's my understanding they will only apply to very specific
7 projects, not every project, so I think that's one of the
8 failings of the introduction is it's really not clear what
9 they apply to.

10
11 CHAIR HANSSEN: Did you have any other additional
12 comments you wanted to make at this time?

13 LEE QUINTANA: No, at this time they're all in my
14 comments that I submitted.

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Yes, and we thank you as well, as
16 always, for submitting a lot of additional comments and
17 things for us to consider. I'd like to ask if any
18 Commissioners have questions for you. I don't see anyone
19 with their hands up, so thank you for that.

20 I will see if there's anyone else that would like
21 to speak in public comments.

22 JENNIFER ARMER: If anyone else would like to
23 speak on this item, please raise your hand. I'm not seeing
24 any hands raised, Chair.

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: So then I'm going to close public
2 comments on this item, and I will turn to the Commission to
3 have a discussion.

4 Our Town Attorney has a comment.

5 ATTORNEY WHELAN: If the Commission would like, I
6 can address the question from the public as to why the
7 Objective Design Standards are necessary. As the Commission
8 probably knows, it's a requirement of Senate Bill 35 and it
9 requires cities to establish Objective Design Standards for
10 Multi-Family Residential development.
11

12 The second part of the question was whom would
13 this apply to? It would apply to Multi-Family Residential
14 development. Thank you.

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that. Commissioner
16 Thomas.

17 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I had a quick follow up
18 question about that. When we're talking about Multi-Family
19 specifically, is that going to be anything larger than one
20 unit?

21 ATTORNEY WHELAN: The State Housing and Community
22 Development Department defines it as two or more. There's a
23 nuance in the Town's code, so we're defining it to mean
24 three or more.
25

1 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I wasn't sure if it was
2 three or four. So it is anything that is three or more, so
3 not a duplex, but a tri-plex? Okay, thank you.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: Are there any more questions
5 upfront?

6 So then in terms of Vice Chair Barnett, you
7 submitted a comment regarding the Palo Alto Objective
8 Standards and you had subparts 1, 2, and 3 that you wanted
9 to discuss. What are you hoping to do with the Objective
10 Standards regarding this? Add things from Palo Alto? Maybe
11 you could help us.
12

13 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I think that the Palo Alto
14 municipal code section has very good Objective Standards
15 that relate to the privacy of neighbors with respect to the
16 use of balconies in adjacent Multi-Family buildings, and
17 you saw what they were from the input I gave. It would be
18 my recommendation that we include that as part of our final
19 approval of the Objective Standards.

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: Because at this point in time we
21 don't have a specific section on privacy, although there
22 might be things in the standards that could address some
23 privacy. So your recommendation would be to include
24 language similar to that?
25

1 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: There is some language about
2 protecting privacy, but it's not specific in terms of the
3 view angle and the height of balcony enclosure.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: It looks like some Commissioners
5 have comments or questions. Commissioner Janoff, and then
6 Commissioner Thomas.

7 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Thank you. I was going to
8 point out that Vice Chair Barnett's recommendations on
9 balconies is a deep dive in a way that the other components
10 of the document don't do, and we talked the time before
11 about not wanting to go into that much detail.

12 I'm not against including some Objective
13 Standards regarding balconies, but I'm concerned about an
14 Objective Standard around privacy. Item 2 on our agenda
15 tonight was all about privacy. We don't have Objective
16 Standards regarding that, so I'm curious to hear from Staff
17 or even the Town Attorney, because privacy isn't just a
18 balcony issue. If we go to balcony, then why wouldn't we go
19 broader? And if we go broader, are we going to get into
20 trouble? I'm just curious what Staff would have to say
21 about privacy. And would those Objective Standards lead us
22 to Objective Standards for Residential projects and that
23 sort of thing?
24
25

1 SEAN MULLIN: Thank you. Specific to the
2 balconies issue, what Staff can offer here is we certainly
3 looked at the specific section from Palo Alto following the
4 direction of the Planning Commission at the last meeting.
5 We recognized the level of detail that their Objective
6 Standards, which are incorporated into their municipal
7 code, that they go to here, and also heard from the
8 Planning Commission to Commissioner Janoff's point that
9 that wasn't the level of detail that perhaps our document
10 wanted to go to.
11

12 The other piece here depends on how you read
13 things and on future development. You can inadvertently
14 restrict future development on neighboring properties by
15 having Objective Standards like this and providing an
16 example of a Multi-Family development going in on one
17 property next to a Residential property, but once that's
18 built if the Residential property wants to redevelop in the
19 future to a different residence, all of a sudden you can
20 create a conflict with privacy based on these Objective
21 Standards.
22

23 Given all that, and there were long discussions
24 with the consultant and Staff, we tried to simplify it down
25 to trying to preserve future development rights and to
create some privacy breaks regarding balconies.

1 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Thank you for that. To my
2 broader question of balconies, one component on privacy, as
3 we heard tonight, windows are another, for example. How
4 would we or could we, or does the Commission want to go to
5 privacy standards?

6 SEAN MULLIN: Windows could certainly be
7 regulated in a similar fashion to the way that Palo Alto is
8 approaching their balconies. Whether the Commission wants
9 to do that remains to be seen.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for bringing that up,
11 Commissioner Janoff. Let's see, Commissioner Thomas, and
12 then Commissioner Clark. Hold on, Ms. Armer has her hand
13 up.
14

15 JENNIFER ARMER: Sorry. I believe that Mr. Safty
16 had an additional thought to add to that discussion.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: I'm sorry, I completely missed
18 your hand. Go ahead.

19 RYAN SAFTY: It's okay; thank you. I was just
20 going to interject it does seem like there's a little bit
21 of confusion about whether or not we did include that. We
22 do have some privacy standards in 4.11b, but to echo what
23 Mr. Mullin said, it was a little bit of a struggle, so we
24 did bring that more as a request to the Commissioners to
25 see which direction you wanted to go, and the reason we

1 didn't decide to tackle windows is there are certain
2 requirements on size of windows for different rooms in a
3 house, so we didn't want to overly restrict the
4 development. But again, any comments we're happy to
5 receive, so please let us know.

6 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that clarification,
7 because it has been a long process starting from when we
8 had the Subcommittee last summer and fall and we went
9 through every Objective Standard in the Town, and so if
10 things aren't in there we probably discussed it and came up
11 with a reason why we might not want to do that.

12
13 Let's go on and hear what the other Commissioners
14 have to say. Commissioner Thomas, and then Commissioner
15 Clark.

16 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I hesitate to add much more
17 about privacy specifically because I do think that it has
18 the possibility of restricting design elements and/or some
19 types of projects, and as we know, it's hard to get these
20 big projects done as it is, and I think that particularly
21 in areas that we're looking to build a lot of these Multi-
22 Family we're hoping that the Town gets some redevelopment
23 in these areas. It doesn't seem like right now we really
24 need to be restricting things with regard to specifics
25 about windows or more specific things about balconies.

1 My other question for the Town Attorney is when
2 is our deadline really for getting these Objective
3 Standards approved by the Town Council according to SB 35?
4 Is there a point at which we get fined, we get in trouble,
5 or we get told these are our standards now?

6 ATTORNEY WHELAN: If I remember correctly, the
7 deadline was January of this past year, so I do think we're
8 past the deadline. In terms of penalties, I think it will
9 be difficult if we get an SB 35 planning application that
10 asks to see the Town's Objective Standards, because the
11 Town will need to demonstrate that a proposed project does
12 not comply with its Objective Standards.
13

14 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: So the longer we drag this
15 out, if we don't have Objective Standards then we really
16 risk projects having local control about project approval,
17 because if we don't have the standards and they go through
18 the SB 35 route and we have nothing to show them,
19 essentially the project gets approved?

20 ATTORNEY WHELAN: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thank you for clarifying
22 that.

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: I'll go to Commissioner Clark,
24 and then Commissioner Tavana.
25

1 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. I also am
2 hesitant to put further restrictions on privacy. Even in
3 the Staff Report one of their concerns is the requirement
4 for private recreation space while simultaneously requiring
5 more privacy, and so I think already it's becoming a
6 problem when we are focusing it in too many different
7 areas, and I do think once we get specific about balconies
8 and windows, then we have to get specific about other
9 things related to privacy, and then once we get specific
10 about privacy, do we have to go more specific with the rest
11 of our plan?
12

13 The Palo Alto standards are a lot more specific,
14 and I think that makes them more restrictive, which is not
15 the goal here. I think in general we understand that these
16 are supposed to allow development while making sure that
17 they fit with the Town, and so I think that it probably
18 isn't a good idea to get more specific about these sorts of
19 things.
20

21 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that, Commissioner
22 Clark. Commissioner Tavana.

23 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Thank you, Chair. I would
24 like to echo Commissioner Clark's statements about privacy.
25 I do think privacy is inherently subjective. What is
private to one person could be acceptable to the next, so

1 any language regarding this topic I do think should be
2 general.

3 Lastly, I think Bess made a number of compelling
4 comments and I'd like to see a comprehensive list of
5 suggestions. I don't know why it hasn't happened yet, but I
6 wouldn't feel comfortable making a recommendation to the
7 Town Council until I hear their complete comments.

8 CHAIR HANSSEN: Before I go to any other
9 Commissioners, I'm going to ask a question for Staff and
10 our consultant who is here. I thought that engaging with
11 architects was part of the process?

12 RYAN SAFTY: Feel free to chime in, Mr. Mullin,
13 if I miss anything, but throughout the process we do have
14 the list of architects on our email blast, so any time
15 there were community meetings or drafts of the document
16 available we were sending that out and strongly encouraging
17 input, and we do look forward to seeing these comments from
18 the architects.

19 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay, fair enough. Then I will go
20 to Commissioner Janoff, Commissioner Clark, and then
21 Commissioner Thomas.

22 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Thank you. Here's a
23 conundrum. We always want to hear from the experts, because
24 we aren't the experts compared to what we know of this
25

1 group of amazing, talented architects. Having said that, we
2 don't have the input and we don't have much time, or we're
3 out of time.

4 I'm usually in favor of pressing on with meeting
5 an objective, and we've had quite a bit of time to do that,
6 but on the other hand, I'm also in favor of hearing
7 directly from the architects, and we got just a little
8 tidbit of what they have to say, so here's my question for
9 Staff.

10
11 I could see myself going either way. I would feel
12 comfortable approving what we have tonight with some
13 changes that we are no doubt going to discuss with the
14 understanding that architects can come in and provide
15 comments and we can make an amendment; we can make a
16 change. So the question for Staff is is it more prudent to
17 get this thing through and then make changes, or vice-
18 versa?

19 If the architects are as concerned about some of
20 the language—and actually I heard more concern about the
21 visuals than the language—what do you recommend? Do you
22 recommend that we go forward with approving something so
23 there are some Objective Standards in place when an SB 35
24 project comes to the Town, or do you recommend we wait?
25

1 SEAN MULLIN: I can weigh in very briefly, and
2 then I would defer to the Town Attorney on whether it's
3 best to get something approved and then amend it later.

4 I think there is tremendous value in receiving
5 input from the local architect community, so much so that
6 that's why we've reached out to them and appreciate that
7 they've gotten together and will be providing us some
8 information. I suspect that with the Planning Commission's
9 direction once that information is understood that there
10 could be some significant changes to the document.

11
12 So there are the two paths that you're looking
13 at. It's not having something on the books for SB 35, or
14 putting something on the books that's going to be changed,
15 or could prospectively be changed pretty significantly in
16 the future.

17 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Personally, I wouldn't want
18 to put something out that's going to look pretty different
19 if we have an amendment, so if the architects can come
20 together and provide us feedback within the next week, then
21 I would be in favor of continuing this to the next Planning
22 Commission meeting so we have the benefit of that
23 information.

24 One thing I would say is the diagrams that we
25 have are a marked improvement over the first draft that we

1 looked at, so I think we're heading in the right direction,
2 but my question for Staff is would there be any downside to
3 including actual images like the three examples that you
4 gave at the end of the Staff Report? They were really a
5 great opportunity to say this is how the evaluation would
6 work, this is how the points would add up, and those are
7 real examples in Town, they look different, and they really
8 provide kind of a range of architectural styles.

9
10 So my question is like the Residential Design
11 Guidelines, for instance, when we have actual images of
12 properties within Town, can we do something similar so that
13 we assuage the concern of the architects that this stuff
14 really does look like brutalist architecture if you go that
15 direction? I appreciate that concern, and if we can put
16 more actual graphics in I think that would make a huge
17 difference in speaking to the range of architecture styles
18 that would be welcome in the Town.

19 SEAN MULLIN: We certainly could include images,
20 and that was a point that was discussed in great detail
21 with our consultant. The caution that we received from our
22 consultant, and that I personally agree with, is that
23 putting an image out there to demonstrate our façade
24 articulation could have the unintended consequence of
25 including something else that violates an objective

1 standard further down the document, and that's just
2 inherent with putting a real world picture in. Because of
3 that complication we chose to move the diagrams from what
4 you saw at the last meeting in June to what you see now,
5 which is closer to the Palo Alto document, which is sort of
6 being the case study that's being held up here, and try to
7 have a more controlled environment to articulate the point.

8 But if it is the will of the Planning Commission,
9 we could certainly start to work on sourcing images and
10 taking photos to demonstrate these points.

11 CHAIR HANSSEN: Let's see what others think.
12 Commissioner Clark, and then Commissioner Thomas.

13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. First I'll touch
14 on the photos. I agree that I had thought it would be good
15 to see some photos in there. I think that Mr. Mullin makes
16 a very good point. I have a couple of thoughts on it.

17 One is that I would hope there are projects out
18 there that don't break any of the rules, since
19 theoretically we're trying to bring these into existence,
20 so I think it would be worth looking, and if you are able
21 to find some and confirm that they fully conform, I do
22 think that those would be great to see in there. If that's
23 not possible, I think creating some more nuanced versions
24 just showing something and seeing which of the ones it
25

1 incorporates, how many points it gets, and showing that it
2 can be asymmetrical and look a little different and things
3 like that, at least having something of that sort in there
4 would be worth it.

5 I also am torn about what to do with the
6 situation with the architects. I think that their input is
7 really important and it sounds like they're going to be
8 putting something together, and I don't see a world in
9 which we receive that and just dismiss it, and I do think
10 that it sounded like there would be some significant
11 changes. It's really, really unfortunate that the timing
12 happened this way and that this wasn't brought to our
13 attention sooner, but I don't feel like it is worth having
14 a really deep conversation and making a lot of changes if
15 they might end up not feeling realistic to the people who
16 are going to be tasked with implementing them.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: Fair enough. Thank you for that.
19 Commissioner Thomas.

20 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I have multiple comments,
21 and first I would like to comment on the visuals.

22 I know that the visuals seem sterile, and I know
23 that I am not an architect, but I see that as more of an
24 opportunity. I really do feel like the visuals are a great
25 improvement and I do feel like in a lot of ways less is

1 more. I think that our Residential Design Guidelines have
2 photos of real houses, because residents read those. Not
3 that residents aren't going to be looking at these Draft
4 Objective Standards, but the reality is that these are for
5 Multi-Family units, these are going to be professionals
6 that are looking at these standards and interpreting them.
7 So for me, I would hope that, as an architect, if you
8 looked at this you would see this more as a blank slate
9 that you could work with rather than being restricted.
10

11 I totally appreciate that the architects have
12 concerns, and I do think that it's unfortunate that we're
13 hearing about them tonight at this meeting when we're so
14 far beyond the deadline, however, I would hope that we
15 could just get some very specific points about what exactly
16 is very restrictive and perhaps might result in too much of
17 a cookie cutter like development.

18 I see Ms. Armer has her hand up. Do you want to
19 say something before I keep going?

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: Yes, why don't you go ahead, Ms.
21 Armer, and then we'll let Commissioner Thomas finish.

22 JENNIFER ARMER: Sorry, Commissioner, I did not
23 intend to interrupt you. I just wanted to make sure that as
24 we do continue with this discussion and consideration as to
25 whether to try to make a recommendation tonight or continue

1 for further discussion in another time to remember that, as
2 with any recommendation from the Planning Commission, we
3 will continue to receive public comments through the
4 process as it goes to Town Council for their consideration,
5 so while we want the recommendation of the Planning
6 Commission to be as complete as possible, there still will
7 be that additional time after this discussion tonight.

8 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Perfect. Thank you for that
9 reminder, because that was one of my other comments that I
10 wanted to bring up, that I personally am interested to hear
11 what other Commissioners think about making minor
12 recommended changes, but overall hopefully getting to a
13 place tonight where we can forward this to the Town Council
14 for recommendation and really, really hope and encourage
15 that those architects get their public comments in over the
16 next week, and it will be if make the recommendation Town
17 Council will know that we feel very strongly that we should
18 be receiving feedback from the architects and taking that
19 into consideration.

21 I just want to know, do any of us feel
22 comfortable forwarding for approval but then telling Town
23 Council that we strongly encourage them to consider any
24 further comments from professionals that they receive?
25

1 My last comment and concern, and this is again
2 unfortunate that we're just hearing some of these concerns
3 tonight, but I did also hear that a concern is that these
4 Objective Standards might trickle down into Single-Family
5 standards and I wanted to confirm with Staff that that is
6 not the case, and that is not my interpretation of this
7 situation whatsoever.

8 RYAN SAFTY: I can take the first stab at this.
9 Thank you for the question. You are correct, these
10 Objective Standards, per direction from the state, are
11 applicable only to these qualifying projects defined as
12 Multi-Family and Mixed-Use. If, at a certain time in the
13 future, there is direction to do this for Single-Family I'm
14 assuming there will be an (inaudible) with Subcommittee and
15 community meetings to get input. Thank you.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that, and I would
18 also say that if you look at the direction of State law
19 that it's not at all focused on Single-Family, because what
20 they're trying to encourage is Multi-Family, because that's
21 the best way to get more housing. Go ahead, Commissioner
22 Thomas.

23 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I'm sorry, I just want to
24 add one more thing related to all that. I really think that
25 as a town, and I know with a lot of the work we're doing,

1 the more towns that get behind on putting up Objective
2 Standards for things and fall behind on all of this, it
3 just is encouraging Sacramento to come in and put more and
4 more restrictions on local control, and I know that having
5 local control and being able to hold local power and
6 decision making of what our Town character looks like is
7 something that's really important to our residents here in
8 town. I really don't want to be responsible for furthering
9 any hard restrictions coming from Sacramento that would
10 take away a lot of our local power, and that is a concern
11 of mine if we continue to continue this.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that. There are
14 several people with their hands up. Let's go to Vice Chair
15 Barnett, then Commissioner Clark, and then Commissioner
16 Janoff.

17 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Thank you, Chair. I share
18 the dismay of my fellow commissioners about the delay from
19 the professionals in the community to provide input during
20 our process, however, we've received a number of specific
21 topics from the speaker about specific comments about
22 design characteristics and Objective Standards that they
23 don't think are practical in real life, and so I would be
24 in favor of some delay. I wish we had a better sense of how
25 long it would realistically take the architects and

1 engineers to provide us that feedback, but I would
2 certainly be comfortable with one week.

3 As to the photos, I may be wrong, but my
4 recollection is that in the process of developing the
5 Objective Standards we did see some photographs that were
6 prepared by the consultant and I thought they were very
7 helpful, and were certainly helpful in the Residential
8 Design Guidelines, so I would encourage that change in the
9 Objective Standards. Thank you.

10
11 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you, Vice Chair.
12 Commissioner Clark, and then Commissioner Janoff.

13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. I want to address
14 two things.

15 First is on the images. As we've said, definitely
16 an upgrade from what we saw before, and I think from what
17 we've heard from the public tonight it sounds like when
18 members of the public do go look at the document it doesn't
19 really make them feel like the standards are going to allow
20 for variety, and it sounds like it's still kind of hard for
21 them to picture what they look like in real life.

22 Personally, when I've been talking to people about the
23 ministerial process and addressing their concerns I talk
24 about the Objective Standards, and so I do think that
25 people are going to go look at them to see what actually

1 happens when a development is going through this process
2 and I think it's important to consider what a lay person
3 might think when they see the document, so I think having
4 something a little more real world in there would be worth
5 it in my opinion.

6 Second, I agree with Vice Chair Barnett that my
7 preference would be to defer this to some degree. I think
8 it sounded like the architects have some serious concerns
9 and I think that the Planning Commission's role is to
10 really look closely at these standards before we're sending
11 them over the Town Council and that we're a trusted source,
12 and so I'd want to make sure that we've looked at them in a
13 similar form to how they'll be seen at the Council.
14

15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that. Commissioner
16 Janoff.

17 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Thank you. If we had any
18 assurance that what we were looking at in draft form was
19 90% close according to the architects, then maybe I'd be
20 comfortable forwarding it the Town Council and then letting
21 them do the remaining work, but I'm not generally in favor
22 of having Council do the Planning Commission's work, and so
23 I really think it's important, given Bess' urgency that we
24 heard, I think we should give them the opportunity to
25

1 provide input. We need to give them a very short deadline
2 so that they understand that we can't keep delaying this.

3 Staff can confirm whether we do or don't have SB
4 35 projects in the pipeline, and if we don't today we
5 probably won't in two weeks, and if we can get this draft
6 in better shape I think we owe it to Town Council to have
7 at least done the invite to the architects, give them a
8 hard deadline, get that input, and be prepared to discuss
9 it next week, so I'm in favor of continuing for that.

10 A couple other comments. When we talk about
11 images, I think it's important to keep the line drawings in
12 there. As Commissioner Thomas indicated, it doesn't tell
13 you much, it just says this is the basic, and that's a good
14 thing for creativity. But if we have a bunch of examples
15 with good architectural design that incorporate these kinds
16 of standards, even if the captions say this is showing good
17 articulation or whatever you want the person to be looking
18 at, it doesn't have to be in town. If it is, it's great,
19 but it could be within the wider community, or even further
20 afield if we want to have really quality architectural
21 images in the standards, so I think that's a really god
22 idea.
23

24 Last point, I think that the comments from Lee
25 Quinta on the introductory area are important. While I

1 thought her recommended changes for specifically talking
2 about government code and what it intended to cover were
3 good, I think if we frame the introduction specifically
4 siting SB 35 and what it covers or what its expectations
5 are, then we have a much stronger introduction about why
6 this is happening and why it's important, and if that
7 includes the government code, great, include that too. I
8 don't think there's any harm in making the introduction
9 nicely comprehensive.

10
11 But I would be in favor of a short continuance,
12 and again for Staff, if we've got SB 35 projects in the
13 pipeline, you'll let us know if we're really flirting with
14 any real possibility that we're going to have some problems
15 if we delay.

16 CHAIR HANSSEN: I'm going to ask Commissioner
17 Thomas to hold on and let Director Paulson speak, and then
18 I have something I wanted to say as well.

19 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, Chair. Just a couple of
20 comments.

21 I think what I also heard from Ms. Wiersema was
22 getting something quickly is probably not going to be
23 realistic, just so the Commission is prepared. I think at a
24 minimum we would have to continue it to the second meeting
25 in September, and so I think that hopefully will give Staff

1 time, because I think what would be important in that
2 exercise is for Staff to meet with the architect's group as
3 well so we can walk through stuff together rather than the
4 back and forth of email or attachment communication, so I
5 think that would be important.

6 We've talked about the illustrations and photos
7 throughout a number of different processes, and they're
8 always challenging, but I think we can definitely look into
9 that piece as well.

10 This is a little broader than just SB 35. There's
11 also SB 330 and the Housing Accountability Act; those all
12 have specific references to Objective Standards. We don't
13 have any projects currently for any of those. The couple of
14 Housing Accountability Act projects you did see were the
15 North Forty utilized that for the first phase, and then the
16 Mixed-Use projects on Union across from Safeway where they
17 had the Single-Family detached and they had a Mixed-Use
18 with three condos above, so they utilized that. They were
19 willing to make some changes. I think specifically from the
20 Union project there were some things that they were willing
21 to do, but they weren't willing to do all the things that
22 were more of a subjective nature.

23 I think it's important to keep that big picture
24 of what we're really talking about. We're definitely not
25

1 going down to Single-Family or duplexes. We've had that
2 conversation as well. If that were something that
3 ultimately the Town is interested in, that would be a
4 completely separate standalone document for those two
5 product types.

6 I just want to make sure that we have realistic
7 expectations both for the architects as well as the
8 Commission to really have a conversation with them, have
9 them pull their stuff together so the Commission can have
10 it as well. I think is going to be a little more than a
11 week; I'm not sure that's realistic. I don't want to speak
12 for the architects group, but I'm fairly confident they
13 would potentially agree.

14
15 CHAIR HANSSEN: Question for Staff. Ms. Wiersema
16 has had her hand up for a while, but I did close the public
17 hearing. Is it possible that I could reopen the public
18 comments and just get that input?

19 JENNIFER ARMER: But it should be for a very
20 specific question, kind of a yes or no type question. If
21 you were to open it, it should be very specific.

22 CHAIR HANSSEN: I'm just going to make a comment,
23 and then I'd like to hear back from Staff as well. I'm not
24 comfortable with sending this off to Town Council, but on
25 the other hand, I'm extremely concerned to hear that we are

1 this many months behind, so if we're going to continue it,
2 it needs to be a fairly short time frame.

3 Some of the comments I heard from Ms. Wiersema
4 were around creativity and design and all that stuff, and
5 these are supposed to be Objective Standards. I don't think
6 that there's anything that's unclear at all about
7 articulation and things like that, concepts that are
8 presented in this document, so any changes that get to be
9 made, it can't be we want to have freedom to do whatever we
10 want, it has to be Objective Standards and we need to give
11 enough detail so that anyone, including people that don't
12 have a lot of experience working with the Town, can look at
13 those things and say yes, I know how to incorporate those.

15 I guess I'm trying to figure out how we can
16 determine what is an appropriate amount of time, because
17 the other side of this is that if we are this far past
18 January, a few more weeks might not matter. So Staff, give
19 me some guidance here.

20 SEAN MULLIN: Thank you. I think looking at the
21 prospective comments from the architect community, as
22 stated before, I think there could be some significant
23 changes. We would be looking for the most specific comments
24 we could get on concerns on existing standards and any
25 recommendations to additional standards.

1 From a turnaround standpoint, from Staff's
2 perspective, we wouldn't be making any changes before we
3 came back to the Planning Commission; I don't believe we
4 would. I think we would collect their input and bring it to
5 the Planning Commission for discussion and could possibly
6 provide responses as we've done before. I can defer to Joel
7 and Jennifer on that as well.

8 CHAIR HANSSEN: Go ahead, Director Paulson.

9 JOEL PAULSON: Thank you, Mr. Mullin. I think,
10 again, another option is we continue it to the first
11 meeting in September, but if we don't have the input from
12 the architects because they haven't been able to pull that
13 together, then we could continue it again. I think that
14 would be a discussion for the Commission, whether or not
15 the Chair is interested in opening up the public hearing
16 for a very specific question such as do you think the
17 architect's group is going to be able to come up with their
18 recommendations by next Thursday so that we can get it into
19 the packet for the meeting on the 14th, or two weeks,
20 because I think the packet goes out, Ms. Armer, on the 9th?

21 JENNIFER ARMER: That's correct. We do have three
22 weeks until the next meeting.

23 CHAIR HANSSEN: I also heard an offer from Staff
24 to meet with these architects versus them having to send
25

1 comments back and forth to each other, which to me sounds
2 much more expedient, because you could take notes on what
3 sounds reasonable in a meeting versus sending things and
4 then having to review them and sending them back.

5 Before I do that, because Commissioner Thomas and
6 Commissioner Janoff have their hands up, I'm going to ask
7 them for their input, and then we'll go from there.
8 Commissioner Thomas, and then Commissioner Janoff.

9 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thank you, Chair. I want to
10 say that I also support Ms. Quintana's comments regarding
11 the introduction. I do think that it's important to be very
12 specific. It's called Purpose, and I think that being very
13 explicit and assuming that people don't know what the
14 purpose of this document is before they look at it is
15 important.
16

17 My comment regarding the photos would be I do
18 appreciate how straightforward and simple this is compared
19 to our Residential Design Guidelines. I think it's quick
20 and easy to look at and easy to interpret, and so I
21 appreciate Commissioner Clark's comments about how lay
22 people are going to look at this, so we should include some
23 examples, so I'm interested in hearing if people are
24 thinking those photos should be integrated throughout or
25

1 more like used as an index to reference examples at the
2 end? So that's one thing.

3 I have a couple of comments and questions
4 regarding just Objective Standards and SB 35.

5 I kind of got the impression from the architects'
6 comments tonight that Objective Standards in general are
7 restrictive with regard to design and architecture, and
8 like Director Paulson just said, not having Objective
9 Standards isn't an option at this point, we have to have
10 them, so I am curious if this group of architects, do we
11 know what kind of projects they're doing? Because I think
12 the projects that are going to come through SB 35 and
13 through this ministerial process, even though it's
14 classified and Town Code is two or more, I would assume
15 that it's going to be larger developments and
16 redevelopments.
17

18 So my question for Staff and/or the Town Attorney
19 is just because this SB 35 Objective Standards pathway
20 exists, can smaller projects still go through the typical
21 Town process in a different way and not have to deal with
22 this point system with regard to Objective Standards and
23 just meet our other Residential Design Guidelines that
24 exist, or is this now going to be the only pathway for
25 development of two or more?

1 ATTORNEY WHELAN: I can start. For SB 35 the
2 project has to invoke it in order to rely on it, however,
3 as the Director mentioned, there is also though the State
4 Housing Accountability Act, and that provides that cities
5 and towns can only deny multi-unit housing if they can
6 demonstrate that the project doesn't comply with an
7 objective standard, and so it's also a benefit to cities
8 and towns to have objective standards in place to consider
9 any Multi-Family housing project.
10

11 SEAN MULLIN: I would add that smaller projects,
12 to the Commissioner's question, the existing process would
13 remain and they could choose to not go through the
14 Objective Standards process, which is a streamlined
15 process, and choose for whatever reason to go through the
16 typical existing Architecture and Site process.

17 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: So basically if you want to
18 develop a lot right now and you want to build a smaller
19 like four-plex on that lot, and it fits with the design,
20 we've looked at all the neighborhood, it doesn't even look
21 like a four-plex, it looks like a normal Single-Family
22 home, there is a pathway to still do that through the
23 typical Architecture and Site application that exists right
24 now? I just want to confirm that.
25

 SEAN MULLIN: That is correct.

1 JENNIFER ARMER: Correct, those existing
2 processes will still be in place for all size projects.
3 It's really just when they're invoking this special
4 streamlined process that we would then require that they
5 comply with these Objective Standards.

6 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thank you. Then my
7 understanding, and please tell me if this is not a good
8 interpretation, is that SB 35 is mainly going to be used
9 for larger projects that are invested with large companies,
10 large developers, contractors, big architecture firms, all
11 of that most of the time in our situation.

12
13 With that, if that is the case, then I am more
14 comfortable just proceeding on, because we still have this
15 other pathway that exists if our local architects feel like
16 these Objective Standards are restrictive, but I am really
17 curious to hear what other Commissioners think about that.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

19 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: I wouldn't mind responding
20 to Commissioner Thomas, but I think we've got a question at
21 hand that really needs to be answered, and that is yes, I
22 agree, we should open the public meeting back up to ask the
23 architect, Bess Wiersema, since she's the named
24 representative for the architects, whether they can compile
25 the comments of the architects within the next two weeks?

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: That was my thinking as well. I
2 think a week is too fast, and if it meant that we couldn't
3 meet at the next meeting, then so be it. But do others feel
4 differently about that before I ask Ms. Wiersema?

5 Commissioner Clark.

6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. I'll have
7 something after that, but I also think that question needs
8 to be answered first.

9 I think it's important that the architects are
10 able to meet with Staff, so I also want to make sure that
11 that's incorporated into the timeline.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: I'm going to reopen the public
13 comments section and I'm to ask Ms. Wiersema a question.

14 JENNIFER ARMER: She should be able to speak once
15 you've asked the question.

16 CHAIR HANSSEN: So my question is this: Can you
17 either send comments or meet with Staff within the next two
18 weeks to help advance this Objective Standards project
19 forward, because we are in such a tight time frame?

20 BESS WIERSEMA: I will make sure that we meet
21 with Staff and we provide you with comments in two weeks,
22 100%. We care, we want to help, and we want to make sure
23 that this is a successful process for what Los Gatos wants
24 to see in terms of this built environment.
25

1 I would say that I want to make sure that my two-
2 week time definition has to do with we have two weeks as
3 community members, business owners, etc., to get our
4 information to Staff, and that does not mean that based on
5 their backup of when they have to submit to you for
6 documents for the hearing, it doesn't become a Desk Item,
7 which is always cumbersome for all of us. So I'm not sure
8 what that calendar timing is, and maybe you can help define
9 that.

10
11 CHAIR HANSSEN: I thought a week was not long
12 enough, so I'm saying two weeks, and I understand that that
13 doesn't include Staff turning this thing around necessarily
14 for our next meeting unless they could do that after
15 getting your input in two weeks, so I'm good with that. So
16 I'm going to close the comments, and I'll go back.

17 We have Ms. Armer, and then we have two
18 Commissioners.

19 JENNIFER ARMER: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to
20 clarify that tonight's meeting, we are August 24th, and two
21 weeks from today would be September 7th. The full Staff
22 Report packet for the next Planning Commission meeting goes
23 out two days later on the 9th, so if written comments were
24 received from the architects by the 7th, they would be in
25 your full packet and you would have the normal period of

1 time to take a look at them, though depending on when they
2 are received, Staff will have more or less time to provide
3 responses in writing in advance of the meeting.

4 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay. It sounds like we can work
5 with that, and then if something doesn't occur as we
6 expected, there certainly is always the possibility to
7 continue it to the second meeting in September, correct?

8 JENNIFER ARMER: Correct.

9 CHAIR HANSSEN: All right. So then our date
10 certain, if it's the will of the Commission to do this,
11 would be the first meeting in September.

12 JENNIFER ARMER: September 14th.

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you. Okay, Commissioner
14 Clark, and then Commissioner Janoff.

15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, just a couple of
16 things about the photos. I know that Commissioner Thomas
17 asked if we would want them throughout the document or as
18 an index at the end, and my personal thought would be to
19 have an image in the sections that are done through
20 scoring, and it can say that these are the parts that are
21 in it and this is the score it would receive, because I
22 feel like that's where they started to look the most
23 monotonous to some people and where it gets kind of
24 confusing to picture multiple being integrated.
25

1 Second, I see what you mean, Commissioner Thomas,
2 about them still having that other option of not going
3 through the ministerial process and still just using the
4 normal one, but I think that it's really important that
5 these Objective Standards are practical, and we really want
6 them to be utilized, so I think talking to the architects
7 is a really good way to make sure that they are as
8 practical as they can be, and I think we need to focus on
9 not relying on somebody possibly using the other process
10 and hoping that people will be able to take advantage of
11 the Objective Standards.
12

13 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that. Commissioner
14 Janoff.

15 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Just quickly, I think that
16 given where we are with the promise of the architects to
17 come back with us, then we should suspend our conversation
18 tonight. We can have longer to look over the comments from
19 the Desk Item so we can incorporate those. I feel like I
20 have no idea where the architects' changes might be, and so
21 going through the document I think doesn't make much sense
22 at this point.
23

24 I would agree that we're just really beating a
25 dead horse about the images, but images always speak more
strongly when they're related to what the comments are

1 talking about, so putting them at the end, where you've got
2 to leaf back and forth, whether you do it online or in a
3 hard copy, it doesn't make too much sense to me, so I'd
4 keep those images interwoven with the discussion so that
5 the examples are clear, or put them, as Commissioner Clark
6 suggested, with examples of how projects would be scored.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: I agree. I was not considering
8 going through the document, because I feel like there's
9 enough support from the Commission to continue the item,
10 although we haven't gone through that process yet.

11
12 I did want to weigh in about the pictures. While
13 understanding some of the complexities of doing pictures, I
14 think we need to have some pictures, especially—I think
15 Commissioner Clark was spot on—in that section where we're
16 scoring a project. If we can get permission from a project
17 to apply the score to them, it should be in the document,
18 not at the end, and make it easy for people to understand
19 how to implement the standards that we have, because the
20 whole idea is streamlining, so we need to make it easier
21 for people and not complicated.

22 I also wanted to comment on Commissioner Janoff's
23 thought that we did get some good comments from Ms.
24 Quintana in the Desk Item. I don't know that everyone had a
25 chance to totally digest them, but one of the comments that

1 was raised, and it was raised before, was about having all
2 of the Objective Standards from every other document
3 included in this document, and Staff did address that
4 comment in the packet and said that instead there would be
5 references to the other documents that it wasn't going to
6 be in scope to do that thorough of a document to pull in
7 everything from every other document and put it in this
8 document.

9
10 I will go to Vice Chair Barnett, and then back
11 Commissioner Janoff.

12 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I'm prepared to make a
13 motion to continue this hearing to September 14th with the
14 understanding that if we don't receive the architects'
15 input within two weeks that it will be denied or not
16 considered for a further hearing.

17 CHAIR HANSSEN: Okay. Do I have a second for
18 that? Commissioner Clark.

19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I second.

20 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that. Then
21 Commissioner Janoff, you had your hand up. Was it to make a
22 motion?

23 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: No, it was to make a
24 comment, but we can go ahead.
25

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: So we have a motion and a second
2 to continue. I did want to ask if any Commissioners would
3 like to make comments before I call the question? Obviously
4 we'll have another chance to see this when it comes back to
5 us. Commissioner Janoff.

6 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: All right, just quickly. In
7 the interest of transparency, I also wanted to underscore
8 the importance of actual images to residents. We're
9 entering into some uncharted territory with the number and
10 scale of the housing that we're looking for under the
11 Housing Element, and obviously this document is going to
12 relate to that type of development. Having residents
13 understand and see what this could look like, and be really
14 beautiful additions to our community, I think would be
15 really important.

16 CHAIR HANSSEN: Thank you for that. Commissioner
17 Thomas, and then Commissioner Tavana.

18 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I do just have a question
19 for Staff. Are we going to get another draft based on the
20 few comments that we gave to you tonight, or can we assume
21 the draft we got tonight is what we'll also see in three
22 weeks?
23

24 RYAN SAFTY: Based on the anticipation of all the
25 future comments we're going to get from the architects, it

1 would be my preference and Staff's preference to probably
2 not go through an amended document and try to collect all
3 the feedback at one time.

4 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes, I was going to say
5 that I would hope that you would do whatever is going to be
6 the most productive use of your time since you're going to
7 probably have to go back and edit it again after that next
8 meeting. Okay, thank you.

9 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

10 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: I have a question for the
11 maker of the motion. If we do not receive comments by two
12 weeks time, will it still be on the agenda for the meeting
13 of September 14th?

14 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: If I may respond, that was
15 certainly my intention, that we would go forward with any
16 remaining comments on the draft that we received with the
17 Staff Report.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: Are there any other questions or
19 comments before I call the question? Commissioner Janoff.

20 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Just to clarify what the
21 maker of the motion stated in response to Commissioner
22 Tavana, are you saying that if the architects come back and
23 say we need another week that we wouldn't give that
24
25

1 continuance? I'm not clear what you're going forward
2 without the input means.

3 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: If I may respond, we had
4 assurance that it absolutely could be provided within two
5 weeks. I should think that after all the delays and failure
6 to respond to the outreach that that's reasonable.

7 CHAIR HANSSEN: I also will weigh in. I heard
8 from Ms. Wiersema that 100% that two weeks was going to
9 work, so I think we should just proceed forward with that
10 assumption. Any other questions? Commissioner Tavana.

11 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: I know they said 100%, but
12 there is always a chance we do not receive comments, so I
13 just want to make sure in case we do not receive comments
14 it still is on the agenda for the next meeting regardless
15 of whether we do or do not receive comments.

16 JENNIFER ARMER: I just wanted to step in and
17 clarify. This would be a continuance to the meeting on the
18 14th regardless of whether any additional input was received
19 between now and then, and then the Commission would be
20 considering the item and making a recommendation, or
21 continuing it again if they so chose at that meeting. Since
22 we don't yet have a recommendation on this item to Town
23 Council, it wouldn't move forward without further
24 discussion.
25

1 CHAIR HANSSEN: I think that works, and so it's
2 going to be on the agenda one way or the other, because we
3 are recommending a continuance, and you all have seen in
4 the past where if something strange happens, then there's
5 always the possibility of continuing it again, but we
6 really do need to finish this.

7 I'm going to call the question, and I will start
8 with Commissioner Thomas.

9 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

10 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Tavana.

11 COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.

12 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Janoff.

13 COMMISSIONER JANOFF: Yes.

14 CHAIR HANSSEN: Commissioner Clark.

15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.

16 CHAIR HANSSEN: Vice Chair Barnett.

17 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

18 CHAIR HANSSEN: And I vote yes as well, so it
19 passes unanimously, and so there is no recommendation,
20 we're just continuing this to the meeting on the 14th.
21

22 (END)
23
24
25