

MINUTES OF MARCH 6, 2018

REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE  
CORTE MADERA TOWN COUNCIL  
AND THE BOARD OF SANITARY DISTRICT NO. 2,  
A SUBSIDIARY DISTRICT TO THE TOWN OF CORTE MADERA

Mayor Condon called the Regular Meetings to order at Town Hall Council Chambers, 300 Tamalpais Drive, Corte Madera, CA on March 6, 2018 at 6:00 p.m.

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Councilmembers Present: Mayor Condon, Vice Mayor Furst and Councilmembers Andrews and Ravasio

Councilmember Absent: Councilmember Bailey

Staff Present: Town Manager Todd Cusimano  
Town Attorney Teresa Stricker  
Director of Planning and Building Adam Wolff  
Associate Planner Doug Bush  
Town Clerk/Assistant to the Town Manager Rebecca Vaughn

**CLOSED SESSION (6:00 p.m.)**

The Town Council adjourned to Closed Session to discuss the following matters.

**CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR**

Closed Session Pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code Section 54957.6

Agency Negotiators: Todd Cusimano, Town Manager and Glen Berkheimer, IEDA  
Employee Organizations: Department Heads, Mid-Management Group and SEIU

**PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

Closed Session Pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code Section 54957 Title: Town Manager

**REGULAR MEETING (6:38 p.m.)**

**1. CALL TO ORDER, SALUTE TO THE FLAG, ROLL CALL**

**SALUTE TO THE FLAG** – Mayor Condon led in the Pledge of Allegiance

**1I. Report out of Closed Session from March 6, 2018 Regular Meeting**

Mayor Condon announced that there was no reportable action from tonight's Closed Session.

**1II. Report out of Closed Session From February 20, 2018 Regular Town Council Meeting Regarding the Following Items:**

**9.I CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR**

Closed Session Pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code Section 54956.8 Property:  
512 Tamalpais Drive, The Wash Tub Laundromat Property Negotiator:  
Michael Gralnick  
Agency Negotiator: Vesa Becam, Keegan & Coppin Company Under  
Negotiation: Price and Terms of Payment

**9.II CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR**

Closed Session Pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code Section 54956.8 Property:

152 Willow Avenue

Agency Negotiator: Todd Cusimano, Town Manager Under  
Negotiation: Price and Terms of Payment

### 9.III PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Closed Session Pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code Section 54957 Title: Town  
Manager

Mayor Condon announced that direction was given to staff from the February 20, 2018  
Closed Session.

## 2. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION

PHYLLIS METCALFE spoke of large, upcoming projects and she suggested the Town  
encouraged, if not insist, that local contractors and subcontractors be used. She cited  
instances where out of state contractors were brought to town to work on projects, some of  
which resulted in the need to redo some of the work.

## 3. PRESENTATIONS

- A. Coalition Connection: Update to Council Provided by Linda Henn, Project  
Coordinator, and Kelsey Fernandez, Assistant Coordinator  
(The Coalition Connection is a collaborative comprised of the Twin Cities  
Coalition for Healthy Youth and the Ross Valley Healthy Community  
Collaborative)

Linda Henn, Project Coordinator, Coalition Connection, provided a PowerPoint  
presentation and overview of how the Coalition was formed through partnerships and  
CMPA acting as the fiscal agent, as well as the Twin Cities Coalition for Healthy Youth and  
"Be the Influence".

She said the Ross Valley Healthy Community Collaborative was started 4 years ago and  
operated under a similar premise and they would partner on projects. The coalitions  
worked together on several projects, decided to join forces, applied for a federal grant and  
branded the joint coalition as the "Coalition Connection".

Their partnerships have been strong and they have been able to receive substantial funding  
through the County and federal government. Their relationship with CMPA involves ABC  
work and a School Resource Officer. Their relationship with Corte Madera is critical as they  
partner with the Recreation Center, the Age-Friendly Inter-Generational Center and the  
Town's schools. Councilmember Ravasio has been the co-chair over the last 7 year and  
continues to guide the Coalition.

Ms. Henn spoke about receipt of a DFC grant after applying three times, which has led to  
increased resources. Drug-Free Communities has assembled a team of 12 sectors which are  
vital in making their work sustainable and she described involvement by both youth and  
adults in Coalition activities and meetings.

She presented data for adult use across the country, stating Marin County has a 74%  
prevalence rate which compares with a California average of 56%. This indicates the  
county's adults like to drink. She then presented data for youth use showing more than a  
50% increase in alcohol use. Therefore, overall Marin County has a high use of alcohol, as  
well as marijuana use which follow the same trends.

With legalization of marijuana, the Coalition anticipates marijuana use to increase because  
the perception of its harm is extremely low. Access will be easier and the coalition's main  
objective is decreasing access and normalization of marijuana, and she and Ms. Fernandez  
plan to continue to make presentations to cities and towns in Marin.

DFC grant goals are to: 1) establish and strengthen collaboration among communities; and 2) reduce substance use among youth. The Coalition's goal is to decrease 11<sup>th</sup> grade alcohol and marijuana use by 5% by 2023 and to decrease prescription drug misuse by 10%. They work on individual strategies with education and skills as well as environmental strategies which focus on changing the environment in which youth operate, and involve youth in programs like "Be the Influence".

She spoke about Marin County's efforts in revising its social host ordinance which has been adopted by many cities, and said CMPA member cities are looking at changing the language to be uniform and to serve as a diversion for under-aged substance use.

Kelsey Fernandez, Assistant Coordinator, distributed copies of the Coalition's main initiatives called, "Raising the Bar", stating the program began last year in Ross Valley where they visited various boards of sports groups and organizations and showed them data from youth and adults in Marin. They adopted a program where they agree to serve only non-alcoholic beverages at teen parties and end of the year celebrations. This will be rolled out in other communities and other coalitions in Marin, along with a county-funded media campaign and a website.

She pointed to the data compiled about higher than normal percentages in Marin for alcohol and marijuana and then to data collected by students at Redwood High School which shows the correlation between students having seen their parents intoxicated and how that correlates with their 30 day use, which was found to be strong.

The Coalition holds two main parent education events every year. This past fall was a panel led "Marijuana is Legal, Now What?" The Coalition Connection also conducts post-information surveys to determine whether information was helpful, what can they do different, and whether it actually affects the way parents behave.

Parent support is another component they work on under the "Be the Influence" program which was started by Laurie Dubin. This year they are rolling it out to middle schools, mostly 6<sup>th</sup> through 10<sup>th</sup> grade because they have seen usage starting earlier with vaping and they want to work with parents of younger grades sooner.

Another excellent parent support program is "Redwood Parents Connect" which was co-founded by Vickie Vann and Deb Blum at Redwood High School. This program will be rolled out this year at Drake High School.

One of the largest additions they are making is involving youth more than they have in the past. Staff attended youth partnership training this January to identify strategies to bring youth more into the loop in terms of leading campaigns and being decision-makers. In February they had a well-known speaker regarding marijuana at three of the high schools, and they will undertake a peer-to-peer campaign and hold a school-wide campaign around marijuana education. Also, today was the first focus group at Drake High School and they will hold more focus groups at Redwood High School to try to understand perceptions, dig more into data identified in order to form their messaging in their work.

She said Don Carney is helping them develop the Youth Advisory Council within the Coalition Connection and several youth participated at their monthly meeting who informed their work from their perspective. They are also a partner with "Redwood Night Live" who held an event last month where 12 youth leaders met with freshman parents about how to communicate with teens, things to look for, etc.

She then discussed new programs: 1) a Physician Partnership Program. They are polling physicians to find out what screen tools they use and their protocols to see if there is a way to standardize them. The Coalition's third representative not present tonight is working on the Merchant Partnership Program and also works with Smoke-Free Marin and she briefly

described the Tobacco Retail License Law. She then discussed marketing, media and community outreach efforts, which has been significant.

She concluded by especially recognizing the efforts of CMPA who is their fiscal agent and she said they could not do this work without them. The Town of Corte Madera has been a huge supporter from the beginning and she acknowledged Bob Ravasio.

Mayor Condon and Councilmembers thanked Ms. Henn and Ms. Fernandez for their presentation and beneficial work with youth and parents, and she supported update of the Town's ordinance to make it uniform with the Larkspur and San Anselmo ordinance.

#### **4. CONSENT CALENDAR**

##### **4.I TOWN ITEMS**

- 4.I.i Authorize Introduction and/or Adoption Of Resolutions And Ordinances By Title Only.  
(Standard procedural action – no backup information provided)
- 4.I.ii Adopt Resolution No. 10/2018 (1) Endorsing The Corte Madera Women's Improvement Club, (2) Allowing Three Temporary Signs In The Public Right-Of-Way From April 23, 2018 To April 28, 2018 Publicizing The Corte Madera Women's Improvement Club "Giant Indoor Yard Sale"; And (3) Determining That The Project Is Exempt From The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant To CEQA Guidelines 15061(B)(3)  
(Report from Doug Bush, Associate Planner)
- 4.I.iii Supplemental Budget Appropriation To Increase Contribution To Central Marin Police Authority (CMPA) By \$66,176 To Resolve Deficits In The Insurance Fund  
(Report from Todd Cusimano, Town Manager)
- 4.I.iv Consider A Three-Year Lease Agreement For Workforce Housing For Use Of Town Owned Residence Located At 152 Willow Avenue; And Authorizing The Town Manager To Execute The Agreement  
(Report from Todd Cusimano, Town Manager)
- 4.I.v Accept Annual Statement Of Investment Policy  
(Report from Daria Carrillo, Director of Finance)
- 4.I.vi Receive And File Investment Transactions Monthly Report For January 2018  
(Report from Daria Carrillo, Director of Finance)
- 4.I.vii Approval Of Warrants And Payroll For The Period 2/01/18 Through 2/28/18: Warrant Check Numbers 218003 Through 218216; Payroll Check Numbers 5720 Through 5746; Payroll Direct Deposit Numbers 34010 Through 34195; Payroll Wire Transfer Numbers 2278 Through 2289 And Wire Transfer Of 2/01/18.  
(Report from Daria Carrillo, Director of Finance)
- 4.I.viii Approval Of Minutes Of February 20, 2018 Town Council Meeting

MOTION: Moved by Furst, seconded by Ravasio, and approved by the following vote: 4-0-1 (Ayes: Andrews, Furst, Ravasio and Condon; Noes: None; Absent: Bailey).

To approve Town Consent Calendar Items 4.I.i, ii, iii, iv, v, vi, vii and viii.

##### **4.II SANITARY DISTRICT ITEMS: None**

## 5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

### 5.1 Public Hearing On Appeal Application PL-2018-0021, An Appeal Of Design Review Application PL-2017-0045 For A New 4,360 Square Foot, Two Level, Single Family Dwelling At 8 Westward Drive (Report from Doug Bush, Associate Planner)

Mayor Condon asked for disclosures and any ex-parte communications from Councilmembers.

Councilmember Furst disclosed she visited the site and saw 8 Westward Drive from the street, visited 10 Westward's backyard and viewed the story poles.

Councilmember Andrews disclosed he visited the site last weekend, spoke with the owner of 10 Westwood Drive and viewed the site from his deck and backyard. He also walked around the yard of 8 Westwood.

Councilmember Ravasio disclosed that he walked the site at 8 Westward Drive and visited 10 Westward Drive and spoke with the owner via telephone. With permission, he accessed the backyard and patio and was able to view the story poles at 8 Westward Drive.

Mayor Condon disclosed she observed the site at 8 Westward Drive and visited the site at 10 Westward Drive, specifically the backyard and back patio.

Associate Planner Doug Bush gave the staff report, displayed an aerial map and pointed to 8 Westward Drive which is located off of Paradise Drive. He described site characteristics of homes along that street which sit on terraced building pads, noting that most are oriented towards the street with windows facing the street and many built in the early 1960's.

The applicants presented an application to demolish the majority of the existing home and construct a new residence in its place in March 2017. There were four Planning Commission meetings held before the appeal was received on the project.

The appellant's property is located at 10 Westward Drive which is southeast and sits above the subject property. He displayed an outline of the property boundaries and dashed lines representing setbacks on the sides which are 6 feet, 20 feet on the front and 25 feet from the rear which creates a potentially buildable area in the center.

He then pointed to the existing footprint of the two-story house as shown on the display and said the proposed structure would largely mimic this while also expanding into the rear yard, with the blue line representing the footprint of the upper floor. He presented the existing elevations as seen today and said the home is two stories, largely original with a sun room at the rear which was added at a later date, and it is almost 25 feet tall.

He then displayed the proposed structure which was approved unanimously by the Planning Commission in February 2018. The applicants are using significant articulation on multiple elevations, using a low sloped roof peak to limit its height, stepping down with the slope and in compliance with polices of the General Plan which call for the massing of the home to mimic the topography of the slope.

Mr. Bush then displayed a rendering first submitted to the Town showing the original design which raised issues for staff and the Planning Commission relating to massing and overall height as it related to the down slope property, and he said the applicant returned with revisions.

There were also issues at that time concerning findings relating to view impacts and impacts on neighboring properties. Through several design iterations before the Planning

Commission, significant changes were made with the home's overall appearance and design, as well as changes to minimize impacts to neighboring properties.

He presented the current rendering of the proposed design and said a significant amount of massing was eliminated on the right side which previously was extended instead as a single, lower floor element into the rear yard where it would not create the previous looming appearance over the lower neighbor. The applicant has used asymmetrical window placement and a very modern design, as well as a significant landscape plan included in the plan sets provided in the packet.

Mr. Bush pointed to the lower floor which he said extends into the rear yard further than from the existing footprint, and it was the applicant's desire to maintain a particular amount of floor space while doing so in a way that would not create problems with massing and impacts to adjacent properties. Even as this floor space extends, it meets all rear yard setbacks, floor area, height, and all standards of the zoning ordinance.

The view issues relate to design review finding 3; impacts to adjacent neighbors. He pointed to the story poles in a prior iteration showing blockage of the bay view. This view is not one that can be seen from the majority of the yard and is seen when standing on the raised deck at 10 Westward.

He then presented a view from January 2018 and said the furthest story pole was moved eastward and with direction of the Planning Commission to relocate it to the point of the chimney, and presented a picture of a contractor standing by the story pole to represent that line of sight. He noted that the story pole furthest to the west was not moved but kept there for reference. The actual wall is moved to where he pointed to with the arrow, and this was what Councilmembers may have seen on their site visit.

In conclusion, Mr. Bush said the Planning Commission approved this project unanimously in February after four hearings. All findings have been made and attached to the resolution for approval. There are several options for the Council, which include: 1) denying the appeal which would approve the project; 2) modify the Planning Commission's action by changing conditions of approval and associated findings; or 3) approving the appeal which would overturn the Commission's decision; or 4) to remand the action back to the Planning Commission with direction for further review.

Councilmember Andrews questioned what happened with the retaining walls.

Mr. Bush said they were removed without permits. He explained that the Building Department notified the applicants who then applied for building permits to install retaining walls and those permits were issued. The applicants have moved forward with remedying that issue and they are in the process of construction.

Councilmember Andrews asked for the timeline of their removal and drilling of holes to reinstall and Mr. Bush said he could not confirm this timing.

Mayor Condon asked if there was a geology report for the hill.

Mr. Bush clarified that there is specific information which must be provided before a building permit can be issued. He said all of these standards were met and permits were issued which includes significant engineering for the retaining wall on the back slope.

Mayor Condon called upon the appellant and disclosed that she was acquainted with the applicant as they both serve on the Marin LAFCO. She believed she could make a fair decision and did not have any financial conflict of interest in the matter.

Tom Sherwood, Appellant, clarified that the retaining walls occurred prior to the initial application being submitted in July/August 2017 and the reinstallation of the retaining

walls occurred roughly during the time of the Planning Commission's approval of the project.

As background, Mr. Sherwood said he and his wife have lived at their home at 10 Westward since 1984, have enjoyed their views from the rear of the property and have done a fair amount of work to their backyard. There are two issues that are the crux of the appeal. One is more of a public policy issue to their particular situation which is the General Plan's requirement that the project be in scale and harmonious with existing and future development adjacent to the site in the vicinity, and this is not the case here.

He referred to a Google Map's aerial view showing that the view to the Bay in the upper right hand corner, with an angled view off to the Bay. The houses are off-set to articulate the view for each of the houses to maximize what each house or lot can see in terms of the Bay and distant hills.

The houses in the neighborhood are two stories, but are very small two stories and uniformly exist over a fairly small portion of the property, usually over a garage and sometimes over the main living area. He then pointed to another view showing other homes in the neighborhood that contain the same pattern.

The existing condition of the house is 2,700 square feet with a lot coverage ratio of .17 and the windows have been in existence for a long time to provide views to the Bay for the prior owner of the house. He compared homes in the neighborhood which show a FAR of .2 with 2,050 square feet, a remodeled house at 2 Westward which was asked to be redesigned to pull it back and to provide an uninterrupted view from the windows at 6 Westward Drive, another home estimated at 2,500 square feet across the street from the subject property, another estimated at 2,000 square feet, and his house which is 2,610 square feet with an FAR of .22 which includes a substantial remodel they made a few years ago by expanding the kitchen by 5 feet, for a total of 50 additional square footage.

He then presented a comparison table of lot sizes and dwelling square footages and said the difference between the approved project and the existing square footages of 8 Westward Drive is more than double the square footage. Most homes are in the 75% to 80% range, so he thought this project is a very large house.

The second finding that intersects with the first and is a private issue is that "the project will not significantly and adversely affect the views, sunlight and privacy of nearby residences". He did not know how one could make this finding. He noted that the Council was viewing the original proposal submitted without any attempt to work with him and his wife and what the home would have looked like if it were approved. Appropriately, the Commission rejected it for being far out of balance. As noted before, the Council will see the final approval and he said the red line is from the deck which will block his views and a view standing on the property line.

He then pointed to the approximate location of the wall of the old house which shows how much forward into the backyard the second story has been pushed, and it is that room and the adjacent room which create the view blockage. He further explained that it was not the playroom on the far side but the outside wall of the house of the larger bedroom.

Mr. Sherwood summarized by saying he appreciates the efforts of the Planning Commission to try and preserve their views. However, part of the problem was that the original application was so overwhelming with the developer making small concessions along the way so it seemed like there were compromises being made but in relation to a project that should have never been presented. Therefore, the question is what the balance is between the development of this house and the impact on the neighboring houses.

He added that if CEQA were involved there are options here to mitigate the impact to an insignificant level and impact, but the project is categorically exempt, and he submitted

that this should be the same standard when considering these types of issues. If there was a feasible way for the applicant to avoid impacting valuable views of a neighbor, he thought they should be required to do that.

He thought there were ways here either by reducing the size of the house slightly, reducing the 100 square foot walk-in closet of the master bedroom and thereby pulling back the second story 5 feet. He explained that the applicant also has more room to build on the first floor, and noted that the Council recently amended the Town's ordinances to allow a greater lot coverage ratio to avoid these very conflicts. He felt that another 400 square feet could be built on the first level that would not exceed the lot coverage ratio requirements and would achieve the size of house desired by the applicant.

Mayor Condon called upon the applicant.

Chris Skelton, representing the applicant, presented the first rendering of the design, although he said there were many design iterations prior to this one. He then presented the final approved design which was unanimously approved by the Planning Commission.

As background, there have been numerous revisions to the design. They looked at alternative site strategies, conducted extensive neighborhood research and outreach with the architect and members of the team, met with adjacent neighbors and worked to revise the design to address concerns raised. There are numerous neighbor support letters in the packet and those published on social media which were not included in the packet, and said they worked with staff on redesigning and going through the planning process.

The application was originally submitted in April 2017 and, at that time, staff determined it was incomplete for technical and procedural issues. After working through those, there was an informal incompleteness comment period from staff indicating they did not believe they could make findings, although the application was technically complete. There was a design revision from that time and perhaps some of the confusion of the story poles stemmed from that.

He said throughout the process the owner and design team wrestled with various issues which include views, privacy, massing and trying to accomplish a dream home. Through the process, staff recommended approval and the Commission approved the project.

He then displayed the pattern of development in the neighborhood showing that most homes are focused predominantly close to the street and most are oriented towards the street. There are homes that have improvements that take advantage of views and on the western side of the street most homes do not. After four hearings, he believes they have done everything they could to work with the neighbor to address view concerns in revising the application.

He discussed massing and site strategies which would have shifted the house further to the south and elongated it which created significant issues. The other was to shift it closer to the street frontage. He pointed to a berm going up to the property and said most homes are terraced and notched into the hillside and they thought bringing it closer to the street would artificially exacerbate the perceived height, bulk and mass.

Mr. Skelton then presented the south elevation from the September hearing which identifies the substantial design iteration accomplished by working with staff in July/August which shifted the house to the east by 4 feet to mitigate and minimize the rear yard view concerns from the appellant. They also eliminated a master bedroom deck and pointed to the dashed out line of how the height of the home was reduced by 2 ½ feet.

Also, the south elevation was somewhat naked due to their efforts in trying to preserve privacy by not putting windows on that southern elevation. He presented the upper floor from September 2017 and said this hearing was pivotal for the applicant because the

majority of the Commission said it was not about a floor area number. Floor area is a metric for evaluating bulk and mass, but someone can have a small house that reads quite large and ominous and a large house that reads much smaller and does not reflect the overall floor area.

The Planning Commission told him that they had too much floor area on the second floor and he described the overall linear footage and presented the final approved upper floor bulk and mass, which is far less significant, or about a 20% overall reduction.

Mr. Skelton then presented photographs relating to Mr. Sherwood's point about the views, stating they had struggled with views. The photographs were taken in consultation with Mr. Sherwood and staff present and they show how a view can be significantly altered if they are 1 foot to the right, 1 foot to the left, 2 feet back or 2 feet forward. The Council will see the white story pole next to the chimney which was used by the Planning Commission towards their approval, and he said the marker shifts depending on where one is standing on the deck. Pinning down exactly where a view corridor or angle is located is difficult, especially here because of the use of that space which is an artificially raised deck, the focus of which is to the back of the house. Therefore, how the view is exercised or enjoyed is a difficult exercise and this was the goal of the January photographs.

Ultimately, the Planning Commission said if they pivot off of the white pole that marks the edge of the chimney, they could make the findings that it is not a significant and adverse view impact. They went out with Mr. Sherwood and asked him if it looked right and he was okay. They left the northwest story pole in place for future reference, but this is no longer accurate in displaying the bulk and mass of the structure which has been recessed back to where the contractor was shown standing, which he pointed to. He explained that from that point they found the pivot point and lined it up to the next pole up which forms a line up. From there, the architect redesigned by shifting in and out to stay on that view angle.

Mayor Condon asked for questions of the applicant or appellant and there were none. She then opened the public comment period.

STEVE TSUCHIYAMA said he and his wife live on the corner of Westward Drive and Balculutha Drive and referred to the significant number of social media comments. He said they moved to their home a couple of years ago and their views were not impacted. They were currently going through a remodel now which he noted was difficult, but it was a thorough process and they believe it was fair. Their neighbors objected as well but were able to work things out with them.

He said he has met the applicants who are members of the community and he believes that whether or not they intend to live in the home it will still be a fine addition to the neighborhood. He voiced his support of the project as approved and agreed that the original plans had been too bulky.

#### *Rebuttal – Applicant*

Mr. Skelton said he wanted to explain the design thought process between January and February's approval, identifying the pivot point and redesigning around that. Even though they tried to solicit what was the marking in December, they could not quite find out an objective standard for evaluating views which are subjective and difficult to ascertain. But, but after the Commission indicated where they thought the line should be, Mr. Sherwood said he was fine with it. Therefore, they went out through the exercise again to go out to Mr. Sherwood's house, hire the contractor and go through the story poles, go through design revisions and then return to the Commission in February only to find on the dais a letter of objection and, ultimately this appeal, which he thought was unfortunate.

He said finding 3 that the project will not significantly and adversely affect views, sunlight or privacy of any nearby residence has been belabored. The staff report has consistently

identified that the view is utilized and perceived from an artificially raised deck. He explained there is a solid wood fence in-between the properties and it is partially obstructed by both near and distant trees and by utility lines. Many things go into a view and ultimately the Commission decided that the view was not impacted as a result of the design. He then introduced the owner to speak with the remaining time.

Mo Rezaian, managing member of the LLC and owner of 8 Westward Drive, said he began the application process almost one year ago and unfortunately the process had become anything but a dream. Like many who move to Marin from the Bay area he and his wife were attracted to the access to the outdoors, sense of community and the outstanding schools. The driving force to move to Corte Madera was the lifestyle and education of his children.

Early on, Mr. Sherwood stated, "Why don't you people find another neighborhood to build in." He took offense to this and said he is Middle Eastern and his wife is partially black. His family is important and he did not want to believe there were any racial issues at play here but said it was difficult not to question the motivation of the appeal based on such statements and the efforts they have gone through to accommodate Mr. Sherwood.

Through this process his wife has questioned whether it was healthy for their family to move next door to Mr. Sherwood. They have had many discussions following the Commission meeting to re-evaluate the situation and thankfully there were many other neighbors who have supported them. Just like one home does not define a community, one person should not influence someone to build their dream home.

He said Mr. Sherwood had refused to identify the LLC or himself by name and expected he wanted to depersonalize his application by constantly referring to him as a "developer", which is false. He works in real estate although he was not sure what his profession has to do with the approvability of this home design. He has two children and thought his family dynamics should not factor into approvability of the application. His family was more excited to join the community before the passive aggressive, adverse process Mr. Sherwood had developed over the past few months.

Lastly, he has tried to work with Mr. Sherwood and many neighbors to express interest in the design review process. In September, the view of the Bay from Mr. Sherwood's raised deck in the rear corner of his yard has been the issue and he has worked diligently through three public hearings since September to resolve the perceived view impacts.

#### *Rebuttal – Appellant*

Mr. Sherwood said he was beyond offended by the owner's statements. His comments had nothing to do with his family. He met the owner's wife and had a nice conversation early on in the process, and his comment was that they should not come into a neighborhood and overbuild as a neighbor; that if they want to build a house of this size they should find a more appropriate location to build the house and not that he was somehow bothered by his ethnicity. He commented that his future daughter-in-law is Indian and he thought the comments were absurd.

He also said numerous statements have been made through the process about how they have tried to work with him. He said he had not met the owner before and he had never been at any meetings. His meetings have been limited to the project supervisor, Tyler and the builder, Hannabal and counselor. At no time had they solicited his input. At no time had they asked him what it would take to compromise or reach an acceptable design. It has always been the case where, 'here is our design and we hope you like it because this is what we are going to go forward with'. He said he could not state strongly enough how this differs from the experience where Steve Tsuchiyama had worked with his neighbors to come up with a compromise, as there has been no working with him.

Early on when he met Mr. Bush for the first time, he mentioned one approach that could be taken was an informal meeting with the applicant to try to work out design issues. He indicated he would be happy to participate in that, did not want confrontation; that he was the type of person who made compromises as evidenced by the stupid statement he made after the hearing was held at the last Planning Commission meeting he had attended, and the applicant never took that up.

The pictures he showed early on with blockage of the view were the initial application, and this is from the staff report and not some watered-down version. There may have been something where they had moved a wall or a garage or something else, but he likened it to the "Winchester Mystery House" all along.

Mr. Sherwood also said he did not believe staff ever recommended approval of this project, thought they had been neutral the entire time and indicated simply what the options were. The applicant has not done everything they could to mitigate the view impacts. They have done everything they could to preserve a house of this scale. They also bought this house with the intention of developing it. They knew the site constraints and frankly, they were trying to fit a square peg in a round hole.

Regarding the comment about schools, when he spoke to the owner's wife at the hearing she was under the impression the schools they loved were the Larkspur Corte Madera School District across the way, despite the fact they are actually in the Reed Union School District. He also explained to her the inter-district transfer process which he would not have done if he were a racist. He thought these comments were offensive beyond belief and lastly thanked the Planning Commission and staff for their efforts and work with due process.

Councilmember Andrews referred to a residence currently going through the approval process and asked how much larger would that be. He said according to the Assessor records, the total square feet of that lot states "Living space at 2055 square feet, garage at 420 square feet, a deck of 20 square feet, for a total of 2499 square feet." He asked how much larger that home would be once remodeled.

Planning Director Adam Wolff said staff did not currently have this information.

Mayor Condon personally urged the Planning Department to allow the Planning Commission to develop design guidelines. She said she had looked through some old documents but unfortunately could not find the design guidelines which were in force when she was on the Planning Commission. What addresses this particular case is there had been guidelines developed for what was the primary view and it was directed at water views, Mt. Tam views and what was the primary view and secondary view. She recalled that the primary views were the living room, dining room and master bedroom and secondary views were usually from the outside or from the patio. The less important views went down to the smaller bedrooms.

She said the Commission had come up with a percentage where if someone had a view corridor within a certain percentage it could be taken. But, it was put on record that if someone came back for a remodel it was always referred to so there would not be creep. Therefore, she urged the Planning Department to facilitate the development and adoption of design guidelines so the Council does not continually get appeals.

Vice Mayor Furst began with statements she has previously used in the case of appeals regarding views, stating the neighborhoods are suburban in character. They are not rural and live close to neighbors, see homes right out their windows when looking and neighbors and should not have an expectation that they will never be impacted at all by neighbors. Some people read the Town's ordinances and policies in such a way that they are led to believe they have a right to no impact, but this is not what their design guidelines state.

In looking at page 4 of the Planning Commission resolution regarding the view impacts on 10 Westward Drive, and recited, "Views from 10 Westward are primarily limited to the patio area in the rear yard with some limited views from the upper floor, including the small bathroom window and windows in the upper living room area facing north/northeast. The widest views of the marsh can be seen from the patio in the rear yard looking north/northeast. These views can be seen when standing on the patio but not when seated and cannot be readily seen from elsewhere in the rear yard. The view from the patio is only visible if a number of specific conditions are met (viewer located on the raised patio/deck must be standing, the view would only be partially blocked, and the views from the living room window would be largely unaffected."

She would not say there would be zero impact to the views from 10 Westward, especially while standing on the raised back patio deck; however, she cannot find they would be significant impacts nor does she think that it is an impact in any other way on that house in any significant way. The bulk of the home's footprint will be on the first floor which, due to the topography, is going to be much lower than the property at 10 Westward. It will also be sited mostly on the south so it appears to have limited impact on 2 Westward. Therefore, she would like to hear comments of fellow Councilmembers, but she thinks the Planning Commission was correct in their opinion that the view impact is neither significant nor adverse and would lean towards denying the appeal.

Councilmember Ravasio said he would largely agree with Vice Mayor Furst's comments. The Planning Commission appeals are the toughest thing the Council opines on and it seems like issues keep returning regarding views. She echoed Mayor Condon's request and would specifically request researching ordinances from Belvedere, Sausalito and Tiburon who have dealt with this view issue for years and are much further along. He thinks this is the third appeal regarding views, and he believes there is a lack of clarity in the Town's ordinance. He thinks the Town should provide the Planning Commission and the public with tools for proper evaluation on how the view issues should work.

He would agree there is an impact on the view but it is not a primary view. The design on the house is very thoughtful. It is attractive and has been stepped down the hill so it is clearly taking into account 10 Westward as well so it is not impacting that view. There is an impact from the patio if someone stands on it in the rear yard, but again, it is a small part of the property and the primary orientation of 10 Westward is such that from what he could see, the overall impact is not large. This is the primary issue and again, he thinks it is important to develop a view ordinance for everyone's benefit. Therefore, he would be able to make the findings and deny the appeal.

Councilmember Andrews said to him the issue is slightly different. He thinks there is too much house for too small a lot and when looking at neighboring houses, the proposed new house is materially larger than all other houses and in fact, the next largest house is 4,185 square feet of house on a 14,595 square foot lot which is much larger than the applicant's lot. He thinks if they reduce the house which is approximately 3,400 square feet it would be in keeping with the size of neighboring houses relative to their lots. Otherwise, the next house approved in the neighborhood may increase to 4,500 square feet and there will be a gradual creep and shift of what is an acceptable house and a neighborhood of "McMansions". He was not sure from a policy standpoint that this is where they want the Town to go, and If he were on the Planning Commission he could not have made finding 4.

Mayor Condon asked and confirmed with Mr. Bush that there were no variances required for the application. She said this is a relatively large home but in the development of neighborhoods, this is what is occurring everywhere and as a result, it is improving the value of the homes and granted, it is a large home, there is nothing in place to restrict another neighbor from building a large home. Eventually, the tract development will look like a development of custom homes and given there were no variances required, she thinks the Planning Commission and staff vetted the project well. She appreciates all of the

work that went into the project and while there is an impact on the bay view, it is not a primary view, is only a view from a limited area and yet it is still preserved. Therefore, she did not see any other alternative but to uphold the Planning Commission's decision to approve the application and supported denial of the appeal.

Vice Mayor Furst referred to Councilmember Andrew's comments, stating homes in these neighborhoods are changing and undergoing renovations but this is an improvement and it will be an attractive home. Despite its size, the view from the street and from neighboring properties appears to be in scale with other homes in the neighborhood. The siting and articulated roof lines and elevations tend to minimize the height and bulk as viewed from adjacent properties and from the front.

Regarding how families live these days, people are accustomed to larger homes and they do not live in tiny homes any longer. Often times there are one or two working parents, each with their own offices, and she said people are using homes differently these days and there is an expectation for more square footage. The Town has many different types of homes so one large property in a neighborhood of mostly two story homes does not change the character of the town or neighborhood.

She also stated she hoped the neighbors can figure out a way to get past this and get along. It was unfortunate there was not better communication early on to address issues before it reached this point and this is something this Council has conveyed to every applicant and appellant. They hope they can put aside differences and figure out a way to be neighbors in what is a great community.

MOTION: Moved by Furst, seconded by Ravasio, and approved by the following vote: 3-1-1 (Ayes: Furst, Ravasio and Condon; Noes: Andrews; Absent: Bailey)

To deny the appeal for Application PL-2018-0021 and uphold the Planning Commission's action by adopting Resolution 11/2018

## 6. BUSINESS ITEMS

### TOWN BUSINESS ITEMS

#### 6.I TOWN BUSINESS ITEMS

- 6.I.i Consider Amendment And Re-Introduction Of Ordinance 975, To Be Approved By The Voters At The June 5, 2018 Election, To Repeal The Existing Special Property Tax Currently Imposed For Storm Drainage And Flood Control Infrastructure; To Increase, And Extend Until Repealed By The Voters, The General Transactions And Use Tax From A ½-Cent Tax To A ¾-Cent Tax; And Require Annual Audit And Citizen Oversight Of Tax Expenditures  
(Report from Todd Cusimano, Town Manager and Peter Brown, Public Works Director)

Town Manager Cusimano gave the staff report and background from the February 20, 2018 meeting to introduce an ordinance that, if approved at the June 5, 2018 election, would continue the one-half cent sales tax measure at a three-quarters cent rate and repeal the existing Storm Drainage property tax of \$98 per residential unit or per 1,000 commercial square feet.

Following that meeting, staff was advised by the Town Attorney to make minor updates to the draft ordinance to maintain compliance of the model ordinance of the California Department of Taxes and Fee Administration (CDTFA), formerly known as the State Board of Equalization. The deadline to submit the ballot measure changed for the placement which is this Friday, March 9<sup>th</sup>. At this time, the Council is being asked to amend and reintroduce Ordinance 975 and the Town Attorney is available to answer questions. If approved, the next Business Item will call for a special election to be held on June 5, 2018, set the question to be placed on the ballot as well as request services and consolidation

with the Marin County Elections Department.

Mayor Condon opened the public comment period.

DAVID KUNHARDT, Hill Path, stated public communication on this issue will be a major feature over the next several months and he said in the revision, there are a number of paragraphs which provides an exception from certain kinds of automobile purchases from the tax. As he reads it, it seems anyone coming to Corte Madera to purchase a vehicle for commercial use that is outside the Town or individual use who can prove they are residence is outside the Town they would not pay the Town's extra sales tax on their vehicle. When calculating what the extra  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent for a Corte Madera resident to buy a car in Corte Madera, for a \$25,000 to \$30,000 car it is \$65 to \$75.

He then asked when the \$98 special tax would be set to expire, and Mr. Cusimano answered it would expire in 2023 which sets an early retirement of this tax by 5 years. Mr. Kunhardt referred to page 5 which states the difference in annual revenue at a one-half cent is \$2.5 million and three-quarters cent is \$3.7 million. On the second page, it states \$3.5 million and he asked that it be stated pessimistically for the taxpayer or optimistically for the Town at about \$3.7 to \$3.75 million as the extra anticipated revenues from the three-quarter cent tax.

He then pointed to the recitation of all of the capital improvements needed in the next 5-20 years, he noticed there is nothing included about hillside roadway replacements, repairs and reinforcements which will be needed.

Mayor Condon said usually the sales tax is paid where the vehicle is registered, and she asked how much the Town would receive. Mr. Cusimano said this sales tax measure applies to all sales within their jurisdiction and the Town receives a greater percentage, but he would like to further research this and clarify it. The \$3.5 million to \$3.7 million should be identified as \$3.7 million so staff will make this consistent.

Town Attorney Teresa Stricker explained these provisions did not change materially from the last version but she would feel more comfortable if she and the Town Manager reported back on exactly how this works for all sales.

Mr. Kunhardt added that there is reference made that "over 32% of the Town's homes are within the 100 year flood zone" and he asked if staff could provide what percentage are within 2, 3 or 4 feet of the current mean tide because those are the projected increases by 2050.

Mr. Cusimano explained that while very important, this is separate from the sales tax measure conversation. In March and April staff will begin the community forums regarding the Town's current system and the state and percentages of households in different scenarios to educate the community.

Mayor Condon reviewed the proposed alternatives for action by the Council.

MOTION: Moved by Furst, seconded by Ravasio, and approved by the following vote: 4-0-1 (Ayes: Andrews, Furst, Ravasio and Condon; Noes: None; Absent: Bailey)

To Re-Introduce Ordinance 975, as amended, to be Approved by the Voters at the June 5, 2018 Election; to Repeal the Existing Special Property Tax Currently Imposed for Storm Drainage and Flood Control Infrastructure; To Increase, and Extend Until Repealed by the Voters, the General Transactions and Use Tax From a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -Cent Tax to a  $\frac{3}{4}$ -Cent Tax; and Require Annual Audit and Citizen Oversight of Tax Expenditures.

6.I.ii Consider Adoption Of Resolution 08/2018 Of The Town Council Of

The Town Of Corte Madera:

(A) Calling And Giving Notice Of The Holding Of A Special Election On June 5, 2018 To Consider Adoption Of A Measure To (1) Repeal The Special Drainage Property Tax (\$98 Per Residential Unit Or Per 1,000 Commercial Square Feet); (2) Extend The Existing General 1/2¢ Sales Tax (Transaction And Use Tax) At A 3/4¢ Rate Until Ended By Voters; And (3) Require An Annual Audit Of, And A Citizens Advisory Committee To Oversee, The Transaction And Use Tax Expenditures; (B) Requesting Consolidation Of The Special Election With The June 5, 2018 Statewide Primary Election; (C) Directing The Town Attorney To Prepare An Impartial Analysis Of The Measure Pursuant To Elections Code Section 9280; And (D) Authorizing Two Councilmembers To Draft, Sign And Submit A Ballot Argument In Favor Of The Measure And Any Rebuttal Argument, And To Select Community Members To Sign Those Arguments.

(Report from Rebecca Vaughn, Town Clerk)

Mr. Cusimano gave the staff report and background, stating the Council at its January 16, February 6, February 20, 2018 meetings received reports regarding funding provided by a half-cent sales tax measure as approved by voters on November 2013. The Council also heard presentations from staff and held discussions regarding planning for future infrastructure needs and priorities and directed staff to return with a resolution for consideration at this meeting to call for an election, placing extension of the measure on the ballot and requesting the County to consolidate a special election with the June 5, 2018 Statewide Primary Election.

He said the sales tax measure is proposed to continue until repealed by voters and would require continuation of a Citizens' Oversight Committee review of 5 residents to be appointed by the Council along with examination audit to ensure funds are spent locally as promised for the benefit of Corte Madera residents. The deadline to submit the measure to place it on the ballot is Friday, March 9<sup>th</sup>.

He requested that the Council 1) designate two Councilmembers authorized to draft and sign the argument in favor of the ballot measure and any subsequent rebuttals to the primary argument; 2) adopt Resolution 8/2018 as amended to include those names and 3) direct the Town Attorney to draft an Impartial Analysis of the ballot measure.

He referred to page 7 which is the draft ballot language which he recited into the record, noting that he recommends keeping \$3.5 million in the language to be conservative with the ballot language which staff will correct.

Vice Mayor Furst asked if the word count is maxed out, and Ms. Stricker confirmed.

Mayor Condon asked if two words could be fit in somehow to state, "Shall Corte Madera repeal the special drainage property tax, thus ending...." So they understand repeal is calling an end to it.

Ms. Stricker suggested substituting the word "repeal" with "eliminate" so the ballot word count remains the same.

Vice Mayor Furst said while she appreciates the language which states, "reducing transportation congestion" but what should be done is to "improve roadway operations" which is best at reducing congestion. She noted they held this conversation at the TAM meeting and she questioned whether this should be revised.

Councilmember Andrews suggested "improve traffic flows". Mr. Cusimano said staff believes that people understand "congestion" and while technically correct, changing this

would require an extra word.

Councilmember Ravasio said he would argue that if the Town invests in infrastructure that improves bicycle safety and accessibility and continue to work with Safe Routes to School and continue to increase the number of children who are walking and riding bikes to school by improving sidewalks for safety, this gets vehicles off of the road. The Town is taking some of the funding and investing in these improvements, and he thinks that will reduce congestion.

Mr. Cusimano said he thinks people understand congestion and suggested using the words, "improve traffic congestion" which Councilmembers opposed.

Mayor Condon opened the public comment period.

KAREN GERBOSI, Parkview Circle, said she is a former proof-reader and copy editor and thinks the words should make sense and are not fluffy and ambiguous. Even if traffic flows are improved by a small percentage, the Town could say it did it but she recommended it be measurable and quantifiable and that voters can resonate with what wording is used.

Councilmember Ravasio discussed the Prince Royal Crosswalk project is out to bid which will make kids safer walking to and from the Cove School, which will not be in a car and which will reduce congestion. He noted there are a half dozen other projects that will do the same thing.

Councilmember Andrews said when talking about transportation congestion, people will think about their most recent drive on Hwy 101 and not think about work done in the Town.

Councilmember Ravasio said he thinks the concept is the same, and it is whether to state it in a positive or negative manner.

Vice Mayor Furst noted that the Town is working on a project with Larkspur, funded through the Active Transportation Program which will improve operations on Wornum, Tamal Vista, Nellen and on Fifer. In terms of roadways, it is opening up Nellen to southbound traffic off of Fifer. This would presumably improve traffic, but it is definitely improving traffic operations. All of the pathway work and safety improvements for pedestrians are improving traffic operations as well, but people may comment on how to measure the resultant traffic congestion reductions.

Councilmembers suggested "improving traffic flow" which they said is positive.

Councilmember Andrews said he supported the word revisions to "eliminate" the special drainage tax and "improve traffic flow" which he thought was cleaner.

Vice Mayor Furst discussed "improve" versus "improving" and suggested the previous reference be revised to state, "street repair" and "improved traffic flow" which was agreed upon. She read the portion of the language, "For example, flood/sea level rise/disaster preparedness, fire prevention, street repair, improved traffic flow, safety improvements, 911 response, and senior/youth programs". Councilmembers concurred.

Ms. Stricker asked and confirmed to use the word "eliminate" for the earlier reference. She clarified that tax proceeds can be used for any unrestricted General Fund purposes and what is in the parenthetical are examples of what the Council has in mind.

Mayor Condon asked and confirmed that she and Vice Mayor Furst will be appointed to draft and sign the argument in favor of the ballot measure and any subsequent rebuttals to the primary argument; and to direct the Town Attorney to draft an Impartial Analysis of the ballot measure.

Town Clerk Rebecca Vaughn referred to page 3, Sections 6, 7 and 8 which refers to rebuttals. There are certain timelines that must be adhered to for submittal in a timely manner which happen not to coincide with any Council meetings. Therefore, there is not time to bring this back to the Council at a meeting for the argument in favor or a rebuttal against any argument that may be submitted in opposition to the measure. Therefore, this is the reason staff included it in the action.

Ms. Stricker added that the Mayor and Vice Mayor would write the argument, sign it and make the determination of which three or four remaining members of the public would sign. There can be no more than 5 signers total and it must include one Councilmember. If both Councilmembers are going to sign, the two Councilmembers would then select 3 members of the community to sign. However, because of the deadlines and the Council's schedule, the Council would be delegating authority to the Mayor and Vice Mayor to move forward.

**MOTION:** Moved by Andrews, seconded by Ravasio, and approved by the following vote: 4-0-1 (Ayes: Andrews, Furst, Ravasio and Condon; Noes: None; Absent: Bailey)

To adopt Resolution 08/2018, as amended by revising wording on page 3, of the Town Council of the Town Of Corte Madera: Calling and Giving Notice of the Holding of a Special Election on June 5, 2018 to Consider Adoption of a Measure To (1) Repeal The Special Drainage Property Tax (\$98 Per Residential Unit Or Per 1,000 Commercial Square Feet); (2) Extend the Existing General ½ cent Sales Tax (Transaction and Use Tax) at a ¾ cent Rate until Ended By Voters; and (3) Require an Annual Audit of, and a Citizens Advisory Committee to Oversee, the Transaction and Use Tax Expenditures; (B) Requesting Consolidation of the Special Election with the June 5, 2018 Statewide Primary Election; (C) Directing the Town Attorney to Prepare an Impartial Analysis of the Measure Pursuant to Elections Code Section 9280; and (D) Authorizing the Mayor and Vice Mayor to Draft, Sign and Submit a Ballot Argument in Favor of the Measure and any Rebuttal Argument, and to Select Community Members to Sign Those Arguments.

6.I.iii Consideration And Possible Action To Adopt Resolution 09/2018 Approving The Housing Element Annual Report  
(Report from Adam Wolff, Director of Planning and Building)

Director of Planning and Building Adam Wolff stated he prepared a brief staff report describing and attaching the 2017 Housing Element Annual Report to comply with Government Code Section 65400 which indicates progress towards meeting Housing Element goals and RHNA production numbers. Table A describes the granting of permits in 2017 for 4 new dwelling units, 2 of which were second units and 2 as new single-family homes. The other Table B describes the Town's total progress in the third year of the eight year Housing Element cycle.

The forms will be changing next year as HCD updates based on State legislation adopted last year and provide direction to jurisdictions on how to report new required information for the next year. This will also impact where the Town falls under SB 35 streamlining rules and regulations. The deadline is April 1<sup>st</sup> and he recommended the Council adopt Resolution 09/2018 approving the report in order to submit the report.

Mayor Condon thanked staff for their work to compile the report which enables the Town to receive grant funding.

Councilmember Andrews referred to Table B and asked and confirmed the tracking is done by calendar year and therefore, Year 3 should be for 2017 statistics.

Vice Mayor Furst said she knows there is a big push in the region by MTC for anti-displacement ordinances. She recalled the Town had a general provision in its Housing Element, and she would encourage the Town to pursue this. Many years ago there was discussion about where to place units and there was a concern that if certain older units are rezoned for a higher density, it is likely to result in evictions with replacement of luxury units, thereby displacing residents. She cited the importance of saving the Town's older, more moderately priced housing stock and pursue those types of policies.

Mayor Condon opened the public comment period, and there were no speakers.

MOTION: Moved by Furst, seconded by Andrews, and approved by the following vote: 4-0-1 (Ayes: Andrews, Furst, Ravasio and Condon; Noes: None; Absent: Bailey)

To Adopt Resolution 09/2018 approving the Housing Element Annual Report.

**6.II SANITARY DISTRICT BUSINESS ITEMS: None**

**7. REVIEW OF DRAFT AGENDA FOR UPCOMING TOWN COUNCIL MEETING**

**7.1 Review of Draft Agenda for March 20, 2018 Town Council Meeting**

There were no amendments to the draft agenda. Town Manager Cusimano stated staff will soon start presentations on the budget and will bring one department each meeting leading up to the budget hearings.

Councilmember Ravasio asked if the homeless and shower funding will be on the next meeting. Mr. Cusimano stated as soon as they are available to attend, the matter will be agendized.

**8. COUNCIL AND TOWN MANAGER REPORTS**

- Town Manager Report

- Mr. Cusimano said Mr. Warman's last day will be this Friday, March 16. He will go on vacation starting June 30<sup>th</sup> and then retire and he has asked that his retirement party be scheduled in June.
- *Coffee with the Staff* will be held on Thursday from 8AM to 11AM at Café Verde with the community, and they will start to do this monthly with various staff members.

- Council Reports

Vice Mayor Furst gave the following report:

- She thanked the Public Works Department staff for their work during the storms.

Councilmembers Andrews and Ravasio had no reports.

Mayor Condon gave the following report:

- The State of The Town Luncheon will be held on March 29, as sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce.
- A new restaurant is opening in a couple of weeks in the Town Center; Marin Pizza which will be where the elephant used to be located.
- A candidates' forum will be sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce. A date has not been set but the facilitator will be Dick Spotswood.
- On August 18 will be the Chili Cook-Off.
- On April 29 from 2PM to 4PM is going to be the grand opening of the Age-Friendly Inter-Generational Center and the community is invited, and she described the many programs to be scheduled.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. to the next regular Town Council meeting on March 20, 2018 at Town Hall Council Chambers.