Appendix A

Notice of Preparation and Scoping Letters
Notice of Preparation and Notice of Scoping Meeting for a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project

TO: Interested Parties
SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting for a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project

LEAD AGENCY: Town of Corte Madera
SCOPING COMMENT PERIOD: October 25, 2016, to November 30, 2016
SCOPING MEETING: 7:00 to 9:00 pm, November 17, 2016
Town Hall Council Chambers
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA

Corte Madera Village, LLC and Restoration Hardware have, as co-applicants, filed an application with the Town of Corte Madera for the Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion project (Project). The Town has determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the appropriate level of environmental review for the Project.

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Town of Corte Madera will be the Lead Agency for the preparation of the EIR for the proposed Project (described in more detail below). The purpose of this Notice of Preparation (NOP) is to solicit guidance from responsible and trustee agencies and comments from the general public as to the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR. This may include identification of potential impacts that should be studied or mitigation measures that should be investigated.

**Project Location**
The Project would be located at 1618 Redwood Highway, at the Village at Corte Madera in Corte Madera, Marin County. Refer to the attached Figure 1 for the Project Location. The Project site is surrounded by marshlands to the north and east, commercial retail to the south, and Highway 101 and a regional shopping center (Town Center) to the west. The Project improvements would occur within the Village at Corte Madera site and on the gravel lot which is located northeast of the Nordstrom retail store on the north side of Redwood Highway.
Project Description
The Project includes construction of a new 46,000 square-foot retail store referred to as the Restoration Hardware Gallery (RH Gallery) within the existing parking lot of the Village at Corte Madera and improvements to the existing gravel lot on the north side of Redwood Highway. Refer to the attached Figure 2 for the Site Plan.

Proposed improvements to the existing 5.14-acre gravel lot include paving, lighting, landscaping, and stormwater facilities. The gravel lot, after improvements, would provide between 420 and 455 parking spaces. The lot is owned by the Town of Corte Madera. Corte Madera Village, LLC is proposing to use the gravel lot to accommodate parking for the Project and has requested the Town of Corte Madera to consider entering into a long-term lease for use and maintenance of the gravel lot. The proposed improvements to the gravel lot are anticipated to take four months and would precede development of the shopping center expansion.

The building footprint would be approximately 25,000 square feet. The building would have two levels, plus an open-air rooftop courtyard surrounding an enclosed scenery loft. The RH Gallery would include a café space of approximately 5,800 square feet. The roof ridge of the scenery loft would be approximately 46 feet from the finished grade. Improvements would occur around the proposed building pad such as utility connections, pathways, landscaping, lighting, and parking lot configuration. The RH Gallery would be constructed after development of the gravel lot. Construction of the building and its associated improvements would take approximately 12 to 14 months.

Potential Environmental Effects
The following environmental factors have been identified as potential environmental effects of the Project and will therefore be evaluated in the EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Land Use and Planning
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Biological Resources
- Population and Housing
- Cultural Resources
- Public Services
- Geology and Soils
- Recreation
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Transportation/Traffic
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Hydrology and Water Quality

The EIR will not include an evaluation of agricultural or forest resources because the Project site does not include any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or land covered by a Williamson Act contract (Corte Madera General Plan, April 2009). In addition, the Project site is not zoned for agricultural, forest land, or timberland, nor are there any agricultural or forest lands within the site (Town of Corte Madera Zoning Ordinance, August 1994).

The EIR will not include an evaluation of Mineral Resources. The proposed Project is located on an existing developed site that is built upon bay fill. Construction of the project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource or availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site as delineated on a land use plan, such as a local general plan or specific plan. Neither the Town of Corte Madera General Plan (Town of Corte Madera 2009) nor the Marin
Countywide Plan (Marin County 2007) designates the Project site as having a known mineral resource of value.

The EIR will evaluate the potential cumulative environmental effects related to implementation of the Project, identify and evaluate alternatives to the Project, and identify mitigation measures that could avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts as a result of the Project.

**Scoping Period**
The scoping period is from October 25 to November 30, 2016. The scoping period has been extended from the required 30 days to 37 days because of the Thanksgiving Holiday. During this time, written comments can be mailed, delivered, or emailed, no later than 5 pm on November 30, to:

Phil Boyle, Senior Planner  
Planning & Building Department  
300 Tamalpais Drive  
Corte Madera, CA 94925  
Email: pboyle@tcmmail.org

**Scoping Meeting**
Oral comments, as well as written comments related to the scope and content of the environmental review of the Project, may be received at the public scoping meeting scheduled on November 17, 2016, from 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm, at the following location:

Town Hall  
Council Chambers  
300 Tamalpais Drive  
Corte Madera, CA

The public scoping meeting will allow responsible and trustee agencies and the general public the opportunity to hear presentations by Town Staff, the applicants and the environmental consulting firm that is under contract with the Town to prepare the EIR. The meeting will include a time for the public to provide comments on the scope and content of the EIR.

If you cannot attend the meeting, written comments also will be accepted after the Scoping Meeting through the end of the scoping period on November 30, 2016 at 5:00 p.m.

Please contact the Corte Madera Planning & Building Department at (415) 927-5064 if you need further information regarding this Notice of Preparation.

Signature: Phil Boyle  
Senior Planner  
Date: [Signature]
Figure 2

Site Plan

PROPOSED PARKING IMPROVEMENTS IN EXISTING GRAVEL LOT

PROPOSED RESTORATION HARDWARE BUILDING

Data source: Project Information 2016. Created by jeller

© 2012. Whilst every care has been taken to prepare this map, GHD (and DATA CUSTODIAN) make no representations or warranties about its accuracy, reliability, completeness or suitability for any particular purpose and cannot accept liability and responsibility of any kind (whether in contract, tort or otherwise) for any expenses, losses, damages and/or costs (including indirect or consequential damage) which are or may be incurred by any party as a result of the map being inaccurate, incomplete or unsuitable in any way and for any reason.

Data source: Project Information 2016. Created by jeller
Phil, re. the above - Environmental Health Services would require the submission of plans for the café indicated in your scoping meeting letter. Thanks for the heads up!!

Dave Smail
Supervising R.E.H.S.
Environmental Health Services
County of Marin
Community Development Agency
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite #236
San Rafael, CA 94903
415 473 6916 T
415 473 4120 F
CRS Dial 711
dsmail@marincounty.org

Email Disclaimer: http://www.marincounty.org/main/disclaimers
Phil Boyle

From: Derek McGill <DMcGill@tam.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2016 11:48 AM
To: Phil Boyle
Subject: Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project

Phil,

Thank you for the notice and opportunity to comment on the Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project NOP. TAM as the congestion management agency of Marin County administers the congestion management program, and monitors roadway system performance on our congestion management network, including portions of Highway 101 adjacent to this project location. TAM would encourage the EIR to analyze any impacts to the performance of the CMP network and consider proposed mitigations resulting from this project.

In addition, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research has recently released draft guidance on SB 743, legislation requiring an update to CEQA transportation impact assessment from traditional delay based assessment to a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric. Although this guidance is not yet in effect pending final rulemaking, this project serves as an opportunity to demonstrate the difference in methodology and resulting impact assessment between LOS and VMT, and would encourage the Town of Corte Madera to coordinate with TAM on this assessment. Caltrans has released draft guidance on how to address impacts under this new legislation on their facilities and this guidance should be reviewed in context of the proposed project.

Please let me know if there are any questions or comments.

Regards,
Derek McGill, AICP
Planning Manager
Transportation Authority of Marin
dmcgill@tam.ca.gov
(415) 226-0825
900 5th Avenue, Suite 100
San Rafael, CA 94901
Hi Phil,

Please find attached a soft copy of the Caltrans comment letter regarding the Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion project. The original letter will be mailed to you. Thank you for including Caltrans in the review process for this project. Should you have any questions regarding this letter or require any additional information, please feel free to contact me at 510-286-5521 or Erik.Bird@dot.ca.gov.

Thanks,

Erik Bird
Transportation Planner
Office of Advance Planning, PSR IV
Caltrans District 4-Bay Area
(510) 286-5521
November 2, 2016

Mr. Phil Boyle
Planning Department
Town of Corte Madera
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925

Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion – Notice of Preparation (NOP)

Dear Mr. Boyle:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above-referenced project. In tandem with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), Caltrans new mission signals a modernization of our approach to evaluating and mitigating impacts to the State Transportation Network (STN). We aim to reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) by tripling bicycle and doubling both pedestrian and transit travel by 2020. Our comments are based on the NOP.

Project Understanding
The project proposes construction of a new 46,000 square-foot (sf) retail store referred to as the Restoration Hardware Gallery within the existing parking lot of the Village at Corte Madera at 1618 Redwood Highway. Proposed improvements to the existing 5.14-acre gravel lot include paving, lighting, landscaping, and storm water facilities. The building footprint would be approximately 25,000 sf. The building would have two levels, plus an open-air rooftop courtyard surrounding an enclosed scenery loft. Access to the development will be provided by the US 101 on- and off-ramps at Tamalpais Drive connecting to Redwood Highway.

Lead Agency
As the lead agency, the Town of Corte Madera is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to State highways. The project’s fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

Traffic Analysis
With the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 743, Caltrans is focusing on transportation infrastructure

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability."
that supports smart growth and efficient development. Recently approved guidance for incorporating SB 743 *(Local Development-Intergovernmental Review Program Interim Guidance, September 2016)* intends to ensure that development projects align with State policies through the use of efficient development patterns, innovative travel demand reduction strategies, and necessary multimodal roadway improvements. Please submit a transportation impact study that provides VMT analysis resulting from the proposed project, applying local agency thresholds or absent those, thresholds recommended by the most recent draft of Office of Planning and Research’s CEQA \( \text{Guidelines} \) (http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/2016_CEQA_Statutes_and_Guidelines.pdf).

**Multimodal Planning**
The project should be conditioned to ensure connections to existing bike lanes and multi-use trails to facilitate walking and biking to nearby jobs, and neighborhood services. Therefore, the proposed project should be conditioned to connect to the existing Class I bikeway/multi-use path and proposed Class II bike lane on Redwood Highway as shown in the 2008 *Marin County Unincorporated Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*. Providing these connections with streets configured for alternative transportation modes will reduce VMT by promoting usage of nearby Marin Transit Bus Routes 22, 113, and 117 and Golden Gate Transit Bus Route 18.

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**
In the Interim Guidance mentioned above, this project falls under Project Type 4 Dedicated Use Areas, which includes projects located on large tracts of land used for commercial purposes such as business or industrial park or warehousing, or for recreational purposes such as golf courses. Therefore, we encourage you to develop TDM policies to promote smart mobility and reduce regional VMT and traffic impacts to the STN. The TDM elements described below should be included in the program:

- Project design to encourage walking, bicycling, and convenient transit access;
- Lower parking ratios;
- Transit fare incentives for patrons and employees such as subsidized transit passes on a continuing basis;
- Designated bicycle parking;
- Charging stations for electric vehicles;
- Participation/Formation in/of a Transportation Management Association (TMA) in partnership with other developments in the area;
- Aggressive trip reduction targets with Lead Agency monitoring and enforcement; and
- Reducing headway times of nearby Marin Transit Bus Routes 22, 113, and 117 and Golden Gate Transit Bus Route 18.

For additional TDM options, please refer to Chapter 8 of FHWA’s *Integrating Demand Management into the Transportation Planning Process: A Desk Reference*, regarding TDM at the local planning level. The reference is available online at: http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop12035/fhwahop12035.pdf. For information

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability."
Mr. Boyle, Town of Corte Madera  
November 2, 2016  
Page 3

about parking ratios, please see MTC’s report, Reforming Parking Policies to Support Smart  
Growth, or visit the MTC parking webpage:  

**Sea Level Rise**

The effects of sea level rise may have impacts on transportation facilities located in the project area. Executive Order (EO) S-13-08 directs State agencies planning construction projects in areas vulnerable to sea level rise to begin planning for potential impacts by considering a range of sea level rise scenarios for the years 2050 and 2100. Higher water levels may increase erosion rates, change environmental characteristics that affect material durability, lead to increased groundwater levels and change sediment movement along shores and at estuaries and river mouths, as well as affect soil pore pressure at dikes and levees on which transportation facilities are constructed. All these factors must be addressed through geotechnical and hydrological studies conducted in coordination with Caltrans.

**Traffic Impact Fees**

Given the project’s contribution to area traffic and its proximity to US 101, the project should contribute fair share traffic impact fees. These contributions would be used to lessen future traffic congestion and improve transit and other multi-modal forms of transportation in the project vicinity.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please call Erik Bird at 510-286-5521 or Erik.Bird@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

**ACTING FOR**

PATRICIA MAURICE  
District Branch Chief  
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
Hi Phil,

I just left you a voicemail, but thought I’d shoot you an email if that’s easier for responding. This isn’t a formal scoping comment on the Restoration Hardware Expansion EIR, but rather just a request for clarification. As the NOP states, the proposed project is surrounded by marshlands to the north and east. I’m assuming that the EIR will extensively cover potential impacts to wetlands and mitigate, as necessary. However, at this time does the proposed project’s site plan demonstrate compliance with the city’s wetland setback requirements?

Thanks for any information and insight on this.

Best,
Rachel

---

Please note change of name and email address (see below).

Rachel Reid (formerly Warner)
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING MANAGER

County of Marin
Community Development Agency
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308
San Rafael, CA 94903
415 473 6863 T
415 473 7880 F
CRS Dial 711
rreid@marincounty.org

Email Disclaimer: http://www.marincounty.org/main/disclaimers
Phil Boyle

From: Neal Toft <ntoft@cityoflarkspur.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2016 4:14 PM
To: Phil Boyle
Cc: Adam Wolff
Subject: Larkspur Comments on NOP and Scoping for Restoration Hardware EIR
Attachments: Restoration Hardware_NOP_LRK_Comments_20161129.pdf

Phil,

Hope it is OK that I just send comments by PDF. Should be an interesting project.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Neal Toft
Director of Planning & Building
City of Larkspur
400 Magnolia Avenue
Larkspur, CA 94939
(415) 927-6713
ntoft@cityoflarkspur.org
November 29, 2016

Mr. Adam Wolff, Director
Town of Corte Madera Planning Director
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925-1418

RE: Notice of Preparation and Scoping for EIR
   Restoration Hardware Expansion
   Village Shopping Center at Corte Madera

Dear Mr. Wolff:

The City of Larkspur appreciates the opportunity to comment on the scoping for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Restoration Hardware Expansion at the Village in Corte Madera. The Town of Corte Madera shares traffic corridors with the City of Larkspur and circulation issues present in Corte Madera can affect Larkspur, and vice versa. A portion of the access to and from Larkspur comes through the Town of Corte Madera, via Tamalpais Drive, Fifer Avenue, Tamal Vista Boulevard, and/or Wornum Drive. The General Plan identifies these roadways as part of Larkspur's primary circulation system. The City of Larkspur General Plan also requires that signalized intersections should not operate at worse than a Level of Service (LOS) D during peak periods, and non-signalized intersections should not operate less than LOS C during peak periods. As such, City of Larkspur's primary concerns relate to the issues of Transportation/Traffic, which are discussed below.

Trip Generation and Distribution

According to the GHD technical memo (December 2015) there will be a new Traffic Study to update existing conditions. As the base data for the 2009 General Plan EIR and the environmental assessment for the 2011 expansion project are both out-of-date, the project impact as well as cumulative conditions also need to be updated. In addition to the intersections listed in the GHD memo, we request that the new study also needs to assess trips and LOS performance at the Lucky Drive interchange with Hwy 101. The majority of the Village workers and a portion of shoppers use this interchange. Intersections that function as part of this interchange include: Tamal Vista at Fifer (CM); Tamal Vista at Wornum (CM); Wornum at Redwood Hwy (CM+L); and Redwood at Industrial/101 NB Ramps (L). The nearly adjacent spacing of the Lucky Drive and SFD interchanges with Hwy 101 causes the impacts at one to effect the other. Thus, that the project impact study should include both the Lucky Drive and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard interchanges. As such, we also request that intersections on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and East Sir Francis Drake Boulevard be included.
Marin County Congestion Management Plan (CMP)

Further, we request that the project be analyzed for consistency with the policies of the Marin County Congestion Management Plan (CMP). The proposed scope appears to include only Hwy 101 as a potential impact area. Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, a CMP roadway, should be added to the scope. The GHD memo reports there are no mitigations available for impacts on Hwy 101. However, there are mitigation projects available for the impacts on both Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and East Sir Francis Drake Boulevard.

Public Transit, Bicycle/Pedestrian Access, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM).

In consideration of potential negative impacts to both Highway 101 and local intersections and roadways, the plan should identify potential enhancements to these modes wherever possible and consider a robust TDM program for the shopping center, if it does not currently exist.

Access to Highway 101

The project proposal has the potential to impact the local intersections discussed above. The consideration of projects such as these highlight the congested conditions that currently occur at the Wornum Drive intersections, and the Highway 101 / Greenbrae Interchange, and the likelihood that future growth in both Corte Madera and Larkspur, however limited, will exacerbate those peak hour conditions. The City of Larkspur encourages the Town of Corte Madera to identify potential traffic and circulation improvements in the areas of Tamal Vista Boulevard / Fifer Avenue / Doherty Drive / Wornum Drive / Redwood Highway / Sir Francis Drake Boulevard to which this project can contribute, and which should be discussed in collaboration by our two jurisdictions.

I appreciate receiving updates on the project and a response to this letter. Should you have any questions or concerns related to the comments provided above, please contact me by telephone at (415) 927-6713.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Neal Toft
Director of Planning & Building

C: Dan Schwarz
   Julian Skinner, Public Works Director
   Larkspur City Council
   Project File
Phil Boyle, Senior Planner  
Planning and Building Department  
300 Tamalpais Drive  
Corte Madera, CA  94925  
Email: pboyle@otcmmail.org

Re: EIR Scoping, Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project

Dear Mr. Boyle:

The Marin Conservation League has some concerns we feel should be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report being prepared for the above mentioned project.

➤ The traffic that will be generated by this project, as well as the cumulative traffic with this project and the soon-to-be-finished Tam Ridge Residences, should be quantified and the impacts determined. Could the expansion of bus service to the east side of the freeway alleviate the impacts?

➤ The impacts of Sea Level Rise (SLR) on the proposed building, the shopping center and the proposed new parking lot should be addressed and mitigation consistent with the county vulnerability assessment proposed.

➤ There should be an analysis of the impacts of elevated lighting for the improved parking lot on the wildlife in the adjacent wetlands. Evaluate pervious paving material to reduce the runoff from the parking lot. Explore ways of sequestering runoff to allow filtering of pollutants before it goes into the wetland.

➤ Does the economic viability of Restoration Hardware provide assurance the building will be occupied for the long term? Visual scenarios should be provided from all angles, including within the existing shopping center.

We look forward to reviewing the Draft EIR as soon as it becomes available. Please provide notification when it is available for review.

Thank you.

Yours truly,
Kate Powers
President

Marin Conservation League
175 N. Redwood Dr. Suite 135
San Rafael, CA 94903
415-485-6257
November 30, 2016

Phil Boyle, Senior Planner
Planning and Building Department
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925
Email: pboyle@fcmmail.org

Re: EIR Scoping, Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project

Dear Mr. Boyle:
The Marin Conservation League has some concerns we feel should be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report being prepared for the above mentioned project.

➤ The traffic that will be generated by this project, as well as the cumulative traffic with this project and the soon-to-be-finished Tam Ridge Residences, should be quantified and the impacts determined. Could the expansion of bus service to the east side of the freeway alleviate the impacts?

➤ The impacts of Sea Level Rise (SLR) on the proposed building, the shopping center and the proposed new parking lot should be addressed and mitigation consistent with the county vulnerability assessment proposed.

➤ There should be an analysis of the impacts of elevated lighting for the improved parking lot on the wildlife in the adjacent wetlands. Evaluate pervious paving material to reduce the runoff from the parking lot. Explore ways of sequestering runoff to allow filtering of pollutants before it goes into the wetland.

➤ Does the economic viability of Restoration Hardware provide assurance the building will be occupied for the long term? Visual scenarios should be provided from all angles, including within the existing shopping center.

We look forward to reviewing the Draft EIR as soon as it becomes available. Please provide notification when it is available for review.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Kate Powers
President
Hi Phil,

Here are Marin Audubon's scoping comments on the Restoration Hardware project.

Thanks

Barbara
November 30, 2016

Phil Boyle, Senior Planner
Town of Corte Madera
300 Tamalpais Avenue
Corte Madera, CA 94925

RE: SCOPING COMMENTS FOR RESTORATION HARDWARE

Dear Mr. Boyle:

The Marin Audubon Society appreciates the opportunity to submit Scoping comments for the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Restoration Hardware Expansion Project. Our comments focus on potential impacts to the adjacent Shorebird Marsh from changes and increased use of the gravel parking lot. Shorebird Marsh was mitigation for adverse impacts to an oxbow marsh for construction of the Village Shopping Center. The oxbows were remnants of the historic tidal marshes that once existed in this site. Shorebird Marsh was designed and functions primarily as a flood ponding basin and also wildlife habitat. Our interest is in ensuring there are no adverse impacts to this remnant of a once extensive tidal marsh system marsh. The DEIR should:

1. Background. Discuss and report the conditions and entitlements for the Village Shopping Center that provided for construction of the gravel parking lot and Shorebird Marsh, and led to the Town’s ownership of it. What agreements, legal restrictions, and binding conditions exist governing development of the gravel lot for parking? A record search should be conducted to verify this important background for the project.

2. Land Use Designation. The property is designated as Baylands Habitat Zone, natural habitat. What was the rational for this designation? Discuss the potential for restoring the site to marsh.

3. Transition Zone. Describe the current conditions of the gravel lot as it interfaces with the adjacent marsh. Discuss the transition zone, the uplands adjacent to Shorebird Marsh, its width and its importance as a component of the flood basin and to the wildlife that use the marsh.

This transition zone is a slope that allows the water level to rise, thereby providing flood ponding benefits. Describe how the marsh is managed for flood control. How much of the transition zone is exposed when measured at the highest water level managed for in the marsh? Discuss the weather that could bring more incidents of intense storm, wave run-up and extreme tides and/or other conditions under which Shorebird Marsh would be full and that would result in risk overflowing and possibly flooding. Would the lot be a useful flood plain under such circumstances? What is the potential for water ponded in the marsh to overflow onto the gravel lot or would all flow be to the north? Could the flood control system be overwhelmed or break down?
Transition zones are widely recognized as important components of marsh habitats during times of high water levels when certain wildlife that do not swim must seek refuge on higher grounds. Transition zones also provide nesting and foraging habitat for special status and other species. Transition zones must be wide enough to allow both habitat and flood benefit functions. Under normal weather and management conditions and at the level of highest water, what is the width of the transition zone that is available for wildlife? I.e. how much refugia habitat remains for wildlife use under usual high tide/storm and then under extreme weather conditions?

4. **Vegetation.** Describe the current condition of the transition zone vegetation along the banks of Shorebird Marsh adjacent to the project site. Discuss and identify the species of non-native invasive plants that are present. Evaluate the condition of the transition zone as a high water refugia for wildlife.

5. **Impacts to the transition zone edge.** Describe the project’s plan for the marsh edge/transition zone. How would the project affect the transition zone? Would the transition zone be reduced in size? Would any vegetation be destroyed? What species would be planted to compensate for any destroyed and for any areas that are unvegetated or vegetated with invasives?

We note that an acceptable transition zone width is at least 100 feet from the high water levels. If it is currently narrower, it should be widened and areas where is a predominance of non-native plants should be revegetated with natives.

6. **Impacts to wildlife.** Right now this edge of the marsh receives little use. The gravel parking lot is not heavily used and there is no path along the edge, so people are not attracted to it, as they would be with the project’s development and the additional parking activity it would bring. The DEIR should discuss how the project would avoid impacts on wildlife and transition zone of construction and of the ongoing use of the converted lot. Would a fence be used to ensure people and dogs do not get into the marsh?

We understand that there is interest in constructing a public path along the marsh edge. We do not support constructing a path along the perimeter of the lot because of the adverse impacts it would bring. Off leash dogs, which have been a chronic problem in the area, entering the transition zone and marsh, and increased numbers of people are primary concerns. There are paths all along the rest of the marsh. This side should remain without a path. A sidewalk should be provided along the street.

7. **Water Quality.** Runoff from the increased number of vehicles would carry more oil and grease. Resurfacing with asphalt, particularly when new, would contribute additional pollutants. With conversion from a gravel surface, rain/runoff that would not be filtered through the soil and the volume of runoff would be greater. What measures are proposed to treat the runoff to protect Shorebird Marsh and the Bay where the runoff eventually ends? How would the increased runoff be accommodated? Describe the impacts of the water treatment system. Is it proposed to be constructed in the transition zone or the parking area?

8. **Night Lighting.** The lot would have to have night lighting to accommodate evening shoppers. Night lighting has been proven to negatively impact birds during migration by confusing them and diverting them from their migratory routes. The results can be exhaustion and death. Night lighting can also adversely impact resident nesting birds. Discuss how the project proposes to avoid the adverse impacts of night lighting on birds using the adjacent marsh and on migration.
Thank you for considering our questions and concerns.

Sincerely,

Barbara Salzman, Co-Chair
Conservation Committee

Phil Peterson, Co-chair
Conservation Committee
November 30, 2016

Phil Boyle, Senior Planner
Planning & Building Department
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925

Dear Mr. Boyle:

I am writing in response to the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Scoping Meeting for the Draft EIR on the Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware expansion project. Please consider the following comments on the scope and content of the EIR.

**Population and Housing**

- Please assess the extent to which the proposed project would result in housing impacts by creating an imbalance between employment and housing.
- The analysis of employment impacts should include the most recent employment and wage estimates from the Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment Statistics reports for Marin County and estimated projected employment for the completed project (also based on OES).
- Provide an analysis of existing housing stock affordable to the projected employment, including current vacancy rates for Corte Madera and Marin County. Additionally, assess the likelihood that anticipated housing development in the Town would be priced to serve the projected employment base of the new retail development.
- Project the cities where employees who can’t find housing in Marin are likely to live. Please use the On The Map tool in the Census Bureau’s Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics program to project likely places of residence.
- If the jobs/housing balance exceeds 1.5, recommend appropriate mitigation measures, including potential on-site measures such as on-site affordable housing as currently included in the General Plan. Assess the applicability of Housing Element Policy H-2.4 and related implementation programs.
Transportation/Traffic

- Assess the impact on commute traffic resulting from employment increases attributable to the project.
- Consider the realistic consumer usage of the remote lot, and the impacts of any shuttle use serving parkers and the shopping center.
- Evaluate pedestrian safety related to both the designated and cut-through paths of travel from the remote lot to the center.
- Evaluate the impact on healthcare and homecare employees serving Corte Madera’s seniors (now 33.2% of the Town’s population) affected by increased retail employee commute and out-of-town customer traffic. Assess the ability to obtain affordable services should the commute of current local workers be adversely affected.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Assess the impact of greenhouse gas emissions due to increased commute traffic resulting from employment attributable to the project.

Biology/Hydrology/Climate Change

- Assess the impact of permanent daily vehicular use at the gravel lot on the long-term viability of the adjacent wetlands and wildlife habitat.
- Identify the projected sea level rise in the area and the long-term viability of the proposed parking on the gravel lot.

Alternatives

- The proposal is similar to other Restoration Hardware proposals in the United States – it is a single-use auto-dependent project. Analyze a mixed use alternative that would address the site’s constraints and opportunities as well as the community’s needs, including:
  - Housing at 40 units/acre with mixed income, affordable and/or independent senior housing. (These units are already included in the General Plan designation for the site.) The new units can provide housing for local workers and/or older residents ‘scaling down’ from local houses that could then free up existing homes for local working families.
  - Structured parking (with ground level retail in appropriate locations) to accommodate site parking within the main property rather than on the gravel lot.
  - Wetlands re-creation on the gravel lot, with appropriate and reasonable passive recreation opportunities.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed DEIR for the Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware expansion project.

Sincerely,

Robert Pendoley
Board Chair
November 15, 2016

Phil Boyle
Town of Corte Madera
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925

Sent via Email: pboyle@tommail.org

RE: SCH#2016102061, Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project, Marin County

Dear Mr. Boyle:

The Native American Heritage Commission has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code section 21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit.14, § 15084.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines Section 15084.5 (b)). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064 subd.(a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (a)(1)). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources with the area of project effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, “tribal cultural resources” (Pub. Resources Code § 21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.3 (a)). AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015. If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. § 800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments. Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.

AB 52

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:
1. **Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project**: Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:
   a. A brief description of the project.
   b. The lead agency contact information.
   c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (d)).
   d. A “California Native American tribe” is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21073).

2. **Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe’s Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report**: A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1(c)).
   a. For purposes of AB 52, “consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code § 65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (b)).

3. **Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe**: The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:
   a. Alternatives to the project.
   b. Recommended mitigation measures.
   c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

4. **Discretionary Topics of Consultation**: The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:
   a. Type of environmental review necessary.
   b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
   c. Significance of the project's impacts on tribal cultural resources.
   d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

5. **Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process**: With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code sections 6254 (r) and 6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (c)(1)).

6. **Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document**: If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency's environmental document shall discuss both of the following:
   a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
   b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (b)).

7. **Conclusion of Consultation**: Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
   a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (b)).

8. **Recommendation Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document:** Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforccable. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (a)).

9. **Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation:** If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (e)).

10. **Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:**
    
a. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
    
i. Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
    
ii. Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
    
b. Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
    
i. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
    
ii. Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
    
iii. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
    
c. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
    
d. Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code § 21084.3 (b)).
    
e. Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a nonfederally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code § 815.3 (c)).
    
f. Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code § 5097.991).

11. **Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource:** An environmental impact report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
    
a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.
    
b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
    
c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC’s PowerPoint presentation titled, “Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices” may be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf

SB 18

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of
open space. (Gov. Code § 65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf

Some of SB 18’s provisions include:

1. **Tribal Consultation:** If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.** (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (a)(2)).

2. **No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation.** There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.

3. **Confidentiality:** Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code section 65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 that are within the city’s or county’s jurisdiction. (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (b)).

4. **Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation:** Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
   a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
   b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and “Sacred Lands File” searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at:
http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/

**NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments**

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center (http://oph.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
   a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
   b. If any known cultural resources have been already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
   c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
   a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
   b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.

3. Contact the NAHC for:
a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project’s APE.

b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.

4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.

a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.

b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.

c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code section 7050.5, Public Resources Code section 5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: sharaya.souza@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sharaya Souza
Staff Services Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse
Phil Boyle

From: Adam Wolff
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 11:48 AM
To: Phil Boyle
Subject: FW: Restoration Hardware Scoping

FYI.

-----Original Message-----
From: Cheryl Longinotti [mailto:cslonginotti@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 11:44 AM
To: Adam Wolff
Subject: Restoration Hardware Scoping

Adam,
I would like to call attention to several factors which should be considered in the EIR for the Restoration Hardware project.

First of all, the EIR should evaluate the project impact on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), not just traffic volumes and level of service at intersections. VMT provides a better measure of environmental impact and is likely to be formally incorporated into CEQA guidelines during the life of the project (https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Revised_VMT_CEQA_Guidelines_Proposal_January_20_2016.pdf).

Secondly, the project is likely to increase turning conflicts at the entrances to the gravel lot.
   a) for Redwood Hwy Path users: The entrances cross the Redwood Hwy multi-user path, which is a major north-south (CalParkTunnel/Larkspur Ferry to Bayside Corte Madera) and east-west (Bayside Corte Madera to Wornum Undercrossing/Sandra Marker Trail) connecting route used by school children, commuters, and those seeking recreation. The impact on safety for path users on foot and on cycles should be evaluated.
   b) for people crossing Redwood Hwy, particularly at the gravel lot: Using the gravel lot as permanent parking could create an ongoing problem similar to what currently exists at Tamalpais/Madera/Sanford and Wornum/Tamal Vista Blvd. That is, DESPITE stop-control, people crossing frequently experience near-misses from right-turning vehicles.

While not strictly a CEQA issue, the Town and project developers need to evaluate traffic impacts and mitigations within a broader framework. The Village is a destination originally designed to be reached exclusively by automobiles. It is truly "at" Corte Madera, not a part of the town's fabric. Safe, comfortable access by foot and by cycle at ALL Redwood Hwy crossings will make for a livelier place and more interesting shopping experience. Where else can one combine a walk through an ecological reserve and a shopping trip? And every parking space not used by a local resident is available for a regional shopper!

Sincerely,
Cheryl Longinotti
From: Rick Fraites <ricfraites@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 10:24 AM
To: Phil Boyle
Subject: EIR Scoping, Village @ Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project
Attachments: Restoration Hardware EIR Scoping - Nov. 2016.pdf; ATT00001.htm
November 30, 2016

Phil Boyle, Senior Planner
Planning and Building Department
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925
Email: pboyle@tcmmail.org

Re: EIR Scoping, Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project

Mr. Boyle:

Community Marin Action Committee asks that the EIR for this project include the following:

- Impacts of sea level rise on the project area, including those predicted in scenarios under review by the County of Marin in its BayWAVE vulnerability assessment in which Corte Madera is participating, and how these would be addressed.
- How runoff from vehicles in the proposed new parking area in the gravel lot will be contained.
- Impacts on birds and wildlife in the marsh, in particular from vehicle and pedestrian activity, lighting, and noise in the parking lot.
- A description of traffic generated by the project, and impacts on the surrounding roadways and on the broader region. There should be an analysis of cumulative traffic impacts that includes projected traffic from the not-yet-leased Tam Ridge Residences.
- Discussion of need for, and impacts of, increased public transit to serve this area (note Nordstrom recent expansion and future Tam Ridge traffic) as an alternative to more car traffic.

Community Marin Action Committee is an advocacy group supporting policies in the document Community Marin 2013, published by several leading Marin County environmental organizations.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Yours truly,

Rick Fraites, chair
Phil,

We were appalled to hear that Restoration Hardware wants to pave 5+ acres used by wildlife. This is unacceptable.

Please do NOT approve yet another assault on wildlife.

We are also going to write a letter to the RH CEO indicating we will not purchase any more of their products if this paving moves forward.

Please stop.

Regards,

Michael and Ann Wylie
Novato, CA
Thanks for asking for public comments.

I think one thing which should be considered is the effect of paving/developing the gravel parking lot on the Bay itself. We just approved a $12 parcel tax to restore Bay wetlands. It seems as if developing the parking lot from gravel to landscaped hardscape is contrary to efforts to restore marshland around the Bay. At the moment the perimeter drive around the shopping center separates nature from developed property. From an aesthetic standpoint I think it is nice to keep it relatively undeveloped.

I think the geological effect of paving the area and causing more rain runoff should also be considered.

The effect of traffic in the area including along Redwood Highway (especially at the Wornum Drive intersection and the entrance to the shopping area with the Trader Joe's) and along Paradise Drive needs to be considered. It's already so dicey turning south when exiting Trader Joe's that I always drive down to Industrial Way and turn around there so that I can turn with a signal to go south on Redwood Highway.

It's also very difficult for pedestrians and bicyclists going East on Tamalpais to cross over 101. Pedestrian access to the bus stop there is also tricky. That should be part of the traffic study, too.
Phil Boyle

From: nick javaras <dealdawg@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 9:21 AM
To: Phil Boyle
Cc: Carla Condon; Michael Lappert; Sloan Bailey; James Andrews; Diane Furst
Subject: Restoration Hardware

To: Phil Boyle
From: Nick Javaras: 315 Willow Ave., Corte Madera
Re: Restoration hardware

Phil, I want to give you one big reason why Restoration Hardware should not to located in its current proposed footprint. But first I need to provide you with my credibility and why you should take my opinion into account. I was President and co-founder of Terranomics Retail Real Estate Company, originally headquartered in Corte Madera but for 25 years in San Francisco. Some of our projects in Marin County include the Cost Plus Shopping Center; the revitalization of Corte Madera Town Center (when the entire center court and wings were empty and the developer was foreclosed on) and my last project was the redevelopment of Strawberry Village.

I must quickly explain the difference between a "destination retailer as compared to an impulse retailer". A good example of an impulse retailer might be The Gap, most clothing stores, or any retailer selling low price point items as opposed to big ticket items (furniture, appliances, etc). A destination retailer is a store that the customer visits specifically for its product line which often are large dollar expenditures. Examples are Home Depot, Macy's home furnishings, etc. They often advertise through catalogs and mailers. Restoration Hardware is another good example of a destination retailer. These type of retailers can locate anywhere with good visibility and access as the customer is going to that store for a specific item in mind. And may visit it many times before making a purchase.

My point is as follows: There is no reason (other than Restoration being headquartered in Corte Madera) for them to be located like a department store anchor at the very valuable main entry point into the Town Center. I have researched the locations of all of their current new store prototypes and found that most of them are "free standing" buildings either in downtown areas or on a "ring road pad" in the outer part of a shopping center. In our case they are eliminating a huge portion of close-in and desirable parking spaces and in return are offering to pave, landscape and stripe the existing gravel lot which is a substantial distance from the main entry point. A great deal for them but not for the Town Center customer.

I have walked the path near the marsh on the eastern side of Town Center many times and for most of the year the parking spaces in that area are vacant. That is where this store belongs. Their customer reads their voluminous catalog and drives directly to the store to see the merchandise in person. As I mention they may make many trips before ever purchasing an item as most of their merchandise are "big ticket" items.
I can bring in some of the best retail gurus in the business today who would be happy to confirm my findings and opinion on this matter should the Town desire.
I encourage you to ask me any additional questions and am also happy to meet with you and others should that be necessary.

Thank your for giving this concern your consideration.
Dear Mr. Cusimano,

I am a resident of Inverness, not Corte Madera, but I regularly shop in Corte Madera. I just heard that Restoration Hardware wants to expand its building to displace 180 parking spaces. This is upsetting, and apparently not well thought through. I understand that the store management has offered to make the gravel overflow parking lot at the edge of the mall a permanent parking area. If this is a convenient location relative to the rest of the mall, why not move their store there?

It's distressing and short sighted to make changes based on one tenant, when so many others will be affected by this change. Do we really need another 27,000 square feet of this Restoration Hardware store in Corte Madera? My answer to that is a definite NO.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Ann Gessert
Hello Ann,

Thank you so much for taking the time to share your thoughts and concerns about the Restoration Hardware project. We will add your email to our project file and will share with the Planning Commission and Town Council at the appropriate time during this process.

Thank you again,

Todd

Todd Cusimano, Town Manager
Town of Corte Madera
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925

Dear Mr. Cusimano,

I am a resident of Inverness, not Corte Madera, but I regularly shop in Corte Madera. I just heard that Restoration Hardware wants to expand its building to displace 180 parking spaces. This is upsetting, and apparently not well thought through. I understand that the store management has offered to make the gravel overflow parking lot at the edge of the mall a permanent parking area. If this is a convenient location relative to the rest of the mall, why not move their store there?

It's distressing and short sighted to make changes based on one tenant, when so many others will be affected by this change. Do we really need another 27,000 square feet of this Restoration Hardware store in Corte Madera? My answer to that is a definite NO.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Ann Gessert
Phil -- I note the Restoration Hardware project and its impact on parking at the Village.

As a mitigation, the extension of SMART from Larkspur Landing to the Village would be a possibility. I would expect it would serve mostly the employees but that could reduce the total parking demand.

A station at San Clemente Drive could serve both the Village and over the freeway to the Town Center, another spot where parking is in short supply.

Hopefully you can get some financial help from the project into such a happening. Let me know if you would like to discuss this in more detail.

Bob

Robert L. Harrison
Transportation Planning
26 Ned's Way
Tiburon, CA 94920
415 435 2871
Phil Boyle

From: Shane McLennan <m_shane_m@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 26, 2016 3:10 PM
To: Adam Wolff
Subject: Fwd: Restoration Hardware

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: <m_shane_m@hotmail.com>
Date: November 26, 2016 at 11:06:16 AM PST
To: <building@temmail.org>
Subject: Restoration Hardware

I think this plan to build a huge Restoration Hardware at the Village is a REALLY BAD IDEA! If you take away 180 prime parking spaces, many people will start shopping somewhere else, I will. The parking at this Mail is very congested already, especially during holiday times. I think this is a HUGE mistake and not thought out thoroughly. Sincerely, a concerned Marin shopper

Sent from my iPhone
To Corte Madera Planning Department

Years ago, when The Village in Corte Madera was planned and then built, I vehemently opposed its site in the marsh and for years boycotted The Village. Now I hear that the gravel parking lot is to be paved over as a result of the planned, massive Restoration Hardware Store. Aren’t we trying to preserve the little marshland we have as a foil against future sea-level rise. At least the existing gravel lot is water permeable. We should not allow extra run-off of polluted water from a paved area into the Bay.

Thank you for considering the harmful ramifications of this plan.

Carol Felton

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sirs:

I am writing to let you know that I oppose the building of a 53,000 square foot Restoration Hardware store in the parking lot of the Village at Corte Madera. I do not think that this mall needs a large furniture store, the parking for the additional employees of a 53,000 square foot building, the additional traffic problems and the elimination of 180 prime parking spaces up front center in the mall. Further, the potential risk to the baylands risk zone wetlands and natural habitat of paving over the gravel lot that exists to add 435 parking spaces.

Thank you for your consideration. Ellen Courtien, Mill Valley
Dear Sir: I am writing to let you know that I oppose the building of a 53,000 square foot Restoration Hardware store in the parking lot of the Village at Corte Madera. I do not think that this mall needs a large furniture store, the parking for the additional employees of a 53,000 square foot building, the additional traffic problems and the elimination of 180 prime parking spaces up front center in the mall. Further, the potential risk to the baylands risk zone wetlands and natural habitat of paving over the gravel lot that exists.

Thank you for your consideration. Gail Consulter, Mill Valley
Re: Opposition to Restoration Hardware Expansion at the Village and request denial of plan amendment and zoning amendment

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Restoration Hardware (RH) proposes to build a 53,000-square-foot luxury showroom in the Corte Madera Village (CMV). Doing so will displace 181 parking spaces which they plan to offset by paving 428 spaces in an existing gravel lot.

A general plan amendment and zoning amendment is required to convert that space into additional parking spaces. Phil Boyle, a senior Corte Madera Town Planner, has advised that both of these amendments need to be justified in the application before being deemed complete for review, consideration and action.

- **Listed below are the adverse realities of this proposal**

1) The gravel lot is built on landfill around the wetlands. A demarcation line was placed in 2008 by the federal government which would place this marshland in a protected status from further bay development to preserve wildlife and serve as a buffer for rising sea levels.

   We need to maintain the wetlands as undeveloped in order to preserve the Bay. An aquatic pond is located next to the proposed parking lot - intensifying the land’s environmental sensitivity.

2) Local traffic already exceeds capacity at this area. Other drivers take this side road to avoid the congested Highway 101. RH’s project will increase traffic congestion beyond what is sustainable for the residents of Corte Madera - at 9,500 capacity.

3) The added parking convenience will cause further traffic. The VSC’s parking lots have reached unsustainable levels. RH’s attempt to shift parking to the north will force customers who wish to purchase from the stores located at the middle and southern area to make longer walking commutes to the Northern Marsh area. This will increase congestion as the shopping experience will be lengthened and will require even more parking spaces.

4) WinCup analogy causing decreased satisfaction of living. We have enough malls/shopping in Corte Madera. Corte Madera is trying to replace all shopping centers in Marin by being the conspicuous consumption capital of Northern California.
5) Increasing noise pollution will decrease the standard of living for locals. The decibel levels from the highway are already at 58 db. Increased traffic will heighten the decibel levels beyond what is sustainable for the residents.

6) Potential mitigation options if this project is forced on the residents of Corte Madera by the Town Council:

a.) Supply 300 electric charging stations + 2 large wind turbines over the shopping center or 5 MW of rooftop solar in Corte Madera at the CMV site to displace the increased Greenhouse Gases that will be emitted from increased traffic levels.

b.) Construct an 18-foot-high wall along the freeway to block unwanted 10 lane highway noise on the residents. San Rafael recently installed a highway noise barrier on 101 near downtown - much to the satisfaction of nearby residents.

c.) Include a Public Swimming Pool to relieve the stress added by this project, the congestion, and the WinCup monstrosity.

Please take into consideration all the negative externalities of this project before approving any application.

Best regards,

Tom Faust

Henry Faust

CC: Barbara Salzman
    Dick Spotswood
Phil Boyle

From: Adam Wolff
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 11:48 AM
To: Phil Boyle
Subject: FW: Restoration Hardware Scoping

FYI.

-----Original Message-----
From: Cheryl Longinotti [mailto:cslonginotti@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 11:44 AM
To: Adam Wolff
Subject: Restoration Hardware Scoping

Adam,
I would like to call attention to several factors which should be considered in the EIR for the Restoration Hardware project.

First of all, the EIR should evaluate the project impact on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), not just traffic volumes and level of service at intersections. VMT provides a better measure of environmental impact and is likely to be formally incorporated into CEQA guidelines during the life of the project (https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Revised_VMT_CEQA_Guidelines_Proposal_January_20_2016.pdf).

Secondly, the project is likely to increase turning conflicts at the entrances to the gravel lot.

a) for Redwood Hwy Path users: The entrances cross the Redwood Hwy multi-user path, which is a major north-south (CalParkTunnel/Larkspur Ferry to Bayside Corte Madera) and east-west (Bayside Corte Madera to Wornum Undercrossing/Sandra Marker Trail) connecting route used by school children, commuters, and those seeking recreation. The impact on safety for path users on foot and on cycles should be evaluated.

b) for people crossing Redwood Hwy, particularly at the gravel lot: Using the gravel lot as permanent parking could create an ongoing problem similar to what currently exists at Tamalpais/Madera/Sanford and Wornum/Tamal Vista Blvd. That is, DESPITE stop-control, people crossing frequently experience near-misses from right-turning vehicles.

While not strictly a CEQA issue, the Town and project developers need to evaluate traffic impacts and mitigations within a broader framework. The Village is a destination originally designed to be reached exclusively by automobiles. It is truly "at" Corte Madera, not a part of the town’s fabric. Safe, comfortable access by foot and by cycle at ALL Redwood Hwy crossings will make for a livelier place and more interesting shopping experience. Where else can one combine a walk through an ecological reserve and a shopping trip? And every parking space not used by a local resident is available for a regional shopper!

Sincerely,
Cheryl Longinotti
November 30, 2016

Phil Boyle, Senior Planner  
Planning and Building Department  
300 Tamalpais Drive  
Corte Madera, CA 94925  
Email: pboyle@tcmmail.org

Re: EIR Scoping, Village at Corte Madera Restoration Hardware Expansion Project

Mr. Boyle:

Community Marin Action Committee asks that the EIR for this project include the following:

- Impacts of sea level rise on the project area, including those predicted in scenarios under review by the County of Marin in its BayWAVE vulnerability assessment in which Corte Madera is participating, and how these would be addressed.
- How runoff from vehicles in the proposed new parking area in the gravel lot will be contained.
- Impacts on birds and wildlife in the marsh, in particular from vehicle and pedestrian activity, lighting, and noise in the parking lot.
- A description of traffic generated by the project, and impacts on the surrounding roadways and on the broader region. There should be an analysis of cumulative traffic impacts that includes projected traffic from the not-yet-leased Tam Ridge Residences.
- Discussion of need for, and impacts of, increased public transit to serve this area (note Nordstrom recent expansion and future Tam Ridge traffic) as an alternative to more car traffic.

Community Marin Action Committee is an advocacy group supporting policies in the document Community Marin 2013, published by several leading Marin County environmental organizations.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Yours truly,

Rick Fraites, chair
Phil,  

We were appalled to hear that Restoration Hardware wants to pave 5+ acres used by wildlife. This is unacceptable.

Please do NOT approve yet another assault on wildlife.

We are also going to write a letter to the RH CEO indicating we will not purchase any more of their products if this paving moves forward.

Please stop.

Regards,

Michael and Ann Wylie  
Novato, CA
Thanks for asking for public comments.

I think one thing which should be considered is the effect of paving/developing the gravel parking lot on the Bay itself. We just approved a $12 parcel tax to restore Bay wetlands. It seems as if developing the parking lot from gravel to landscaped hardscape is contrary to efforts to restore marshland around the Bay. At the moment the perimeter drive around the shopping center separates nature from developed property. From an aesthetic standpoint I think it is nice to keep it relatively undeveloped.

I think the geological effect of paving the area and causing more rain runoff should also be considered.

The effect of traffic in the area including along Redwood Highway (especially at the Wornum Drive intersection and the entrance to the shopping area with the Trader Joe's) and along Paradise Drive needs to be considered. It's already so dicey turning south when exiting Trader Joe's that I always drive down to Industrial Way and turn around there so that I can turn with a signal to go south on Redwood Highway.

It's also very difficult for pedestrians and bicyclists going East on Tamalpais to cross over 101. Pedestrian access to the bus stop there is also tricky. That should be part of the traffic study, too.
Phil, I want to give you one big reason why Restoration Hardware should not to located in its current proposed footprint. But first I need to provide you with my credibility and why you should take my opinion into account. I was President and co-founder of Terranomics Retail Real Estate Company, originally headquartered in Corte Madera but for 25 years in San Francisco. Some of our projects in Marin County include the Cost Plus Shopping Center; the revitalization of Corte Madera Town Center (when the entire center court and wings were empty and the developer was foreclosed on) and my last project was the redevelopment of Strawberry Village.

I must quickly explain the difference between a "destination retailer as compared to an impulse retailer". A good example of an impulse retailer might be The Gap, most clothing stores, or any retailer selling low price point items as opposed to big ticket items (furniture, appliances, etc). A destination retailer is a store that the customer visits specifically for its product line which often are large dollar expenditures. Examples are Home Depot, Macy's home furnishings, etc. They often advertise through catalogs and mailers. Restoration Hardware is another good example of a destination retailer. These type of retailers can locate anywhere with good visibility and access as the customer is going to that store for a specific item in mind. And may visit it many times before making a purchase.

My point is as follows: There is no reason (other than Restoration being headquartered in Corte Madera) for them to be located like a department store anchor at the very valuable main entry point into the Town Center. I have researched the locations of all of their current new store prototypes and found that most of them are "free standing" buildings either in downtown areas or on a "ring road pad" in the outer part of a shopping center. In our case they are eliminating a huge portion of close-in and desirable parking spaces and in return are offering to pave, landscape and stripe the existing gravel lot which is a substantial distance from the main entry point. A great deal for them but not for the Town Center customer.

I have walked the path near the marsh on the eastern side of Town Center many times and for most of the year the parking spaces in that area are vacant. That is where this store belongs. Their customer reads their voluminous catalog and drives directly to the store to see the merchandise in person. As I mention they may make many trips before ever purchasing an item as most of their merchandise are "big ticket" items.

I can bring in some of the best retail gurus in the business today who would be happy to confirm my findings and opinion on this matter should the Town desire.

I encourage you to ask me any additional questions and am also happy to meet with you and others should that be necessary.

Thank your for giving this concern your consideration.
Dear Mr. Cusimano,

I am a resident of Inverness, not Corte Madera, but I regularly shop in Corte Madera. I just heard that Restoration Hardware wants to expand its building to displace 180 parking spaces. This is upsetting, and apparently not well thought through. I understand that the store management has offered to make the gravel overflow parking lot at the edge of the mall a permanent parking area. If this is a convenient location relative to the rest of the mall, why not move their store there?

It's distressing and short sighted to make changes based on one tenant, when so many others will be affected by this change. Do we really need another 27,000 square feet of this Restoration Hardware store in Corte Madera? My answer to that is a definite NO.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Ann Gessert
Hello Ann,

Thank you so much for taking the time to share your thoughts and concerns about the Restoration Hardware project. We will add your email to our project file and will share with the Planning Commission and Town Council at the appropriate time during this process.

Thank you again,

Todd

Todd Cusimano, Town Manager
Town of Corte Madera
300 Tamalpais Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925

Dear Mr. Cusimano,

I am a resident of Inverness, not Corte Madera, but I regularly shop in Corte Madera. I just heard that Restoration Hardware wants to expand its building to displace 180 parking spaces. This is upsetting, and apparently not well thought through. I understand that the store management has offered to make the gravel overflow parking lot at the edge of the mall a permanent parking area. If this is a convenient location relative to the rest of the mall, why not move their store there?

It's distressing and short sighted to make changes based on one tenant, when so many others will be affected by this change. Do we really need another 27,000 square feet of this Restoration Hardware store in Corte Madera? My answer to that is a definite NO.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Ann Gessert
Phil -- I note the Restoration Hardware project and its impact on parking at the Village.

As a mitigation, the extension of SMART from Larkspur Landing to the Village would be a possibility. I would expect it would serve mostly the employees but that could reduce the total parking demand.

A station at San Clemente Drive could serve both the Village and over the freeway to the Town Center, another spot where parking is in short supply.

Hopefully you can get some financial help from the project into such a happening. Let me know if you would like to discuss this in more detail.

Bob

Robert L. Harrison
Transportation Planning
26 Ned's Way
Tiburon, CA 94920
415 435 2871
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: <m_shane_m@hotmail.com>
Date: November 26, 2016 at 11:06:16 AM PST
To: <building@temmail.org>
Subject: Restoration Hardware

I think this plan to build a huge Restoration Hardware at the Village is a REALLY BAD IDEA! If you take away 180 prime parking spaces, many people will start shopping somewhere else, I will. The parking at this Mall is very congested already, especially during holiday times. I think this is a HUGE mistake and not thought out thoroughly.

Sincerely, a concerned Marin shopper

Sent from my iPhone
To Corte Madera Planning Department

Years ago, when The Village in Corte Madera was planned and then built, I vehemently opposed its site in the marsh and for years boycotted The Village. Now I hear that the gravel parking lot is to be paved over as a result of the planned, massive Restoration Hardware Store. Aren’t we trying to preserve the little marshland we have as a foil against future sea-level rise. At least the existing gravel lot is water permeable. We should not allow extra run-off of polluted water from a paved area into the Bay.

Thank you for considering the harmful ramifications of this plan.

Carol Felton

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sirs:

I am writing to let you know that I oppose the building of a 53,000 square foot Restoration Hardware store in the parking lot of the Village at Corte Madera. I do not think that this mall needs a large furniture store, the parking for the additional employees of a 53,000 square foot building, the additional traffic problems and the elimination of 180 prime parking spaces up front center in the mall. Further, the potential risk to the baylands risk zone wetlands and natural habitat of paving over the gravel lot that exists to add 435 parking spaces.

Thank you for your consideration. Ellen Courtien, Mill Valley
Dear Sir: I am writing to let you know that I oppose the building of a 53,000 square foot Restoration Hardware store in the parking lot of the Village at Corte Madera. I do not think that this mall needs a large furniture store, the parking for the additional employees of a 53,000 square foot building, the additional traffic problems and the elimination of 180 prime parking spaces up front center in the mall. Further, the potential risk to the baylands risk zone wetlands and natural habitat of paving over the gravel lot that exists.

Thank you for your consideration. Gail Consulter, Mill Valley
Dear Planning Commissioners,

Restoration Hardware (RH) proposes to build a 53,000-square-foot luxury showroom in the Corte Madera Village (CMV). Doing so will displace 181 parking spaces which they plan to offset by paving 428 spaces in an existing gravel lot.

A general plan amendment and zoning amendment is required to convert that space into additional parking spaces. Phil Boyle, a senior Corte Madera Town Planner, has advised that both of these amendments need to be justified in the application before being deemed complete for review, consideration and action.

- Listed below are the adverse realities of this proposal

1) The gravel lot is built on landfill surround the wetlands. A demarcation line was placed in 2008 by the federal government which would place this marshland in a protected status from further bay development to preserve wildlife and serve as a buffer for rising sea levels.

   We need to maintain the wetlands as undeveloped in order to preserve the Bay. An aquatic pond is located next to the proposed parking lot - intensifying the land’s environmental sensitivity.

2) Local traffic already exceeds capacity at this area. Other drivers take this side road to avoid the congested Highway 101. RH’s project will increase traffic congestion beyond what is sustainable for the residents of Corte Madera - at 9,500 capacity.

3) The added parking convenience will cause further traffic. The VSC’s parking lots have reached unsustainable levels. RH’s attempt to shift parking to the north will force customers who wish to purchase from the stores located at the middle and southern area to make longer walking commutes to the Northern Marsh area. This will increase congestion as the shopping experience will be lengthened and will require even more parking spaces.

4) WinCup analogy causing decreased satisfaction of living. We have enough malls/shopping in Corte Madera. Corte Madera is trying to replace all shopping centers in Marin by being the conspicuous consumption capital of Northern California.
5) Increasing noise pollution will decrease the standard of living for locals. The decibel levels from the highway are already at 58 db. Increased traffic will heighten the decibel levels beyond what is sustainable for the residents.

6) Potential mitigation options if this project is forced on the residents of Corte Madera by the Town Council:

   a.) Supply 300 electric charging stations + 2 large wind turbines over the shopping center or 5 MW of rooftop solar in Corte Madera at the CMV site to displace the increased Greenhouse Gases that will be emitted from increased traffic levels.

   b.) Construct an 18-foot-high wall along the freeway to block unwanted 10 lane highway noise on the residents. San Rafael recently installed a highway noise barrier on 101 near downtown - much to the satisfaction of nearby residents.

   c.) Include a Public Swimming Pool to relieve the stress added by this project, the congestion, and the WinCup monstrosity.

Please take into consideration all the negative externalities of this project before approving any application.

Best regards,

Tom Faust

[Signature]

Henry Faust

[Signature]

CC: Barbara Salzman
    Dick Spotswood
Dear Mr. Woff,

I find shocking the proposed change to the Village Shopping Center to allow for a 53000 sq ft Restoration Hardware, given the impact on available parking and the wetlands. Please include my opposition to the expansion as being out of kilter with the size of the shopping center, and paving over the gravel lot as detrimental to the natural setting and ongoing health of the wetlands. Already the traffic and amount of parking lots at both the Village and Town Center are not sustainable.

Best regards.

Kate McCormick
Mill Valley
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