

MINUTES
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, JULY 12, 2010

Mayor Krolik called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. at the Hillsborough Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue, Hillsborough, California.

ROLL CALL: Present: Krolik, Kasten, Fannon, Regan, Benton

MINUTES: The minutes of the June 14, 2010 City Council meeting were approved as submitted.

PRESENTATIONS:

- Mayor Krolik thanked George and Anna Hsu for their very generous donation to the Carolands Gatehouse Project to preserve one of Hillsborough's most charming and beloved treasures. Police Chief Matt O'Connor provided a Power Point presentation on the demolition and reconstruction of the Gatehouse, which is being used as a Police substation, and presented the Hsus with a plaque for their generous donation. Mayor Krolik presented the Hsus with a Certificate of Appreciation and a framed photo of the Hsu family in front of the reconstructed Gatehouse. The Hsus presented Mayor Krolik, the Town, the Police Department, and Sally and Jim Meakin with a photo album of the Carolands Gatehouse Donor's Open House.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

On motion of Councilmember Fannon, seconded by Councilmember Benton, and unanimous on voice vote, Consent Calendar items 1 through 8 were approved.

1. MONTHLY CLAIMS: JUNE 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2010

The monthly claims for the month of June 2010, in the amount of \$6,724,741.19 were approved as submitted.

2. QUARTERLY TREASURER'S REPORT

The Treasurer's Report for the quarter ending June 30, 2010, was approved.

3. QUARTERLY INTEREST RATE PRODUCTS (SWAP) REPORT

The Interest Rate Products (SWAP) Report for the quarter ending June 30, 2010, was accepted.

4. RESOLUTION AMENDING THE LANGUAGE IN SECTION 14 OF THE JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT (JPA) ESTABLISHING THE CENTRAL COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT (CCFD) TO CLARIFY THE DISBURSEMENT OF REVENUES

The resolution amending the language in Section 14 of the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) establishing the Central County Fire Department (CCFD) to clarify the disbursement of revenues was adopted.

5. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE REPORT OF WEED ABATEMENT CHARGES AND ORDERING COLLECTION

The resolution confirming the report of weed abatement charges and ordering collection was adopted.

6. RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONTRACT WITH BROWN AND CALDWELL FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM MASTER PLAN (BURLINGAME PORTION)

The resolution amending the contract with Brown and Caldwell for the completion of the Master Plan Study (Burlingame Wastewater Treatment Plant Tributary) in an

amount not to exceed \$14,000, and allocating the same from the Sewer Fund, was adopted.

7. RESOLUTION AWARDING THE 2009-2010 SANITARY SEWER CLEANING AND VIDEO INSPECTION PROJECT – PHASE VII (A) TO ROTO-ROOTER

The resolution awarding the contract for the 2009-2010 Sanitary Sewer Cleaning and Video Inspection Project – Phase VII (A) to Roto-Rooter in the amount of \$157,670, with a contingency in the amount of \$31,534, for a total construction budget of \$189,204, and allocating the same from the Sewer Fund was adopted.

8. RESOLUTION AWARDING THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY CONSERVATION BLOCK GRANT (EECBG) PUMP MOTOR REPLACEMENT PROJECT TO PUMP REPAIR, INC.

The resolution awarding the contract for the Energy Efficiency Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) Water Pump Motor Replacement Project in the amount of \$94,184, with a contingency in the amount of \$5,000, for a total construction budget of \$99,184, and allocating \$48,184 from the Water Fund was adopted.

NEW BUSINESS:

9. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF GREEN WASTE CARTS

Public Works Director Martha DeBry stated that the Town has granted a franchise to a new waste hauler, Recology, effective January 2011, and in order to reduce start-up costs, the Town can purchase the estimated 3,500 existing green waste carts from Republic Waste Services for \$10 per cart. She added that the cost of the carts would be factored into the final rate application by Republic to the Town. She reported that it is anticipated that the Town will run a deficit with Republic, which can be paid off with a roughly \$200,000 reserve established from the Ox Mountain settlement. She stated that the purchase of the carts is estimated to save \$0.20 per residence per month over the life of the franchise.

Councilmember Benton asked how the Town would get reimbursed for the carts. Ms. DeBry replied that the Town would get reimbursed through the refuse rates and the cost would be paid off within a year.

Mayor Krolik asked if there would be a problem with critters getting into the carts. Ms. DeBry replied that the problem with critters getting into the carts is somewhat infrequent and that the cost would be \$100 each for a more critter proof cart.

On motion of Councilmember Fannon, seconded by Councilmember Regan, and unanimous on voice vote, the resolution approving the purchase of the green waste carts and approving the costs to be included in the 2010 rate application to be submitted by Republic Waste Services was adopted.

10. APPROVAL OF HILLSBOROUGH BEAUTIFICATION FOUNDATION'S PROPOSED DESIGN FOR THE NEW PLACE ISLAND

Public Works Director Martha DeBry stated that the Hillsborough Beautification Foundation (HBF) is proposing to rehabilitate the New Place island located at the corner of Eucalyptus Avenue and New Place Road immediately in front of North School. She reported that the island is currently landscaped, but over the years the plants have become aged and overgrown. She explained that the project includes adding cherry trees, a variety of plants, a walking path and benches, and keeping the existing alder tree. She stated that the new crosswalk plan would encourage pedestrians to walk across the island to promote pedestrian safety. She added that the work should be completed by the fall.

Mayor Krolik stated that the proposed design was a beautiful plan and asked if the cherry trees would be messy. HBF member Maryellie Johnson replied that the cherry trees are not messy and that the tree canopy would not obstruct visibility. She added that low growing and native plants would be included in the landscaping also and that permeable pavers would be installed in the island walkway. HBF member Donna Abrahamson stated that the landscaping maintenance would be low, the water usage would not increase, and the island could act as a staging area for the school. Ms. Johnson added that the proposed design draws the eye inward rather than outward and discourages jaywalking.

On motion of Councilmember Regan, seconded by Vice Mayor Kasten, and unanimous on voice vote, the proposed design for the New Place island was approved.

PUBLIC HEARING:

11. FUNDRAISING EVENT PERMIT APPLICATION 10-03 FOR THE SAN MATEO ARBORETUM SOCIETY'S 35TH ANNUAL HILLSBOROUGH/SAN MATEO GARDEN TOUR

City Clerk Miyuki Yokoyama stated that the San Mateo Arboretum Society submitted a fundraising application for their 35th Annual Hillsborough/San Mateo Garden Tour on Saturday, September 11, 2010, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at 1585 Marlborough Road, 308 Alberta Way, and 120 Roblar Avenue.

Ms. Yokoyama stated that public notices have been sent to homeowners located within a 500-foot radius of the three locations and that one letter of concern about traffic and parking issues has been received regarding the 1585 Marlborough Road location. She added that staff recommends approval of the application subject to the conditions of the Police, Fire and Building Departments.

Councilmember Fannon asked if the parking concerns at 1585 Marlborough Road have been resolved. Police Captain Mark O'Connor stated the parking concerns have been resolved at 1585 Marlborough Road.

Mayor Krolik opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

On motion of Vice Mayor Kasten, seconded by Councilmember Fannon, and unanimous on voice vote, Fundraising Event Permit Application 10-03 for the San Mateo Arboretum Society's 35th Annual Hillsborough/San Mateo Garden Tour on Saturday, September 11, 2010, subject to the conditions recommended by staff, was approved.

12. FUNDRAISING EVENT PERMIT APPLICATION 10-04 FOR THE COYOTE POINT MUSEUM DINNER AND AUCTION

City Clerk Miyuki Yokoyama stated that Coyote Point Museum submitted a fundraising application for a dinner and auction on Friday, September 24, 2010, from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. at 190 Bridge Road.

Ms. Yokoyama stated that public notices have been sent to homeowners located within a 500-foot radius and that no comments have been received. She added that staff recommends approval of the application subject to the conditions of the Police, Fire and Building Departments.

Mayor Krolik opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

On motion of Councilmember Fannon, seconded by Vice Mayor Kasten, and unanimous on voice vote, Fundraising Event Permit Application 10-04 for the Coyote

Point Museum's dinner and auction on Friday, September 24, 2010, subject to the conditions recommended by staff, was approved.

13. RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (MND) AND MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN (MMP) AND RESOLUTION APPROVING THE DESIGN FOR THE 3115 RALSTON AVENUE RESIDENTIAL PROJECT (MARK SINCLAIR, BREWER DEVELOPMENT LLC / HABITAT ARCHITECTURE / MICHAEL CALLAN LANDSCAPE)

City Attorney Norm Book recused himself due to a potential conflict of interest. He announced that the Town will be represented by Special Counsel Joan Cassman.

Mayor Krolik announced the agenda item and outlined the public hearing process.

Director of Building and Planning Liz Cullinan provided a Power Point presentation and stated that the project description for the 3115 Ralston Avenue project is a new two story Mediterranean style residence of approximately 11,816 square feet in floor area (15.63% Floor Area Ratio). She stated that landscaping would include new plantings, tree removal, a new tennis court, swimming pool and terraces, and grading of approximately 3,595 cubic yards of cut and 2,660 cubic yards of fill earth material, with approximately 685 cubic yards of exported earth materials.

Ms. Cullinan stated that the total square footage of the project is approximately 12,941 square feet in size, with approximately 2,000 square feet of the residence below grade. She added that setbacks are approximately 70 feet from Ralston Avenue, 153 feet from Pinehill Road, 22 feet on the right side and 35 feet at the rear, which exceed the setbacks required by code.

Ms. Cullinan reported that a total of 35 trees are proposed for removal, and, of these, removal of 18 trees are 12 inches in diameter at breast height and greater. She stated that the majority of these trees are Eucalyptus, are in fair condition, and range from 12 inches to 26 inches in diameter, with the removal of one 24-inch box tree. She added that there would be a planting of 106 new trees ranging from 15-gallon to 48-inch box sizes. Ms. Cullinan stated that a series of three retaining walls and a tennis court are also proposed.

Ms. Cullinan explained that since submittal of the application, many changes have been facilitated in order to address neighbor concerns, and as a result of continuing mediation efforts by staff on behalf of the interested parties, the May 27, 2010, and July 1, 2010, plans reflect the increased setback from Ralston Avenue from approximately 55 feet to 70 feet at the closest point, an "S"-shaped driveway to allow for less direct views of the proposed residence from Ralston Avenue, berming along the driveway allowing for additional screening and the elevation of screen trees, preservation of two oak trees within the front property line setback area, a reduced total square footage by approximately 1,500 square feet or 10%, a reduced floor area by 902 square feet resulting in an floor area ratio (FAR) of 15.63%, relocation of the tennis court back approximately 10 additional feet from the Pinehill Road property line, and reduced off-haul of earth materials by approximately 250 cubic yards.

Ms. Cullinan stated that on June 17, 2010, the Architecture and Design Review Board (ADRB) approved the project through a 4:0 vote with conditions requiring enhanced landscaping along Pinehill Road and Administrative Review of the entry gate and mailbox.

Ms. Cullinan informed the City Council that there are three decision-making components, including the Initial Study for review and consideration, the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) which would need to be adopted by resolution, and design review which would also need to be adopted by resolution.

Ms. Cullinan summarized the public outreach, which included four public notices that were sent beginning January 15, 2010, 26 properties were provided notification of the project, the public notice was posted at the Town's three bulletin boards beginning March 8, 2010, a neighborhood meeting was held by the applicant on January 28, 2010, and story poles were erected on February 8, 2010.

Ms. Cullinan reported that the original environmental documents were deemed sufficient; however, staff reviewed 35 points presented in public comment relating to the environmental documents, resulting in the 13 specific enhancements noted in the Staff Report. She added that other documents were provided for City Council review, including additional supplemental memoranda from the City Engineer and Cornerstone Earth Group documenting site stability.

Ms. Cullinan stated that the Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., the Edward L. Pack Associates and the Hillsborough Police Department noise studies and readings indicating that daytime tennis court noise is within acceptable single family residential decibel levels. She added that since Hillsborough does not allow lighting for tennis courts, tennis court noise does not present a significant or potentially significant environmental impact needing mitigation. She further stated that the Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc. noise report indicates that construction noise would exceed the California Model Ordinance standards, but that the Town of Hillsborough has not adopted the California Model Ordinance standards. She explained that the Town instead has adopted specific community thresholds which serve as a benchmark for determining a potentially significant noise impact under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). She stated that compliance with the local noise ordinance establishes that such noise impacts are not a significant environmental impact. She added that comments regarding noise that does not exceed the Hillsborough noise standards constitute opinion and are appropriately addressed through enhancement measures.

Ms. Cullinan stated that the April 22, 2010 letter from Bexton Associates recommended reducing the size of the house, enlarging setbacks, reducing coverage, increasing the setback of the tennis court, and relocating the driveway on Ralston Avenue to provide additional screening from trees. She added that although aesthetic impacts were not found significant in the MND, the May 27, 2010, and July 1, 2010, revised plans reflect these changes.

Ms. Cullinan explained that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. She reported that the Town is not aware of specific new projects that may be under construction at the same time within the same vicinity as the proposed project. She stated that the California Environmental Quality Act does not require speculation or a cumulative analysis of projects that are not reasonably foreseeable.

Ms. Cullinan stated that for drainage and erosion control, interim and permanent erosion control measures in the proposed mitigation measures, management of the volume and quality of drainage run-off, and detainment of any excess run-off from the site to pre-development levels are required.

Ms. Cullinan reported that the June 10, 2010 geotechnical investigation by Earth Investigations Consultants found that the project is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint, there is no evidence of landslides, the site is underlain by stable bedrock, and that groundwater was not encountered. She stated that review by the City Engineer confirms that the geotechnical reports provide adequate information for the project and that peer review conducted by Cornerstone Earth Group dated July 7, 2010, June 15, 2010, and June 4, 2010, supports the conclusions of the June 10, 2010 Earth Investigations Consultants and J. Yang and Engineers studies.

Ms. Cullinan introduced City Engineer Cyrus Kianpour.

Mr. Kianpour noted his presentation would address the issues of drainage and increase of impervious area, which were brought up in the geotechnical letters submitted by Berlogar Geotechnical Consultants and Cotton, Shire and Associates and discussed at the ADRB meeting. He provided a Power Point presentation and background on the original geotechnical report prepared by J. Yang and Associates, as well as the Town's peer review of the report by Cornerstone Group. He provided a cross section display of the project site with and without the grading and improvements proposed. He stated that the geotechnical investigation report covered the site history, review of geological maps and photos, a site conditions field review, a geotechnical investigation, and observations during construction. He then reported on the site history including information on the formations visible on the property and the field investigations completed. He added that the purposes of field investigations are to view the conditions and then find what lies beneath the site. He stated that during the field investigations completed by the applicant's geotechnical firm, a total of nine exploratory holes were drilled, all of which encountered bedrock.

Mr. Kianpour addressed the letter from Cotton, Shire and Associates, which raised the issue of the tennis court as a potential instability area. He stated that two exploration bores were drilled in the tennis court area to depths of 11.5 feet and 10 feet and that the drilling encountered bedrock. He displayed a cross section showing areas where the drilling occurred and where bedrock was hit. He stated that the letters submitted by Mr. Wilson's representatives hypothesize about landslides based on inspections from the property perimeter rather than based on actual soil samples. He continued to explain the process of geotechnical investigations and exploratory work and stated that, in his opinion, there are no landslides present on the property and there is a change in land formation across Pinehill Road. He stated that as for drainage and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements there would be no increase in the amount of runoff between pre-development and post-development flows. He added that there will be over 1,000 square feet of increased impervious area. He explained that a new drainage inlet was installed at the Town's costs on Pinehill Road which corrected the runoff issues. Mr. Kianpour showed photos of the area. He reviewed the Town's requirements and explained that at the design stage, this amount of detail relating to drainage and NPDES requirements is typically not required.

Mr. Kianpour turned the presentation back to Ms. Cullinan.

Ms. Cullinan stated that in order to approve the project, the City Council first needs to adopt the MND and MMP on the finding that on the basis of the whole record there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and the MND reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis, and that the additional information and enhanced mitigation measures contained in the revised MND do not create a new significant environmental effect and are not necessary to mitigate a significant environmental effect.

Ms. Cullinan explained that the key elements of approval of the design are that it meets the Zoning Code, General Plan, and Design Guidelines, and that these documents require that the project be compatible with the neighborhood. She added that the design must also be consistent with quantitative development standards set forth in the Municipal Code (i.e. height, setbacks, and size), be sensitive to the environment, the topography of the site and surrounding buildings, be of high quality materials, and be unique and historically accurate architecturally.

Ms. Cullinan stated the project meets the Zoning Code/Development Standards compliance as the proposal is within the height, parking and coverage requirements, is under the permitted floor area, and exceeds required setbacks. She reported that the project meets the General Plan and Design Guidelines neighborhood compatibility as there is no set definition of "neighborhood" within the Code. She explained that a neighborhood can be defined as a district or area with distinctive characteristics that distinguish it from other community areas and that may include physical barriers, the

surrounding area or vicinity, or by viewscape (visibility amongst properties), walkability, previously established social networks and terrain.

Ms. Cullinan explained that quantitative factors are but one consideration, and are not the sole factor in determining compatibility and massing impacts on a neighborhood, as architecture, landscaping, siting and terrain also need to be considered. She reported that setbacks within the neighborhood vary widely and appear to be patterned in response to topography and view opportunities. She added that varying rather than uniform setbacks are a component of this neighborhood's character and that the proposed residence falls within the range of established neighborhood setbacks.

Ms. Cullinan reported that visual massing of the proposed project from Pinehill Road would not be out of character with other homes in the neighborhood, as the left side setback for the residence is approximately 153 feet, a generous perimeter landscaping exists at this property line, and the site slopes upward from Pinehill Road. She added that massing of the proposed project from Ralston Avenue would not be out of character with other homes in the neighborhood, as the front setback for the residence is approximately 70 feet, the proposed driveway is curvilinear, the front-most elevation is a small percentage (5%) of the width of the property frontage, and generous perimeter landscaping exists at this property line and within the front setback area.

Ms. Cullinan explained that in regards to massing and floor area, the proposed residence is divided into segments with staggered and varying setbacks, thereby breaking up and reducing the visual appearance and massing. She stated that the proposed residence would, therefore, represent a less than significant increase in size and massing and be generally compatible with the massing in the neighborhood. She further stated that due to the architecture, the massing, the landscaping and the siting of the proposed residence, the project does not appear to overwhelm the neighborhood and maintains the character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Cullinan reported that the original neighborhood surveys conducted by staff utilized Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and San Mateo County Assessor's information to provide general guidance to the ADRB. She explained that in light of the heightened interest in quantitative neighborhood development standards, staff has refined the original survey to incorporate approved plans where available, and, as a result, there are differences between the first surveys and the final surveys. She stated that staff's primary survey is based upon properties within a viewscape of one another and that staff conducted a second survey including additional properties at the request of interested members of the public and the applicant. Ms. Cullinan provided slides showing the viewscape analysis map, and three expanded analysis maps.

Ms. Cullinan stated that the refined survey results show that the average size home within the viewscape survey is approximately 8,814 square feet or 9.7% FAR with specific sizes ranging from 2,556 to 13,938 square feet and 2.93% to 15.0% FAR. She further stated that the average size home within the expanded survey is approximately 7,417 square feet or 9.3% FAR with specific sizes ranging from 2,556 to 17,900 square feet and 2.83% to 22% FAR. She added that the average street setback is approximately 63 feet within the viewscape neighborhood survey and 95 feet within the expanded neighborhood survey. She reported that individual property setbacks range from 25 feet to 90 feet in the viewscape neighborhood survey and 25 feet to 390 feet in the expanded neighborhood survey.

Mayor Krolik asked which survey was requested by the neighbors. Ms. Cullinan replied that the expanded survey was a result of the requests from the neighbors and the applicant.

Councilmember Benton asked what the mean was for the surveys. Ms. Cullinan replied that staff would work on providing the mean to the City Council.

Ms. Cullinan stated that while the application exceeds the average home size, it is similar in size to a number of homes within both surveyed areas, including within close

proximity. She further stated that the Pinehill Road street setback exceeds the average in both surveyed areas, and the Ralston Avenue street setback exceeds the surveyed areas within the viewscape neighborhood and is within an approximate 26% range of the setbacks within the extended survey. Ms. Cullinan provided charts of the setbacks, lot sizes, floor area, and FAR percentage from the viewscape and expanded analyses, showing that the project's standards fall within the ranges of established standards within the neighborhood.

Ms. Cullinan stated that it should be noted that a number of surveys have been presented and results will vary depending on the methodologies used as evidenced by the differences between surveys using the GIS/Assessor's information and plan sets. She added that surveys should be used as general guiding tools, but not the sole and definitive elements of neighborhood compatibility.

Ms. Cullinan stated that in regards to sensitivity to the environment and the topography of the site and surrounding buildings, existing trees in poor condition will be replaced on a nearly 3:1 ratio with larger trees of more appropriate species to the site and the Town. She added that healthy perimeter trees are proposed to be maintained. She explained that the proposed residence would occupy roughly the same footprint of the existing two story home. She stated that land disturbance associated with the new home would, therefore, be significantly less than if the residence was located on a different portion of the site. She further stated that as documented in the Initial Study (IS) and MND, the proposed improvements have been designed and environmentally mitigated to facilitate the protection of environmental resources.

Ms. Cullinan reported that the ADRB and public commenters acknowledged that the proposal is of a high quality design and utilizes quality construction materials such as wood, copper and stone. She added that while the proposal is grand, it is not overly opulent and reflects style and details appropriate to its historical architectural style.

Ms. Cullinan stated that the proposal has historically accurate architecture as it includes arched windows and doors, wooden doors, low pitched tile roof and high quality materials including clad wood windows, Redlands clay tile roof, copper gutters, downspouts and chimney caps, custom garage and entry doors and custom roof eave detailing, which are common features of the Mediterranean style of architecture.

Ms. Cullinan stated that the proposal is unique to the neighborhood as there is a wide variety of housing styles and sizes within the neighborhood including Tudor, Mediterranean, and French. She further stated that while the construction materials and style have similarities to other homes in the neighborhood (i.e. stucco, tile, wood windows, copper gutters), the siting and specific architecture (such as bermed landscaping, a motor court and a porte cochere) is unique to the neighborhood. She stated that the differences of the proposed setbacks with those in the neighborhood create additional diversity in siting, enhancing the varying patterns within the neighborhood.

Ms. Cullinan reported that a series of public comments have been received and that they have been included in the City Council agenda packet and that additional comments that were received after the agenda packet distribution were placed on the dais for the Councilmembers' review. She explained that the primary public comments were related to environmental issues, including aesthetic, construction, geologic, biological, and geology and soils impacts.

Ms. Cullinan reported that a letter dated September 8, 2009, from Timberline Tree Service, Inc. verified deadwood and acacia removal. She stated that a site inspection by the Town Consulting Landscape Architect on May 26, 2010, noted removal of diseased and invasive trees all under 18 inches in diameter. She added that issues relating to limb removal on neighboring properties are outside of the purview of the ADRB and City Council.

Ms. Cullinan recommended opening the public hearing and receiving final comments on the environmental and design documents, and adopting the two resolutions approving the MND and MMP and design of the project.

Councilmember Regan noted the proposed off-haul of 685 cubic yards and asked how much each truck would carry and if a truck route had been determined. Ms. Cullinan responded that each truck would carry approximately ten cubic yards of earth material and that the off-haul route was included in the environmental document. Councilmember Regan stated that it would then take approximately 70 truckloads to haul the earth material.

Councilmember Benton asked if there would be other construction projects in the area at the same time, such as 3000 Ralston Avenue. Ms. Cullinan replied that that the 3000 Ralston Avenue project would not be in the construction phase which would generate large amounts of construction traffic.

Mayor Krolik announced that the applicant would now make his presentation.

Mark Sinclair introduced his architect, Alex Mortazavi, and his attorney, Bart Hechtman.

Mr. Hechtman commented that the Wilsons hired Land Use Counsel Steve Mattas for issues regarding compliance with CEQA. He stated that staff prepared the MND and MMP and that the individual environmental issues were discussed in the staff report. He further stated that his letters also summarize the environmental issues in the City Council agenda packet. He highlighted a few issues. He stated that courts have held that it is a misuse of CEQA to use the environmental review process as an instrument to stop development and that is what has happened here. He reported that responses regarding issues in the MND on some occasions were received late as experienced at the ADRB meetings, causing staff to respond on the fly, and he commented that staff did an excellent job responding. He stated that courts have also held that City Councils must determine the credibility of expert opinions and that the Councilmembers are entitled to decide if Mr. Mattas' opinions are credible. He explained that as City Attorney for Los Altos Hills, Mr. Mattas allowed 67 homes to be built using CEQA's categorical exemption, including one home that is larger than the Horta proposed residence. He stated that the noise from the proposed tennis court is less than the Town's code and that the Town prohibits tennis court lighting and, consequently, tennis will not be played at night. Mr. Hechtman reported that a photo from 1937 was presented, which showed a supposed spring flowing suggesting the potential for a landslide, but he stated that there is no spring near the property, only a drainage pipe along Pinehill Road. He stated that a single family home is exempt from CEQA as the State legislature is not focused on environmental impacts from a single family home. He added that the project has no significant impact on the environment as mitigation measures have been imposed and the MND and MMP can be adopted. He reported that Brewer Development and Mr. and Mrs. Wilson of 3080 Ralston Avenue have been negotiating the design for months and he was hoping to reach an agreement before bringing it before the City Council, but reaching an agreement with the Wilsons was unsuccessful even after agreeing to 24 changes to the design.

Mr. Hechtman turned over the presentation to Mark Sinclair.

Mr. Sinclair provided a Power Point presentation and reviewed some of the positive comments received on the design of the Horta residence. He also reviewed the aesthetic value of the existing house, cost driven in the 1950s, and the proposed house, architecturally driven as a 1920s home. He reported on the evolution of the neighborhood, comparing square footage, FAR, setbacks, tennis courts, heights and hardscape for 3080 Ralston Avenue, 2755 Ralston Avenue, and 3030 Ralston Avenue. He stated that the proposed project is not changing the neighborhood, as it has already been changed and he stated that the design is based on guidelines and the precedent set by new developments in the neighborhoods. Mr. Sinclair stated that in 1997, the Wilsons built under the same guidelines, became the largest house,

maintained a setback of 73 feet, set the precedent, and forever changed the tree-lined street. He showed before and after aerial photos of the tree removal at the Wilsons' property at 3080 Ralston Avenue and stated that privacy was removed as a result of the trees being eliminated.

Mr. Sinclair commented on the unanimous 4:0 vote by the ADRB at the June 17, 2010 ADRB meeting in favor of the project, and stated that the ADRB's decision was based on the MND report, which included staff's extensive research and analysis and shows no significant impacts on the environment or on the neighborhood. He stated that the decision was also based on the design being well within the development standards, compatibility with the neighborhood, period architecture, and use of quality materials.

Mr. Sinclair also reviewed the various design changes, including relocating the pavilion, swimming pool, barbeque and outdoor kitchen area, removing the outdoor counter area and bar, reducing the FAR and overall square footage, increasing the setback on Ralston Avenue and the tennis court, providing more screening, eliminating the exercise room, reducing the basement, reducing the visual FAR, providing more screening, accentuating the "S" shaped driveway, adding a four-foot tall landscape berm with three trees to add height and taller screening, saving two additional oak trees, and changing trees from 36-inch box to 48-inch box. Mr. Sinclair provided photos showing the landscape screening compatibility of the existing screening at 3115 Ralston Avenue and in the neighborhood.

Mr. Sinclair reviewed the change to the tennis court, which included increasing the setback by 10 feet, and he stated that the tennis court is 22 feet 10 inches above Pinehill Road and he stated that the report shows that there is no impact for sound. He added that tennis courts are very compatible with residential living, and no where else is this more evident than in this neighborhood. He stated that the Edward L. Pack Associates, Inc. report found that the noise levels will be below the existing ambient hourly average and hourly maximum noise levels at the neighboring properties and at 50 feet typical noise levels from a tennis game would not exceed typical daytime noise levels in the neighborhood.

Mr. Sinclair also reviewed the averaging versus compatibility guidelines and facts for neighborhoods. He addressed the hardscape concerns and stated that drainage has been engineered and poses no impact and that the drainage is better than a majority of the homes in the neighborhood. He also addressed the landslide concerns and stated that there were two separate independent soils reports which found no risk of landslides, nine total borings found bedrock and new retaining walls and the building foundation will increase stabilization. He stated that the neighborhood outreach resulted in 24 design changes. He questioned the petition to oppose the project and asked whether it was fair or dishonest. He stated that the ADRB voted 4:0 to approve the project and he stated that at the March 1, 2010 ADRB meeting, ADRB Chair Mark Heine stated that the design fits well within the existing context and was appropriate to the lot and the neighborhood.

Mr. Sinclair thanked the City Council for their time.

Joel Baldwin, Engineering Geologist for Earth Investigations Consultants, reviewed his June 10, 2010 geotechnical investigation, noting that the area is diverse in its geologic setting and that the property is comprised of resistant Franciscan Sandstone. He explained that during the exploration process, bedrock was hit at 5-1/2 feet down. He stated that the photos from 1937 of the site had been studied and because of the geomorphology, he could understand where the photos indicate a change in the topography through the semi-arch shape in the break of the slope. He added that the conditions change across Pinehill Road and that after studying the photos, it appeared that the features in the photos were a result of vegetation and animal paths leading to the creeks. He stated that sandstone was found at a shallow depth and that serpentinite was found on the opposite side of Pinehill Road. He added that in the 1950's and 1960's there were many slides due to the lack of onsite geological controlling during construction. He added that there was no record of any landslides at

3115 Ralston Avenue and that the conditions across Pinehill Road are not comparable to the project site. He stated that erosion could not occur deeper than Pinehill Road and that stabilization of the hillside would be aided by removing loose dirt on top as a part of the construction project. He concluded by stating that the site conditions were a reflection of grading in the 1950's.

Steve Mattas, attorney for the Wilsons, stated that his clients have been trying to work together with the applicants to avoid bringing the proposed project before the City Council. He stated that he is providing a letter to the City Council with revisions to the proposed City Council resolution approving the design. He explained that Condition 9 on page 122 of the City Council agenda packet should include seven trees, not four trees, and that a couple of other conditions have been revised and additional language is requested.

Leslie Wilson thanked the City Council for their time and energy. She stated that she has lived in Hillsborough for fourteen years and has dedicated many volunteer hours with the Hillsborough Beautification Foundation. She added that her children love the neighborhood. She stated that the comments, cursing and hostility that took place at the July 17, 2010 ADRB meeting were not present tonight. She commented that 60% of the neighbors signed the petition to oppose the project. She again thanked the City Council for their time.

Mr. Mattas provided a Power Point presentation on neighborhood concerns and requested changes for the 3115 Ralston project and reviewed the personal concerns of the Wilsons and the background on the project. He also reviewed the General Plan and Town policies, which require that the Town maintain the character of the neighborhoods, new development proposals not overwhelm their sites or their neighborhood, and that the City Council is required to consider the project's aesthetic compatibility with the site and the neighborhood, including the impact of the square footage on the site and the neighborhood.

Mr. Mattas stated that Guideline 4.D of the Design Guidelines regarding setbacks and landscaping states that buildings should generally reflect the established development conditions of neighboring properties, including building setbacks and landscape treatments. He added that when the term "should" is used conformance with the standard is strongly encouraged and should reflect the Town's expectations for new development.

Mr. Mattas provided an overview of the project and stated that it proposes too much stuff for the house, tennis court, pool and patio, driveway, and hardscape, and that the project sets a new standard in the area for FAR, setbacks, and hardscape.

David Chung, a Hillsborough resident, commented that he wished that the three dimensional model was used at the City Council meeting as it is hard to visualize the proposed project. He stated that he lived in upper Hillsborough and not lower Hillsborough, and that the differences between the two neighborhoods were significant and would be like comparing apples to oranges. He further stated he wondered how the Town defined a neighborhood, noting he had posed the question to Town staff and there were various definitions. He added that neighborhoods have properties comparable in lot sizes and setbacks and mentioned the eighty-three homes with two-acre lots which were built beginning in the 1920's. He stated that these properties had low hardscape ratios, a great deal of privacy and were bounded by Ralston Avenue and Pullman Road. He commented that it did not make sense to include the wedge-shaped property in the Crocker Woods area and the lot on Laurent Avenue to get the 20% FAR. He stated that the 15.63% FAR of the proposed project will affect the Ralston Hills neighborhood and that was not something the neighbors expected. He further stated that there were two transitional lots which had FARs of 14% to 15% and lot shapes vary from central lots to transitional lots with more usable space to build on. He addressed setbacks and noted the differences between 3300 Ralston Avenue and 3115 Ralston Avenue topographically. He stated the process had led him to have concerns about the future of Hillsborough; however, the benefit was that he was

brought in touch with his neighbors and it also has been a lesson for him in what a neighborhood should be.

John Wilson stated that he wanted to clarify a couple of things. He reported that his home addition and remodel was designed in 1997 with unanimous support from his neighbors, but that he had to spend a lot of money to move his proposed tennis court into the valley to address his neighbors' concerns. He stated that two years after his project was completed, some of his trees had a beetle disease and were removed, but were not part of the remodel project. He explained that the neighborhood consisted of two acre parcels, noting staff's surveys as incorrect. He stated that the two-acre neighborhood consisted of eighty-three properties and he provided an overview of the development pattern of the neighborhood. He commented that the proposal at 3115 Ralston was leapfrogging over the existing development pattern. He added that the data presented in the Power Point was obtained from the Town and if no plans were available, County data was used. He posed the possibility of removing the lot area of the flag portion of the lot at 3115 Ralston Avenue since it was not buildable and mentioned that staff surveys included half acre lots, which did not seem to be consistent for comparison purposes.

Mr. Wilson stated that the 3115 Ralston project sets a new standard, as it is a 13,000 square foot home on 1.7 net acres. He explained that the project is 220% above the average FARs in the area, leapfrogs even the highest city and highest gross FARs in the area, and is the largest house in area on the first and second floors. He added that the 70-foot setback is closer to the street than the existing house and well below the 98-foot area average. He added that 30,765 square feet of hardscape (41% lot coverage) on the highly sloped lot with an adjacent landslide history was unprecedented.

Mr. Wilson reviewed the Ralston Hills neighborhood (all with over two acre lots) and stated that staff included in their presentation some Crocker Woods lots and Laurent Avenue lots and excluded Ralston Hills properties with FARs below 10% to get the 20% FAR. He reviewed the gross FAR and street setback norms for all 83 Ralston Hills homes and all Hillsborough lots of 10,000 square feet or more. He stated that as of July 2010, 67% of the neighborhood requested a maximum gross FAR of 12%, a minimum setback of 80 feet along Ralston Avenue, and substantially increased landscape screening of the home and lot from the street. He further stated that he has already made a compromise for the increased size by 30% to 13,000 square feet (14.5% FAR), reduced his request for additional screening trees by 50%, and 45-foot street setback for the tennis court, the sound wall and permanent screening. He added that an 80-foot setback was necessary for the proposed redwood screening trees at the driveway and tennis court.

Mr. Wilson reviewed the landslide history in the area and stated that in 1998, a 3,000 cubic yard landslide occurred at 165 Pinehill Drive and stated that there have been five documented landslides at two properties, with the closest one only 60 feet away from the 3115 Ralston project. He added that risks at the site have been confirmed by two geotech consultants. He stated that 31,000 square feet of hardscape increases the risks downhill and that 41% of the hardscape with only a 25-year rain design standard is not reasonable for the site.

Mr. Wilson stated that the proposed tennis court sets new standards because it is too close to the streets. He added that 15 of 18 court locations are in the rear or away from the street and the proposal is adjacent to two streets and has only a 35-foot setback compared to the average of 171 feet.

Mr. Wilson recommended reducing the FAR to 14.5%, increasing the Ralston Avenue setback to an 80-foot minimum, increasing the tennis court setback to 45 feet with a 4-foot sound wall and screening, and, for future projects in a 2-acre area, adopting compatibility standards based upon two-acre lots, not half to one acre lots.

Councilmember Benton asked for clarification on what “recommended” meant and asked if it meant acceptable to John Wilson. Mr. Wilson confirmed that “recommended” meant acceptable to him.

Vice Mayor Kasten asked if the surveys presented included gross or net lot areas. Mr. Wilson replied that the surveys included a mix of gross and net lot areas since not all properties had plans available for review. He added that the mix of net and gross lot areas resulted in a one to two percentage difference. He displayed a chart of the gross floor area ratios and stated that it was rare to see large homes close to the street.

Vice Mayor Kasten stated that the data showed 3115 Ralston as 70 feet from the street and asked for clarification regarding which street was referenced. Mr. Wilson confirmed the distance is from Ralston Avenue.

Mayor Krolik informed John Wilson that the presentation time was approaching thirty minutes.

Mr. Wilson stated he would wrap up the presentation and in response to previous comments he stated that no forging of petitions occurred. He explained that cut and paste was used with the petition signatures due to lack of space on paper and that 67% of the neighborhood did not support the project. He then provided an overview of the compromises made with the applicant.

Harold Bexton, architect for John and Leslie Wilson, stated that the possibility of including an 80-foot setback while maintaining the architectural design was a possibility, specifically to meet the neighborhood setback requirement. He displayed a slide to show the proposal with an 80-foot setback and additional tree screening, noting that as presented, there was little space for the proposed trees to grow and be maintained. He added that based on the “S”-shaped driveway proposed, the 80-foot setback would be required to accommodate the driveway features and trees. He provided an overview of the hardscape proposed and its inconsistencies with the neighborhood.

Terry Garnett stated that he is a 20-year resident and that he lives across the street from the Wilsons. He stated that he is not familiar with the nomenclature, but was concerned about the landslide risks as he lives at the downward slope. He displayed a slide for 165 Pinehill Road and provided an overview of his concerns of landslide issues in the area. He stated that nine holes of exploration on the site did not constitute a true test for geotechnical issues. He addressed the tennis court issue and noted that 15 of the 20 tennis courts in the area were at the rear of the property and not facing a street. He added that all measurements presented in the Power Point for setbacks from the proposed tennis court to his home were measured to the front door, disregarding the pool in the rear yard. He stated that there were rumors that 145 Pinehill Road would be working with Brewer Development to build a new home, which could result in concurrent projects. He expressed his concerns with traffic and construction workers, noting that he recently installed a security system with cameras on his property. He stated that communities similar to Hillsborough had more stringent restrictions on residential development, noting the maximum square footage permitted in Woodside. He made specific mention of his concern with future projects in the area and stated that the sound wall would be the good neighbor thing to do. He expressed his concerns with the process, noting that due to the fact that a developer was proposing the new residence it felt like a dysfunctional process. He added that this proposal, if approved, would set precedence and would be a benchmark for moving forward. He stated that from square one, he felt there was an issue with the City Planning process and he felt that the deck was stacked. He stated that he felt uncomfortable as he felt that staff supported the project and he added that the Planning Department should be monitoring and protecting the residents, their property values, and their quality of life.

Mayor Krolik opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Mayor Krolik asked for closing comments from the applicant.

Mr. Hechtman, attorney for Mr. Sinclair, stated that he had responses to a few comments made and that he wished to address the letter that Mr. Mattas submitted with three new conditions. He explained that Condition 9 was revised as Mr. Mattas stated that it did not reflect the ADRB's recommendations, but Mr. Hechtman stated that the ADRB minutes were not yet available to review. Ms. Cullinan stated that she was fine with revising Condition 9 on page 122 of the City Council agenda packet. Mr. Hechtman stated that they were agreeable with the new condition in Attachment "A" as requested in Mr. Mattas' July 12, 2010 letter to the City Council. He stated that the request to delete the word "clearly" from the fifth line of Attachment "A" is a minor change that is workable. He added that they did not want to debate the geotechnical issues. He stated that the third item was Mitigation Measure 1.0, which incorporated the second engineering condition and that Cornerstone Earth Group and Earth Investigations Consultants conditions were fine. He addressed the neighbors' comments made and noted that the neighborhood was asking for a set of requirements to be imposed on the project that did not exist based on hodgepodge calculations. He asked the City Council to please recognize this and that if these requirements had been enforced, the owners at 3080 Ralston would never have been able to build. He reemphasized the issue of design and noted that many of the petition signers had not even seen the plans for the new residence. He stated that an 80-foot setback was possible but not proposed and the drawing presented was part of confidential discussions between the applicant and the neighbor. He closed by stating that Harold Bexton, who commented on the proposed trees, was not an arborist and Mr. Hechtman thanked the City Council for their time.

Ms. Cullinan presented the calculations for the median based on the staff surveys conducted, noting that the main difference was in the setbacks.

Councilmember Regan questioned which survey would be used for consideration of the project. Ms. Cullinan responded that all surveys presented are up for consideration.

Ms. Cullinan explained the surveys completed by staff, noting that the initial survey was of the viewscape, or visible surrounding area from the project site and the subsequent surveys were a result of requests from the applicant and neighbors. She added that during the design process, staff pushed the applicant to address comments and concerns received, which the applicant was not always happy with staff about. She added that Attachment A should be corrected to accurately reflect the requirement of the ADRB for upsizing of seven trees, not four between Pinehill Road and the tennis court.

Councilmember Regan asked who the Hortas were. Ms. Cullinan replied that the Hortas were the probable buyers of the new residence.

Mayor Krolik announced that since there has been so much community interest in the proposal, the Councilmembers will need to state for the record if they have met or talked with either party individually. Councilmember Regan stated that he responded to an email received in which he declined to meet about the proposal. Vice Mayor Kasten stated that he had no communication with the applicants or neighbors regarding the project and Ms. Cullinan had responded on his behalf to the email received. Councilmembers Benton and Fannon indicated that they had no communication with the applicants or neighbors regarding the project. Mayor Krolik stated that she had attended a charity event held at the Wilson's home and when asked about the project provided general comments on the Brown Act.

Councilmember Fannon commented that public outreach for the project began on January 15, 2010, and that he has listened to the diatribe from lawyers, consultants,

and architects debating issues. He remarked that the exorbitant amount of time staff put in on the project is awful and that the concerns should have been settled with neighbors working together. He stated that the ADRB was the arbitrator and with a unanimous vote approved the project and stated that the ADRB considered the project as outstanding from the beginning. He reported that since that time there were quite a few setbacks in terms of progress. He read an email received from John Wilson dated March 30, 2010, stating that so long as three areas were addressed, his concerns would be allayed. He stated that the three concerns in Mr. Wilson's email were addressed, but a total of 24 concerns were brought up regarding the FAR, street setbacks, etc. He commented that the project meets the code requirements and that he had reviewed the changes. He stated that the City Council has to send a message that they should not be adjudicating neighborhood issues, as they are not in that business and neighborhood issues should be settled outside the City Council chambers. He further stated that since this project was approved by the ADRB with the 24 changes, there was no need to bring it before the City Council. He commented that his preference was to go back to the three changes only and remove the other twenty-one changes. He asked staff if the City Council held the authority to make these types of changes since it was approved by the ADRB.

Ms. Cullinan responded that if the City Council required only the three changes, the applicant would need to bring the plans back to the next ADRB meeting as the plans would be different than those for consideration that evening.

Councilmember Regan asked if the ADRB approved the plans with the three changes or the twenty-four. Ms. Cullinan responded that the plans approved by the ADRB included the twenty-four changes.

Councilmember Fannon stated again that the project should not be at the City Council meeting for review and that the issues between neighbors should have been settled outside of the City Council meeting.

Councilmember Regan agreed that the planning process involves working with the ADRB and not the City Council. He added that residents need to interpret the Town's Design Guidelines as Ms. Cullinan and the ADRB members have done.

Councilmember Regan asked if the new conditions of approval needed to go back to the ADRB for review. Ms. Cullinan responded that the new conditions of approval would be incorporated into the final approval document and did not require review by the ADRB.

Vice Mayor Kasten stated that Mr. Sinclair had been very sympathetic to the neighbors' concerns, which seemed to be a moving target. He stated that the design was beautiful and compatible with the neighborhood, noting the ADRB spent an enormous amount of time on review of the project and gave a unanimous vote of approval. He added that staff did a wonderful job. He stated that he votes for approval of the project and he stated that the applicant should be able to build the house and move forward.

Councilmember Benton commented that he took a different stance on the project and understands that neighborhoods change and neighborhoods are important. He stated that the passion and concern expressed speaks to the strength of the Town. He added that more than a few years ago he chaired a committee for four or five meetings to review the development regulations and the committee concluded that it is a subjective process and requires intelligent and informed decisions and an intelligent and informed ADRB, which the Town has. He remarked that he had a great deal of respect for the ADRB. He stated that the ADRB gave a lot of their time and voted 4:0 in favor of the project and he stated that he was inclined to side with the ADRB's decision.

Mayor Krolik stated that when a house was being built across the street from hers, it was very upsetting and disruptive as the construction process is emotional, noisy and

dirty. She commented that she appreciates the residents who strive to protect the character of the Town and noted that there have been a lot of changes made to the project and that the neighbors should see the glass as half full. She stated that the developer has shown diligence, persistence and willingness to accommodate the neighbors. She further stated that she went on the site visit and found that much of the house will not be seen from the street. Although there would be some ambient tennis court noise, she added that there are a good number of streetside tennis courts throughout the Town. She commented that leaf blowers were louder. She stated she was glad the landslide issues were settled and acknowledged that the guidelines are subjective, but that the standards are objective. She added that the impacts are within the guidelines and the visual FAR proposed is 14.48%, which is less than the 14.5% requested by the neighbors. She noted that the bottom line was that the new residence would be an improvement to the existing conditions, as the existing residence is an eyesore. She added that the proposal will be a successful project and addressed Mr. Garnett's frustration by stating that the Town does its best to listen to the residents' concerns, but with attorneys involved, staff and Councilmembers could not talk face-to-face with the residents. She thanked all attending for their time and passion and stated the City Council was ready for a vote.

Special Counsel Joan Cassman restated the three revisions which would need to be incorporated into the motion for approval.

On motion of Councilmember Regan, seconded by Vice Mayor Kasten, and unanimous on voice vote, the resolution adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) for a single family residential project at 3115 Ralston Avenue was adopted as amended. On motion of Vice Mayor Kasten, seconded by Councilmember Benton, and unanimous on voice vote, the resolution approving the design of a new two story Mediterranean style residence at 3115 Ralston Avenue of approximately 11,816 square feet in floor area (15.63% floor area ratio) and associated landscape plan including new plantings, tree removal, new tennis court, swimming pool and terraces was adopted as amended to include seven citrus trees.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no public comments.

CITY COUNCIL ITEMS:

Mayor Krolik announced that the City Council may need to hold a Special City Council Meeting to cancel the election if only two persons file nomination papers for the two City Council seats in the upcoming election. She explained that the City Council may appoint the two nominees to the two City Council seats at a Special City Council Meeting five days after the date of publication of the Certificate of Facts and before the 75th day before the November 2, 2010 election. She added that due to the deadlines for local newspapers, the earliest the notice could be published would be August 14th and, therefore, the only day the Special City Council Meeting could be held would be on Thursday, August 19th. She asked the City Council if they would be available on Thursday, August 19th and what time they would be able to meet, if a Special City Council Meeting is necessary. Vice Mayor Kasten and Councilmembers Regan and Benton announced that they would be able to attend, if necessary, and that 2:00 p.m. would work with their schedules.

Mayor Krolik reviewed the changes to the Voluntary Guidelines for Campaign Signs and explained that the location for campaign signs is now more lenient and that the size of the signs has increased from 12 inches by 15 inches to a standard size of 18 inches by 24 inches.

Mayor Krolik announced that she wanted the City Council to be aware that the Burlingame Historical Society would like to designate the Howard Avenue/Ralston Avenue tree grove as an historic place.

City Engineer Cyrus Kianpour announced that the San Mateo County Parks Foundation will be holding the Tour de Peninsula on Sunday morning on August 1, 2010. He stated that Crystal Springs Road will be closed to motorists for two to three hours for the bicycle ride. Police Captain Mark O'Connor explained that because last year's Tour de Peninsula drew an unexpected 3,500 bicyclists, there were safety concerns for this year's event, so Crystal Springs Road will be closed from Stonehedge Road to Skyline Boulevard.

Mayor Krolik announced that there will be no Council of Cities Dinner / Meeting for the month of July.

Vice Mayor Kasten and the other Councilmembers thanked Director of Building and Planning Liz Cullinan and Associate Planner Serena Ponzo for their work on the 3115 Ralston Avenue residential project.

ADJOURN:

Mayor Krolik adjourned the meeting at 9:36 p.m.