

7/23/90

4:00 p.m. Item - PCA-84-P-129-3 - NVRD METROPLACE L. P.
Providence District

On Thursday, July 12, 1990, the Planning Commission voted unanimously (Commissioners Bobzien, Byers, and Thomas not present for the vote; Commissioners Murphy and Sell absent from the meeting) to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of PCA-84-P-129-3, subject to the execution of the proffer condition dated July 12, 1990.

The Commission also voted unanimously (Commissioners Bobzien, Byers, and Thomas not present for the vote; Commissioners Murphy and Sell absent from the meeting) to approve FDPA-84-P-129-2, subject to the Board of Supervisors' approval of PCA-84-P-129-3.

Planning Commission Meeting
July 12, 1990
Verbatim Excerpts

PCA-84-P-129-3 - NVRD METROPLACE L. P.
FDPA-84-P-129-2 - NVRD METROPLACE L. P.

After Close of the Public Hearing

Secretary Harsel: I will close the public hearing and recognize Mr. Hanlon for action on this case. Mr. Hanlon.

Commissioner Hanlon: Thank you very much. Madam Chairman, this seems to me to be fairly simple. It's a housekeeping matter as far as the building height is concerned. That's consistent with all of the requirements that we have had up to now. And I think that, although staff is in no position, of course, since it just saw this proffer tonight, to change its recommendation, I think that careful consideration of the position that staff took coming into this hearing makes it fairly clear that the applicant has basically run up the white flag. I guess I'm a little bit concerned about why it is that these things are routinely going to the Board of Supervisors, but I don't see -- I guess that's a problem for the Board of Supervisors and might well be taken up between now and the Board date. And it may be that Ms. Strobel could consult with Mr. Walsh or whoever's available. Back at the time -- I don't recall that there was any special issue about taking FDPs to the Board of Supervisors on this, but if everybody is comfortable with following the usual procedure, I at least don't see any reason why that should not be followed with respect to this project. But I'm not ready to just go off and improvise there. I just suggest that that -- that thought be given to that between now and the Board date. In any event, it is necessary to have a proffer condition amendment now because there previously was a commitment to build in accordance with a particular FDP that will be amended. Consequently, Madam Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE PCA-84-P-129-3, SUBJECT TO THE NEW PROFFER CONDITION DATED JULY 12, 1990.

Commissioners Lockwood, Hubbard and Huber: Second.

Secretary Harsel: Seconded by Mr. Lockwood and Mr. Hubbard and Ms. Huber. Is there any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Secretary Harsel: Opposed? Motion carries unanimously.

Commissioner Hanlon: Madam Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDPA-84-P-129-2, SUBJECT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE ASSOCIATED PCA.

Commissioners Lockwood and Hubbard: Second.

Planning Commission Meeting

Page 2

July 12, 1990

PCA-84-P-129-3 and FDPA-84-P-129-2

Secretary Harsel: Seconded by Mr. Lockwood and Mr. Hubbard. Any discussion?
All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Secretary Harsel: Opposed? Motion carries unanimously.

//

(Both motions carried unanimously with Commissioners Bobzien, Byers, and Thomas not present for the vote; Commissioners Murphy and Sell absent from the meeting.)

GLW