

The Special Meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Dan Goltz at 8:00 p.m. in the Town Hall on June 30, 1975. Representing Town Staff: C. R. Leitzell, Planning Director; Al Solnit, Advance Planner.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Ainsworth, Bolles, Fairchild, Goltz, Greenfield, Ragan, Strassman

Commissioners Absent: None

Chairman Goltz introduced and welcomed the new Planning Commissioner Stanley Greenfield.

Chairman Goltz also announced that he was advised by Staff that Commissioner Greenfield would not be able to vote on the final outcome, or any remaining elements, of the General Plan as he was not present for all the public hearings on the General Plan. This was confirmed by the Town Attorney.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - JUNE 16 AND JUNE 23, 1975

Amendments:

Pg. 2, under "Matters for Consideration" add the heading "Housing".

Pg. 2, last sentence in para. directly above motion to read: "He was afraid that this would be implemented by redrafting the definition of "family" in the Code".

Pg. 3, first line, add word "motion" to end of line.

Pg. 3, 2nd para. up from motion recommending paragraph under "Housing Needs" - Change wording "...statement was added" to "...statement was suggested".

M/S Strassman, Bolles that the minutes of June 23, 1975 be accepted as corrected. Passed unanimously, Commissioners Bolles, Greenfield and Ragan abstaining.

Corrections:

Add to major headings throughout minutes, "Park & Recreation and Public Facilities Element", "Noise Element", "Scenic Highways Element", and "Circulation Element" the chapter numbers, Chapter V, Chapter VI, Chapter VII and Chapter IV, respectively.

Pg. 1, 4th para. under "Noise Element" word "asterick" change to "asterisk".

Pg. II, 1st main para., 2nd line change: "adopted by the Town Council, was really any good" to read "adopted by the Town Council, was not effective".

3. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

A. PUBLIC HEARING: Continuation of Public Hearing on the Proposed General Plan

OPEN SPACE - Chapter III

The Public Hearing was reopened for new comments by members of the audience on the Open Space Element.

Mr. Carl Baumsteiger, 1 Monterey Terrace, reiterated his concern about the 1 unit per 10 acre density zoning proposed on undeveloped lots. He felt if the Commission passed that kind of density the Town would have a very strict "no-growth" policy, which would put the Town and his group of citizens on a "collision course".

There were no further comments from the audience. The public hearing was closed.

Commission first considered a previous comment by Mr. Carl Baumsteiger which was to add Goal "F" to the Open Space Element to read: "Insure that the burden of preserving private open

DDB863

is shared equally among the community who benefits rather than be placed solely upon the property owner."

Commissioner Bolles felt the statement was not a goal of a General Plan, but more a result of implementation.

Commissioner Ainsworth also felt the statement was not a planning goal.

Commissioner Greenfield questioned how you measured "cost" vs. "benefit". He felt the General Plan must be careful not to put the Town into the position of being faced with an endless conflict between cost/benefit.

Mr. Solnit stated when a Town gets into restricting development there are compelling reasons which are considered -- natural hazards; limited public facilities; is any particular group of people being excluded; does the action produce an economic spill-over effect.

He felt San Anselmo's application of low density to steep hillside lots could be documented by: 1. The Town does have limited public facilities, 2. The Town can demonstrate public hazards, 3. The character of development on the hillside lots have never accommodated low and moderate income housing, and 4. because San Anselmo is a unique area, this action does not drive market demand somewhere else.

Chairman Goltz stated that since the proposed goal "F" was a specific request, one of the Commissioners would have to propose the addition. Commission agreed it was not a goal and should not be added.

Another goal of Mr. Baumsteiger's, "Lots of record will be excluded from legislation requiring open space use restrictions", was considered.

Commissioner Ainsworth felt the impact of this statement would be to foreclose implementation on such "lots of record".

Commissioner Goltz felt that that type of statement could not be made in the General Plan. Commission all agreed this goal was not to be included in the General Plan.

Commissioner Ainsworth suggested a new Goal "F" to the Open Space Element: "Establish and/or preserve a system of trails providing residents with non-disruptive access from residential areas to parks and public open space."

This goal was a result of comments made at earlier public hearings regarding the possible negative effects of trails near residential areas.

Commissioner Bolles questioned whether or not Commissioner Ainsworth's goal belonged in the Open Space or Circulation Element.

Mr. Leitzell stated the State Guidelines included trails as a necessary part of open space. Therefore, the goal was in the proper place.

The section on Private Open Space was next considered, with minor wording changes being made. Chairman Goltz felt this section provided mention of compensation in terms of "money's worth".

Chairman Goltz felt acquisition of Open Space lands through: General funds, bond issues, or revenue sharing was unlikely and therefore suggested some consideration be given to alternative means for raising money (i.e. environmental review fees), to be included under the "Implementation" section of "Public Open Space". He felt the Town should be prepared when and if lands become available to purchase such lands.

Commissioner Ainsworth stated he felt it was inappropriate to use administrative fees for funding. He did feel, however, that since new development on a large scale produced a lot of Town expense there could be some kind of development tax.

Commissioner Greenfield suggested the possibility of raising money through town functions.

Commission agreed to and recommended the following be added to the end of the "Public Open Space - Implementation" section: "The Town should seriously explore implementation of an on-going fund for this purpose".

Mr. Leitzell commented on the statement made at the hearings that slopes having a gradient of 30% or more were considered unstable, as being an arbitrary figure needed some additional comment from Staff. He stated that while 30% was an arbitrary number, it was generally recognized as a slope where many problems start occurring.

The last major subdivision in San Anselmo; Indian Rock Units I and II, Woodland Park and Oak Springs, had the type of steep lots that presented in terms of runoff and slope stability. Page 91

Mr. Leitzell felt that if you allowed that kind of development density or a 1 unit per 1 acre density in the Sleepy Hollow area (hopefully the County will stick to the 1 unit per 10 acre zoning) the roofs, driveways, roads and other impervious areas would create erosion and flooding problems downstream. Trees, grass and shrubbery all have the effect of retaining and slowing the runoff, reducing erosion and flooding.

Mr. Leitzell felt that if developers came into San Anselmo from Sleepy Hollow (annexing to the City) and found the zoning was less restrictive (more density than allowed in the County) then the creeks, storm drains and highways would become overburdened. Sleepy Hollow and San Anselmo Creeks would end up a concrete ditch to avoid yearly flooding, and the highways could become so overburdened a bypass (road) would probably have to be built. Mr. Leitzell felt that the Town can't have that kind of development and keep its present amenities. The open hillside areas should not be developed (except at a very low density). He said the existing steep hillsides now within the City Limits are not of significant area (at least on the north side of the valley) to have much impact.

Commissioner Ainsworth felt development in Sleepy Hollow would not affect San Anselmo as the Circulation Element avoided traffic problems anyway. Page 91

Chairman Goltz suggested that Mr. Leitzell's statement could possibly be included in the General Plan's Introduction.

M/S Bolles, Strassman that the Open Space Element, Chapter III, Pages III-1 through III-7 including additions, amendments and proposals adopted this evening be approved and recommended to the Town Council.

Motion carried: Ayes: Bolles, Fairchild, Goltz, Ragan, Strassman  
Nays: Ainsworth  
Abstain: Greenfield

Commissioner Ainsworth stated his sole objection to the Open Space Element was the 1 unit per 10 acre density provision.

OTHER MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

Chairman Goltz announced he received a letter regarding a single family dwelling which had been converted into a duplex at 53 Foothill. A copy of this letter, along with earlier history would be forwarded to the rest of the Commissioners. (Action regarding this matter is to be considered at the Town Council meeting of July 8th.)

Mr. Leitzell mentioned the fact that there was another request for a new business at the old "Orange Julius" site, 606 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. He questioned whether the Commission felt they would like to review this particular application, a car


DDB863

stereo shop. The Town Attorney was requested to make the final decision, based on the GPC Ordinance No. 679, as to whether it needed Planning Commission consideration.

Mr. Al Solnit stated he would be unable to attend the July 14th meeting on the General Plan due to previous commitments.

M/S Ragan, Strassman to continue the public hearing on the Proposed General Plan to July 14th, and to adjourn this meeting to the regular meeting of July 7th. Passed unanimously.

DAN GOLTZ, CHAIRMAN  
SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION

By   
Catherine Carpenter  
Planning Secretary