

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order on January 23, 1980, by Chairman Harle at 8:00 p.m. in the Town Hall Council Chamber. C. R. Leitzell, Director Public Works/Planning, and T. J. Robbins, Assistant Director Public Works/Planning, present.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Buckle, Harle, Hayes, McPeak, Olive, Ollinger, Ragan
Commissioners Absent: None

2. CITIZENS COMMITTEE REPORT FOR REZONING OF UNDEVELOPED LANDS

Commissioner Ragan said that at one time the Town had talked about no development on the ridges; however, he does not feel that is fair to property owners, as some construction can be hidden in blind spots on the ridges.

Commissioner Buckle said the Citizens' Report did not reflect proper densities, in his opinion. He proposes:

<u>Zone</u>	<u>Elevation</u>	<u>Allowable Density</u>
1	Below 150 feet	In accordance with the San Anselmo Slope Policy, revised June, 1972
2	150 - 300 feet	One unit per one acre
3	300 - 500 feet	One unit per two acres
4	Above 500 feet	One unit per three acres

Commissioner Buckle feels that design review is necessary to allow public input and flexibility. He feels "numbers" should not be used for ridge top zoning, as each ridgeline is different and we could not control the visual impact.

Regarding Section 2, Commissioner Buckle feels it is already covered by existing Town ordinances. He suggested adding to the Ridge Zone definition, "Have design review to review all construction which is including R-1 building permits as well as subdivisions, and also include all parcels over four acres."

Commissioner Olive said she agrees with Mr. Leitzell's report that the different areas of Town should be considered separately in this zoning. She suggests that PPD continue for two or more units. She proposes:

<u>Zone</u>	<u>Elevation</u>	<u>Allowable Density</u>
1	Below 100 feet	In accordance with the San Anselmo Slope Policy, revised June, 1972
2	100 - 200 feet	One unit per one acre
3	Above 200 feet	One unit per three acres

Commissioner Olive said she would also change the second sentence under Grading in Section 2 to read, "All grading shall be performed in strict compliance with applicable Town codes", as Mr. Leitzell suggested. Items B through F are covered by Town codes. She said the density bonus option should be eliminated, as the bonus is not applicable to the lots that could use it.

Commissioner Ollinger said we need "numbers", which he calls guidelines that are flexible enough for properties on two ridges, where construction can be hidden from the valley. He agrees with Mr. Leitzell that there should be two different densities for the two sides of town. Commissioner Ollinger suggested that rather than just have 200 foot and 500 foot contours as in the Citizens' Report, there should also be a 350 foot contour to give us more flexibility and equity in reaching a solution. Since some ridges are flat, the horizontal measurement is not particularly good. He suggested Section 1c be omitted. He also agrees with Mr. Leitzell's addition to Grading in Section 2.

Commissioner Hayes pointed out that the Commission has two goals - to provide more feedback to the community and to provide public

safety and welfare. There can be two approaches for the ridgeland zoning - determine density by a fixed access or access by a fixed density. Should we use street funds for a fixed density?

Commissioner Hayes feels the Town should adopt the guidelines of the Committee Report. We should consider maintaining the PD zoning so as to have public input. He suggested Sections 1c and 2h be brought up in a design review element. Although the bonus may be an incentive, Commissioner Hayes feels that if someone wants to build on the ridge, they will despite a bonus. He would like to see Section 2g considered as a separate ordinance, and delete the rest of Section 2. He added that a vertical dimension should be used to define the ridges, and the definition of ridges should be expanded to include those ridges mentioned in the General Plan.

Commissioner McPeak, a member of the Citizens' Committee, said he personally would like to see no development on the ridges, but he generally supports the Citizens' Report.

Commissioner McPeak said it was his idea to have the horizontal measurement of ridges. Regarding the bonus incentive, he feels it can only be effective if we offer enough incentive.

Commissioner Harle said there are four things to consider - access, geological safety and steepness, ridge preservation, and aesthetics. He feels it is good to base density on elevations. There are only 17 pieces of land that are five acres or more. Commissioner Harle suggested treating these lands on an individual basis, i.e., PD zoning, and let general specifications apply to those other lands less than five acres. He said a vertical measurement should be used and have variances for hardships.

Commissioner Harle said the community that exists gives the developer the value of his property, i.e., existing roads, landscaping, etc. He proposes:

<u>Zone</u>	<u>Elevation</u>	<u>Allowable Density</u>
1	Below 100 feet	In accordance with the San Anselmo Slope Policy, revised June, 1972
2	100 - 200 feet	One unit per ½ acre
3	200 - 300 feet	One unit per one acre
4	300 - 500 feet	One unit per 1.33 acres
5	Above 500 feet	One unit per 2.5 acres

Parcels of five acres or more to be subject to PD zoning with density guidelines subject to modifications based on access.

Commissioner Harle said only the first sentence of Section 1c should be used. Section 2a through 2f should be omitted; Section 2g should add "Town road improvements be based on mileage, i.e., persons at the bottom of the hill drive less than those at the top; the ridges mentioned in the General Plan should also be in the Report; if buildings encroach on the ridge they should be subject to design review. He feels the bonus incentive will not stop people from building on the ridges.

Commissioner McPeak said he studied Broadmoor Avenue up to where it meets Indian Rock and found there is a difference as to what a little extra width will do for access. Broadmoor has more traffic than Redwood Road and not as great a problem in terms of access.

Commissioner Buckle suggested the Committee work up some alternatives on density, i.e., perhaps group parcels that would affect a given road.

M/S McPeak, Buckle, to continue this hearing to a special meeting on January 30, 1980.

Motion carried: AYES: Buckle, Hayes, McPeak, Ollinger, Ragan
NOES: Harle, Olive

The Commission also agreed to meet with the County Planning staff and the Town Council on February 5, 1980, to discuss the County-Wide General Plan.

3. ADJOURNMENT

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:30 p.m. to the special meeting on January 30, 1980.

Lisa Burclin

LISA BURGLIN
PLANNING ASSISTANT