

249

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order on April 13, 1981, at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Ollinger in the Town Hall Council Chamber. T. J. Robbins present.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Harle, Hayes, McPeak, Ollinger, Peterson, Signorelli

Commissioners Absent: Ragan

2. Z-193 - Kenneth Norberg, 1330 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-224-17, "Willow Glen Development", final review of the draft Environmental Impact Report and the proposed rezoning from PPD R-1/R-3 (Preliminary Planned Development with a presumptive use of Single Family Residential and Multiple Family Residential) to SPD (Specific Planned Development) for 23 townhouses.

Kenneth Norberg, applicant, James McDonald, Architect, and Jackson Menzie, from Del Davis Associates, present.

Mr. Menzie noted a few changes to be made in the amendment portion of the EIR: 1. Pages 8 and 10; change "Riviera" to "Rivera"; 2. Page 13, change ". . . within five feet . . ." to ". . . within eight feet . . ."; 3. Page 17, Item 17, change ". . . item 7 . . ." to ". . . item 11 . . ."

Edward Majesky, 30 Rivera Street, said the townhouses on the north end will appear higher than two stories as the street is lower. He reiterated his statement that the location of the creek on the topo prepared by Rhodes and Gardner is incorrect.

Robert Neaylon, 18 Beverly Way, said if the property fronting Rivera Street were zoned for R-1 use there would not be traffic congestion and people would take better care of their homes. He noted Page 27 of the DEIR, Line 4, ". . . retain all significant trees . . ." and Page 9, Line 23, ". . . retain, where feasible, all significant trees . . ." - does this mean they can cut down whatever trees they wish. He is concerned about the six trees surrounding his property being cut down.

Dolly Anderson, 21 Mountain View Avenue, said the March 2, 1981, Planning Commission minutes did not include her comment regarding flood control as the floor levels are very low and there could be problems. She added that the traffic pattern is very objectionable.

Walter Anderson, 21 Mountain View Avenue, said it is very difficult to gain access onto Sir Francis Drake Boulevard from Mountain View Avenue at commute time.

Joyce DeMartini, 5 Brookside Drive, said she agrees with Mr. Neaylon's comment about the creek location and vegetation being removed from Rivera Street. She also feels the handicapped and moderate income units are in a poor location as it is in the rear of the lot and will be damp. She questioned whether the Commission had even looked at the property.

Arthur Moraes, 18 Rivera Street, said he would not mind single family homes on that lot, but is against the proposed townhouses. He questioned who will be responsible for street improvements.

Frank Forrester, 61 Mountain View Avenue, feels the proposed density and type of units will depreciate the neighborhood.

Stephen McClure, 12 Beverly Way, questioned why it is okay to make the traffic situation on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard even more congested which is what would happen with this project.

Mr. Neaylon, addressing the bus turnout lane mitigation, said he never sees people waiting behind the busses on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in the morning nor between 5:00 and 5:30 p.m.

Mr. McDonald disagreed, saying that if a bus is pulled to the side of the road and someone is waiting to turn left into the high school's parking lot, traffic stops and this frequently happens during the evening commute.

Commissioner McPeak requested the various traffic service levels, A, B, C, D, E and F be defined in the Report.

Commissioner Ollinger suggested the EIR indicate the relation of the floor levels of the proposed townhouses to those existing houses in the area so as to get some idea of the variability. He also noted the statement on Page 17 of the addendum which states the proposed two-story structure would be compatible to portions of the residences located in the area and said they would be different as the existing houses are detached. Regarding Page 20, Comment 4, he said he had requested an explanation of what would be done to the creek in terms of landscaping and maintenance.

Mr. McClure said he still sees no enforcement procedure for the locking of the proposed gates on Rivera and Beverly.

Mr. Robbins cited Section 21081 of CEQA, saying that if the Commission finds one or more significant environmental effects that would result from this project then the findings would have to be made that would either mitigate those effects or that specific economic, social or other considerations make the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible. As noted on Page 36 of the EIR this project would generate an approximate increase of traffic in the evening peak hour of one percent and less than one percent in the morning peak hour and the question is whether this would be a significant incremental increase to the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard traffic volume.

Commissioner Peterson distributed his summary of changes and alterations that have been required or incorporated into the project as mitigation and avoidance of the impact on traffic in the area pursuant to Section 15088 of the California Administrative Code, Title 14.

It was mentioned that the majority of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard traffic comes from the west of Town.

M/S Peterson, Signorelli, that the Planning Commission recommend to the Town Council certification of the EIR.

Commissioner Harle requested the following be added to the above motion: that lowering the density of the project would partly be a mitigation for traffic.

No vote taken on the motion.

M/S Peterson, Signorelli, to recommend to the Town Council that the EIR for the Willow Glen Development as prepared by Del Davis Associates, Incorporated, be certified with the addition of the mitigation measure suggested in the EIR to be inserted between Nos. 2 and 3 on Page 41, to read: If the density of the project is reduced the traffic impact would be reduced; and that there be consideration given to left hand turn pockets both in the east and west directions at the signalization intersection as a mitigation measure.

Motion passed unanimously.

It was announced that the final EIR will be heard by the Town Council on April 28, 1981.

The hearing continued for the rezoning application:

Commissioner Hayes said he is concerned that the townhouses in the rear of the lot are surrounded by single family residences and questioned the location of the pool on the side of the project versus in the center of the project to buffer the noise from the existing homes in the area. Regarding density, he roughly estimated by using the slope policy requirement of 7,500 square feet of area per single family dwelling, the density could be nine to 12 units.

Commissioner Signorelli addressed Mr. Neaylon's issue that the townhouses will be close to his house and suggested more trees

could be saved to act as a buffer. He suggested deleting one of those seven units and putting a window through the proposed structures to break up the mass and having vehicular access to the pool from the northerly end to the easterly border where Unit 16 is proposed. He added that the parking plan should not be reduced by the change.

Commissioner Ollinger agreed there should be some kind of a buffer between Mr. Neaylon's property and the proposed townhouses. He said he has no argument with the design of the units, but is concerned about the density.

Mr. McDonald said the project meets the parking requirements in that 2-1/3 spaces per two bedroom townhouse are being provided and R-3 has a requirement of only 1-1/2 spaces per two bedroom unit; the proposed location for the handicapped and moderate-income units is best as there will be less noise and has nice surroundings. He feels Mr. Neaylon's concerns are valid. Mr. McDonald pointed out that R-1 zoning allows a maximum lot coverage of 40 percent; this project will have a 22 percent coverage.

Commissioner Harle said comparing this development to the density of surrounding lots, one could expect to get 16 to 18 units on this lot.

Commissioner McPeak said he roughly estimated at least 20 units could be constructed on this lot and his figures were conservative. He added he has some concerns about the proposed pool location and the location of Units 1 through 4 in relation to Mr. Neaylon's property.

M/S Signorelli, McPeak, to recommend to the Town Council that 1330 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-224-17, be rezoned from PPD R-1/R-3 (Preliminary Planned Development with a presumptive use of Single Family Residential and Neighborhood Apartment District) to SPD (Specific Planned Development) for 21 townhouse units.

Motion failed: AYES: McPeak, Peterson, Signorelli  
NOES: Harle, Hayes, Ollinger

Commissioners Harle, Hayes and Ollinger felt the difference between 21 and 23 units is not significant. Commissioner Signorelli said his deletion of two units was not based on density, but rather due to the need for an access to the pool and to lessen the visual impact on the Neaylon's.

Mr. McDonald suggested 18 townhouses on the front area with three single family homes on the Rivera Street side which would require access for those homes from Rivera Street. He later withdrew his suggestion for the time being and requested continuance of this item so that he can restudy the concerns raised this evening.

Commissioner Peterson pointed out that the applicant is proposing that over ten percent of the units be available for handicapped and moderate-income persons and he expressed concern that if the Town requires the density be reduced then those units might not be constructed. He noted that other Marin County municipalities give a bonus to developers who provide such units and suggested that might be appropriate in this case.

M/S McPeak, Signorelli, to continue the rezoning hearing to the meeting on May 11, 1981.

Motion passed unanimously.

### 3. ADJOURNMENT

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was continued to the regular meeting on May 11, 1981.

*Lisa Burglin*

LISA BURGLIN  
PLANNING ASSISTANT