

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Vice-Chairman Hayes on March 23, 1981, at 8:00 p.m. in the Town Hall Council Chamber, 525 San Anselmo Avenue.

1. ROLL CALL

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

2. Draft Environmental Impact Report and Rezoning Application -  
Chernewood 14 Unit Condominium Development - Kintetsu Enterprises of  
America - Off of Woodside Drive, A/P 5-300-15

Mr. Sohn, Kintetsu Enterprises, and Del Davis, Consultant, present.

Mr. Davis discussed the scope of the EIR. He noted that the proposed units 1 through 6 are located in a zone of a currently active earth slide and subsurface exploration will be required to determine the magnitude of this slide and its ability to be repaired. Without such a study it is questionable whether the sites are buildable. He mentioned that at the neighborhood meeting the basic concern was the change in the visual character of the area by clustering townhouses; however, this is a matter of taste.

Yusof Uraiqat, 70 Cherne Lane, said there have been slides in that area, there will be noise generated by the use of the recreational facilities and there will be an adverse visual impact.

Linda Jones, 36 Woodside Drive, said at the beginning of the Report it mentions a swimming pool and tennis courts and at the end it says there will be a seeded area and garden house. Mr. Sohn said they plan to leave as much of the lot open space as possible, but do plan recreational facilities, i.e., tennis courts.

Vincent South, 152 Oak Springs Drive, said he opposes the project due to past slides in the area and traffic impacts.

Ms. Jones said where Idlewood intersects Woodside there have been many traffic accidents as it is a blind curve. She is also concerned about the potential noise generated from outdoor parties; the visual impact; and fire danger.

Bill Werner, 27 Woodside Drive, suggested that access should be off of Carlson, rather than Idlewood and Cherne Lane as the fire engines find it difficult to make it up those roads.

David Levinson, 2 Idlewood Drive, suggested the following: Page 53, Line 12 through 16, which states there would be a "minor increase to traffic currently utilizing Idlewood and Carlson Avenue," is not accurate as there are currently four homes on Idlewood and an additional eight homes will result in a 200 percent increase in traffic. Page 66, Line 12, does not address the full impact on fire fighting as the units will be close together and it is questionable whether the San Anselmo Fire Department has adequate equipment to fight a fire on that land. Page 74, if read very carefully, does not follow logic as it tends to leave out the effect of non-San Anselmo residents shopping in Town and paying sales tax. Line 30 on that page which indicates a possible net fiscal gain from these properties of \$5,180.00 is negligible.

David Kimball, 28 Woodside Drive, said he is concerned about the traffic impact.

Andrew Gambardella, 4 Rancho Drive, said the fire engines cannot presently turn around on Rancho Drive.

Jean Holm, 10 Idlewood Drive, presented a letter to the Commission stating omissions in the Report, comments on various segments of the Report and their opinions (see file).

John Reilly, 7 Lillian Court, said he is concerned about the number of trees that will be cut down, the effect of potential noise and street improvements.

John Grey, representing his parents, said the Report should be expanded in regard to the General Plan as he feels the project is in conflict. He feels there will be a major impact on fire protection given the height of the structures, the common walls, heavy shrubbery growth and the steepness of the canyon. He also said the acceptance of condominiums will change the character of the area.

John Etcheverry, 88 Woodside Drive, said the traffic effects on Woodside Drive were not discussed. He added that he is concerned about the potential noise and visual impacts.

Ed Croce, 11 Rancho Drive, said he would like to see more information on the effect the additional traffic will have on Carlson Court, whether the street is Town maintained, and how it will be handled in terms of upkeep.

Mrs. Riddle, 19 Carlson Court, said the roads are very narrow and that traffic is already congested on Butterfield Road.

Jerry Mayer, 122 Oak Springs Drive, who submitted a letter to the Commission, said allowing condominiums in this area will set a precedent for future development and questioned who will pay for the street improvements.

Tim Ecke, 19 Cherne Lane, said the fire trucks are well maintained, but they will not go up the hill fast. He added that their ladders may not reach the top of the proposed structures and the rate of spread is faster with common wall construction. He said there will be a noise impact and besides the normal trip ends per day there will be additional traffic caused by people driving to and from the tennis courts.

Philip Marsh, 80 Woodside Drive, said there will be an effect on traffic and parking during construction.

Mary Huber, 15 Cherne Lane, referring to Page 52, Line 16, said there are only five houses on Cherne Lane. She added that there are 12 children who play on that street and with the additional traffic it will be a hazard.

Jay Huber, 15 Cherne Lane, said the access from Woodside Drive onto Cherne Lane is steep and any increase in traffic will affect them greatly. He added that cars must use the driveways up there to turn around.

Charles Best, 64 Woodside Drive, told the Commission that he has records of the rainfall in that area for many years.

Mr. Sohn suggested that his firm would be willing to change their proposal to their alternative plan, which is eleven single family dwellings. The Commissioners noted that the application before them was for 14 condominium units and this hearing would be based on that proposal.

Commissioner Ragan noted the following: 1. Page 5, Lines 29 to 33, "dedicated" does not belong in there; question "developed" as the street is full of ruts; and "Access is also available from Carlson Avenue" is a ridiculous statement as there should be no access from there. 2. Page 7, Lines 14 to 19, the density is far in excess of what the General Plan recommends. 3. Page 7, Line 31, the parking is insufficient. 4. Page 13, Line 28, unfortunately, Sir Francis Drake Boulevard cannot be improved. 5. Page 16, Line 29, willing to stake his reputation that it is almost impossible to build in that area. 6. Page 23, Line 24, given tonight's testimony it is evident that condominiums are not wanted. 7. Page 25, Line 13, disagrees that there will be no significant adverse impacts in air quality. 8. Page 28, Lines 17 through 23, this should be digested very carefully. 9. Page 29, Lines 7 through 13, don't see how this could ever be mitigated. 10. Page 29, Line 24, agrees. 11. Page 32, Line 29, the project will increase runoff. 12. Page 33, Lines 6 through 10, Cherne Lane has bad drainage conditions.

13. Page 49, Lines 9 through 16, this is an absolute lie; to which Mr. Davis suggested he would conduct another study in front of 64 Woodside Drive per Commissioner Ragan's request.
14. Page 53, Lines 32 through 34, he does not agree.
15. Page 54, Lines 10 through 12, the roads are so narrow he doesn't see how there can be a safe access there. 16. Pages 54 and 55, Lines 30 through 19, he said the mitigations are impossible. 17. Page 64, Lines 12 through 14, questioned when the plant will be completed.

Commissioner McPeak said he has heard from the neighborhood that the slides in the area are not sufficiently addressed in the EIR; there will be increased noise; it is important that it be noted and addressed in the EIR what the recreational facilities will be; it should be clear what the status of the roads are in the area, i.e., accepted, etc.; and he pointed out that the density will not be determined until a soils report is received.

Commissioner Harle said he is concerned with the possible mitigations stated for traffic and geology.

Commissioner Peterson said he is concerned with traffic - the condition of the streets and the effect on young children playing, and the area of geologic stability or lack of it. He feels requiring a soils study is not a mitigation, and added that such a study is necessary for the EIR to be complete.

Commissioner Signorelli noted that on Page 53, Line 10, it should read, ". . . should not exceed 15 - 20 mph."

Commissioner Hayes suggested a further soils study be made. He also expressed concern about off-site improvements that will be necessary to accommodate the level of development there in terms of drainage. Referring to Page 19, Lines 17 through 25, he questions the degree of conflict with the General Plan for 14 condominiums per 11.4 acres and suggested the discussion be made clearer in the final draft.

M/S McPeak, Peterson, that the developer provide a detailed soils report as given in Items 1, 2 and 3 of Appendix C, page 10 of the DEIR, and expand the scope of the EIR consultant to include third party review of the soils report, and that the consultant take the comments generated at this evening's meeting and amend the DEIR as appropriate.

Motion carried: AYES: Harle, Hayes, McPeak, Peterson, Signorelli  
NOES: Ragan

M/S Peterson, Signorelli, to close the public hearing.

Motion passed unanimously.

*Lisa Burglin*

LISA BURGLIN  
PLANNING ASSISTANT