

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order on November 23, 1981, at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Ollinger in the Town Hall Council Chamber. Alan Bruce and T. J. Robbins present.

1. ROLL CALL

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

Commissioners Absent: Ragan

2. Review of Environmental Negative Declaration and Draft of the Updated Housing Element of the General Plan.

Lynn Sedway and Katie Crecelius, of Lynn Sedway & Associates, present.

Chairman Ollinger suggested that everyone run through their comments prior to group discussion.

Ms. Crecelius listed the comments made at the November 16th joint meeting that their firm felt were pertinent and welcomed any further comments: She noted the public participation section will not be placed in the Element until after the hearings; and the graphic "Figure 1" referred to on Page 37 will be shown after there is agreement as to the identification of affordable housing sites in Town. The comments were:

1. Page 1, delete " . . . including those of senior citizens." from Component B;
2. Page 10, Policy 2.2, the threshold of "eight or more units" was from the Toal Draft - the question was how are the required five percent for low income and five percent for moderate income rounded off - this would be rounded to one unit;
3. Page 20, the term, "housing problems" be deleted from the second sentence of the first paragraph; this could be changed to "housing needs";
4. Page 20, Present Problems, the statement referring to increases in housing costs in relation to personal income growth was questioned. Ms. Crecelius said this is general knowledge in the industry based on past experience;
5. Page 37, it be stated, "San Anselmo will not approve any development on unsafe land."; this could be inserted either at the end of Paragraph 1 or at the beginning of Paragraph 2;
6. Page 38, the request for a discussion of the traffic situation on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard could be placed under Market Constraints on this page;
7. Page 42, first paragraph, second and third sentences, and Page 43, Cost . . . , second and third paragraphs, be removed. Ms. Crecelius said there was considerable discussion and removal of these sections will require some editing;
8. Page 48, Table 14, "15% Developer Profit" be changed to "15% Developer Overhead and Profit";
9. Page 51, Site Acquisition, the figure for Sorich Park be changed from "20" to "20 to 50".

Peter Fraser, 100 Oak Knoll Drive, suggested:

1. Table 8 on Page 30 include both San Rafael and Novato. Mr. Bruce suggested Novato might be questionable;
2. Page 26, Overcrowding, and Page 14, Population . . . , are contradictory;
3. Page 36, Supply of Land, first sentence, is misleading as no mention is made of the 220 acres of undeveloped hillside land;
4. Page 38, Land Costs, first sentence, is an illusion;
5. Page 42, Land Use . . . , the second sentence should be expanded upon, and the first, second and third paragraphs should be substantiated in writing;
6. Page 61, Table B, the numbers should be filled in and there should be clarification as to what this table reflects;
7. Page 43, last paragraph, the second, fifth, sixth and seventh sentences are not true;
8. Page 47, Table 13, Raw Land, the figure is not realistic;
9. Table 13 and Table B reflect a 1,200 square foot dwelling and a 1,500 square foot dwelling, respectively;
10. Page 48, first paragraph, if not typically constructed in Marin County, then this paragraph does not belong on this page;
11. Page 50, Condominium Conversion, the trigger factor for conversions

- is such that there will be none;
12. Page 51, Site Acquisition, low and moderate income housing will not be built as it is not politically feasible;
  13. Page 52, Inclusionary Zoning, there is a question of its legality and it will never happen;
  14. Page 54, Table 15, New Development, the figures are grossly under what we are attempting to demonstrate;
  15. Page 55, last paragraph, the last sentence is not true;
  16. Page 59, Appendix B, is deceptive as on Page 43, last paragraph, second sentence, it refers to developments not subject to special environmental constraints and that statement is in the body of the report.

Mr. Fraser reiterated his comments made at the last meeting with regard to the Town's failure to comply with the 1977 Guidelines.

Carl Baumsteiger, 1 Monterey Terrace, again read his letter dated November 16, 1981, to the Commission and requested copies be made available to the Commission, Council and consultant.

Mr. Baumsteiger suggested the Town review San Rafael's response to their Element from the State as he feels San Anselmo may receive a similar one. He feels the Town has not made a good faith effort units in the Sorich Park area is excessive and questioned the proposed number of units for the lower slopes of the Sunnyhills, but the 220 acres of undeveloped hillside land are not considered.

Jerry Mayer, 122 Oak Springs Drive, suggested the consultant have a considerable discussion on the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard traffic situation, pointing out that if the road is widened the Town will lose housing in that area.

Jerome Draper, 295 Los Angeles Boulevard, questioned:

1. Goals D, E, F and G in the 1975 Element are not listed in the proposed Element. Commissioner Hayes said they are in the intent;
2. Pages 18 and 19, Tables 3 and 4, he submitted a computer printout representing 12,161 parcels of land generated from the County Assessor's Office and which indicates there are more than 2,000 undeveloped parcels between here and San Geronimo;
3. Page 29, Employment Growth, first paragraph, the trend for home work centers is increasing;
4. Page 36, first sentence, change to read, "Environmental problems, economic conditions . . .";
5. The EIRs prepared for Willow Glen, Indian Hills, and Chernenwood be forwarded to the consultant for her review of the traffic discussions;
6. At times the development delays are the fault of the developer;
7. Page 51, Sorich Park figure is not realistic as a recent project close by was only allowed six units;
8. Page 39, fourth paragraph, the cost of raw land is dependent upon how long the developer has owned the property;
9. Page 41, there should be an entire section on environmental problems relative to the following - Sir Francis Drake Boulevard is past its capacity; we have an outdated flood control system; there is a lack of adequate Police and Fire services; water pressure is inadequate in some areas; there are slide areas; and Table III in the General Plan is not valid;
10. Page 52, Second Units, it should be mentioned that San Anselmo was one of the forerunners.

Ken Anderson, Laurel Avenue, suggested there be no discussion on low income housing as it is infeasible, to which Paul Brand, 130 Allyn Avenue, agreed. Both felt there should be discussion of the fact that San Anselmo was one of the first jurisdictions to adopt a Second Unit Ordinance.

Bill Cordingley, 16 Elkhorn Way, said that if the General Plan commits us to provide so many units, we must be prepared to do so.

Ken Meyer, 20 Elkhorn Way, suggested on Page 33, the annual target be one percent, rather than three percent, and there should not be inclusionary zoning.

Chris Heubach, 66 Lincoln Avenue, said the Guidelines are written for all cities and many of the smaller jurisdictions have different characteristics than the larger cities, which might be taken into account by the State.

Commissioner Signorelli requested there be further explanation of the cause factors that motivated the Legislature for the need of the 1977 Guidelines and why the State instituted the mandatory 1980 Standards. Ms. Sedway said it is discussed in her Background Paper which can be attached to this Element. Page 8, Site Acquisition, the second sentence should be deleted since it is referenced on Pages 36 and 37, Supply of Land. He recommended two sites for possible low and moderate income housing - above the Pine Street Parking Lot and the Magnolia Parking Lot. Page 42, second paragraph, add to the second sentence, ". . . process is costly, cumbersome and time consuming, . . ." He feels the numbers listed on Page 51, Site Acquisition, have no political reality.

Commissioner Hayes noted some errors made in his calculations for the number of units in the Sunnyhills lower slopes to be changed to "36 to 60" and in Sorich Park to "30 to 50". These figures are based on the 12 - 20 units per acre discussed in the General Plan. If using the 7,500 square feet per unit figure, to determine the lower value of the density range, those numbers would be slightly lower - 18 to 60 for Sunnyhills lower slopes; six to 20 for Shaw Drive; 4 to 15 for Lincoln Avenue; and 15 to 50 for Sorich Park. Ms. Crecelius pointed out, however, that the State might view the lower densities as too low and look at it as not being a good faith effort.

Commissioner Peterson feels there is a void in the Housing Element as housing is not addressed for all economic segments of the community, but only for the low and moderate income range and a conscious effort has been made to hide the hillside density problem. Other comments were:

1. Page 1, Goals, Component E, change to read, ". . . housing element, with extensive citizen participation at every stage.";
2. Page 2, third paragraph, blame the confusion on the State;
3. Page 3, third paragraph, include by what deadline we have to comply with AB 2320 and indicate what changes to the Zoning Ordinance are necessary;
4. Page 4, change to read, ". . . consistent with the 1977 Guidelines and reflects the new statutory . . .";
5. Page 5, Objective 4, add "economic status";
6. Page 5, Objective 5, change to read, ". . . Encourage extensive citizen participation . . .";
7. Page 6, regarding conversion properties of ten or more units to retain 15 percent of the units affordable to low income households - this should read, "No decision has been made as to whether this 15 percent would be equity or rental units.";
8. Page 8, Site Acquisition, would like to see a definition of suitable sites for low and moderate income housing and why 220 acres of hillside land are not suitable for it;
9. Inclusionary Zoning - impossible for Town to determine the number of possible units. There should be an inventory of land;
10. Page 13, Policy 5.1, add, ". . . housing issues to receive public comments.";
11. Page 15, Table 1, second paragraph, it is not true that one would expect the 1980 distribution to be roughly similar to 1970;
12. Page 16, Table 2, is not consistent with Table 6 on Page 24 as it deals with household versus family income;
13. Page 18, add, "4. Denial of development applications for single family developments.";
14. Page 23, end of first paragraph, should be added, "Potential first time buyers currently occupy rental units which would be free for occupancy by other renters as purchasing opportunities were available. Also, elderly home owners might move to multi-unit developments (developed specifically for elderly) which would free their homes to these first time buyers.";

15. Page 28, Item 3, regarding the estimated additional 150 units - where are they and there should be an analysis;
16. Page 32, Table 9, if congregate facilities are included in the existing market rental units number, they should not be;
17. Page 35, second paragraph, low income units will tend not to have living and dining rooms;
18. Page 42, second paragraph, he questioned the Council's authorization to the Town Attorney to draft an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and why the Commission did not review;
19. Page 51, Site Acquisition, there is no mention of the zoning problems.

Commissioner Peterson submitted an Analysis of EIR Processing on Multi-Family Applications and requested that staff fill in the appropriate dates in the blanks; this might be part of the Element.

Noting the differences of opinion between existing home owners and investors, Commissioner Harle suggested those with existing homes might have priority over investment uses; and on Page 42, Land Use . . . , first paragraph, the word, "inaccessibility" is inadequate in as much that the undeveloped land cannot be developed without construction of new and wider roads and that cost should go to the developer.

Commissioner Ollinger said it should be mentioned in the Government Constraints section how quickly the Isabel Cook Homes project was approved.

Commissioner McPeak does not see how the Town can recommend a Negative Declaration on the potential developments as listed on Page 51. Mr. Robbins explained to the Commission that the Town does not view those possibilities as projects as we have not yet received any specific proposals. At the time of specific proposals, then there would be environmental reviews.

Commissioner Peterson stated he spoke to Ron Bass and Barry Steiner of the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), who both said these developments are considered projects at this time. He submitted his letter dated November 23, 1981, addressed to George Davison and Hadden Roth, to that affect, along with a document from OPR. It was agreed that the information submitted by Commissioner Peterson should be reviewed by the Town Attorney.

### 3. ADJOURNMENT

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:53 p.m. to the next special meeting on November 30, 1981. It was announced that the Town Council will hold a special hearing at their regularly scheduled meeting on November 24, 1981, to discuss the Housing Element.

*Lisa Burclin*

LISA BURGLIN  
PLANNING ASSISTANT