

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Edwin Bergeson at 8:00 p.m. on February 27, 1984 in the Town Hall Council Chamber. George Davison, Director Public Works/Planning, and Lisa Wight, Planning Technician, present.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Bergeson, Hayes, Sharp, Sousa
Commissioners absent: Harle, Signorelli

2. Draft Hillside Density Ordinance for all Undeveloped and Partially Developed Hillside and Ridge Parcels.

Commissioner Hayes explained the ordinance to the audience.

Mr. Davison said Section 5 of the Table of Hillside and Ridge Density parcels should be eliminated as zoning must be specific and not vague. Regarding Hugh Cadden's letter dated February 23, 1984, the 18 foot height limit is from the highest perimeter, so it is possible that part of the house could go to 35 feet in height.

It was pointed out that A/P 7-201-10, owned by Shortall, should be three units, rather than two - typographical error.

Richard Wheezner, 164 Oak Springs Drive, questioned whether the Commissioners had visited A/P 5-011-62. Commissioner Hayes said that community meetings were not held in all areas of Town.

Richard Shortall, Sr., resident of San Francisco, owner of A/P numbers 7-154-02, 7-154-07, 7-201-02 and 7-201-10, said he does not understand why his property has been given the lowest density in San Anselmo, i.e., adjoining property (Fraser/Horn) not as conducive to building has a higher density. He said his representatives have been attending the workshops and have no idea why the density is so low - it is discriminatory.

Gail Gilboy, 113 Madrone Avenue, representing the Shortall's, asked how this relates to the Housing Element and questioned whether the Department of Housing and Community Development has been advised by the Town that they plan to cut density. She said Commissioner Signorelli had told her the Commission knows five units will not be economically possible, so we shouldn't spend money on studies. The road can be upgraded and the property developed nicely.

Commissioner Bergeson pointed out that in the future if improvements are made in access, there is nothing to preclude the owners from asking for more units. Commissioner Hayes said that present density must be based on the conditions as they exist now.

Hugh Cadden, resident of Ross, owner of A/P 7-101-01 and 7-151-01, said his property is in the ridge zone and the 18 foot height limit seems arbitrary. He suggested the height be considered under architectural review.

John Murphy, resident of Greenbrae, owner of A/P Nos. 5-043-16, 5-043-22 and 5-043-31, read his letter dated February 23, 1984, requesting the Commission to either remove his property from the density table and he will later submit an SPD application for four units, or leave it in the table for 4 units, rather than the three presently proposed. Bill Johnson added that in 1960 six to seven pads were put in for homes.

Peter Fraser, 100 West Oak Knoll Drive, Sleepy Hollow, owner of A/P Nos. 7-071-03, 7-101-01 and 7-154-04, regarding Section 10-3.1202, what are the "special circumstances"?; Section 10-3.1204 - he would like to see more of a statement about the two lots other than just "holding" because by law access must be available; Section 10-3.1206(a) - increasing the potential for damage to the environment by not permitting attached units, and also eliminating any possibilities of low and moderate income housing which is directly at odds with the Housing Element; make an asterisk by Section 10-3.1207(d) because the trails plan map is inaccurate; Section 10-3.1207(f) - he agrees with the concept, but how do you determine who is the public, management, who pays to maintain trails, pays for liability, etc.? This should be policy, rather than in ordinance; Section 10-3.1208(d)(2) - the sizes of trees and shrubs should not have to be done at the point of a gun; and Section 10-3.1211 - this should be removed from the ordinance, talked about at a round table and put in policy. Mr. Fraser said the density maximums are set so low that it will not be economically feasible to develop these parcels.

Jonathon Braun, 479 Scenic Avenue, said he approves of the development criteria section. He said A/P 7-101-01, originally proposed for two units and now proposed for three, sits right on top of the ridge and is a good distance from any flexible access. This ordinance would add 20 units to Oak Avenue, which is a substantive burden and does not include second units and lots of record.

Carolyn Preston said it seems the density guidelines seem to be visual. If the Town can be shown through professional studies that a number of units can be accommodated, drainage can be solved, visibility minimized, etc., the owner should have the right to prove buildability.

Gay Kagy, 280 Redwood Road, said the wording in Section 10-3.1211(b) (1) should be more restrictive to read, "shall not be permitted" as the way it reads now it is wishy-washy. Section 10-3.1208(h) should be deleted.

Jerome Draper, 295 Los Angeles Boulevard, suggested it be noted next to each parcel on the density table whether it is in the ridge zone and what level of stability it has per the geologists's map.

M/S Hayes, Sharp, to amend Section 10-3.1202, "special circumstances" to read, ". . . the unique and sensitive character of hillside and ridge parcels require . . ."

Motion passed unanimously.

M/S Sharp, Hayes, to change Section 10-3.1206 to read, "The use of lands in this District shall be detached single family residential units. Cluster development is encouraged.

Motion passed unanimously.

M/S Hayes, Sousa, to change Section 10-3.1208(d)(2), to read, ". . . types, can sizes and planting densities . . ."

Motion passed unanimously.

M/S Hayes, Sharp, Section 10-3.1211(a)(1) be changed to read, "Ridge tops are those identified in the San Anselmo General Plan."

Motion passed unanimously.

M/S Bergeson, Hayes, Section 10-3.1211(b)(2), change to read, "Consideration of which shall be guided to low profile of development, actual height shall be determined by design review process, existing height limits as set forth elsewhere in Code shall be excluded from this ordinance."

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Davison suggested A/P 6-061-24 might be better with a zoning of commercial.

Jonathon Braun suggested A/P numbers 7-131-15, 7-142-01 and 7-182-03 have a total density of four rather than five, and A/P numbers 7-101-01 and 7-151-01 have a total density of two rather than three.

The Commission agreed to continue discussions on the Ordinance, Negative Declaration and General Plan Amendments to the regular meeting on March 5, 1984.

3. ADJOURNMENT

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:05 a.m. to the next regular meeting on March 5, 1984.

Lisa Wight
LISA WIGHT
PLANNING TECHNICIAN