

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order at 8:00 p.m. on September 28, 1987, by Chairman Hayes in the Town Hall Council Chamber. Staff present: John Roberto, Planning Consultant,

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Harle, Sias, Zaharoff, Yarish, Julin, Hayes, Manning.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S Zaharoff, Harle, to approve minutes of August 14, 1987, with the following corrections: page 3, 2nd to last paragraph, after the word "relevant" insert "if it can be shown that the larger garages are not visible outside"; page 4, paragraph 5, after the word "that" insert "this".

Motion carried: Ayes: Harle, Sias, Zaharoff, Hayes
Abstains: Manning, Yarish, Julin

C. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Chairman Hayes introduced and welcomed the two newly appointed Commissioners Tim Yarish and Jo Julin.

1. AR-6 - Quarry Mountain, Incorporated, End of Tomohawk Drive, A/P Nos. 177-220-50, 177-250-40 and 177-250-41, architectural review of five single family homes, Units 4, 5, 9, 10 and 12, and review of draft Resolution of Approval.

Doug Elliott and Bruce Burman, applicants, and Alfred Morrissette, architect, present.

John Roberto, Planning Consultant, stated that there has been an appeal to the Commission's amendment to condition A-1 of Resolution 85-1 that requests the Council overturn the Commission's authority to approve building designs which allowed for construction of homes, or portions of homes, outside of the approved building envelopes for Quarry Mountain. The Town Council took action on the appeal in two parts. They first endorsed the concept of flexibility in allowing for some construction outside the building envelopes but in the Council's second action referred the Commission Resolution back to the Planning Commission for clearer definition as to the reasons the Planning Commission had for wanting to allow for some limited development outside the approved envelopes. The Council also wanted the Commission to be more specific as to the types of design criteria which would be used when allowing for some limited construction outside the building envelope. The Council directed that the Commission hearings on the wording revisions should have public notice, and be conducted as a public hearing. Until this is done, all designs previously approved with construction outside the building envelope will be held in limbo until the Council takes final action on the appeal.

Mr. Roberto went on to say that the Planning Commission is not precluded from holding it's public hearing tonight on the home design for lots 4, 5, 9 and 12 but can only approve building designs which are entirely within the building envelopes approved for the Quarry Mountain Subdivision. The applicant has informed staff that minor modifications to the layouts of the homes up for discussion tonight have been made and they now all fall within the building envelope. Included in the staff report dated September 24, 1987 is a proposed Resolution (Exhibit "A") setting forth the findings required for design approval that provides blank spaces where the Commission can insert the lot number of the homes that are found to have an acceptable design within the approved building envelope. This Resolution makes

reference to two exhibits: Exhibit A will be comprised of the respective drawings which depict the design approved by the Commission; and Exhibit B will include conditions and modifications, if any, to the drawing contained in Exhibit A.

Steve Best, 46 Elk Horn Way, said that his interpretation of the Town Council decision was to deny the approval of building outside the building envelope.

Larry Stack, 10 Alice Way, wanted to know why the Commission was proceeding when the homes are being appealed to Council, and as stated in the staff report the homes are held in limbo. Wasn't there also a 10 day appeal period when nothing can be acted on.

Doug Elliott, applicant, said they have tried to respond to the Planning Commission, Town Council and the public and therefore all the homes have been modified to fall within the building envelope. The revisions are relatively minor and there have been no changes to the exterior plans.

There was general discussion as to what were minor changes or major changes and the feeling of the Commission was to get a brief overview from staff as to the original design outside the building envelope and a brief overview from the applicant as to the changes made. If it is decided that the changes are major then a motion would be made to continue the application to allow for another public hearing, otherwise the hearing would continue tonight.

Unit No. 4 - Mr. Roberto said portions of the decks protrude beyond the side and rear building envelope line and portions of the detached garage protrude beyond the front and side building envelope. Mr. Elliott said they rotated the garage and pushed it up against the house, took off the decks and added a trellis in front. The livingroom was decreased by 4 feet.

Unit No. 5 - Mr. Roberto said that portions of decks protrude beyond the side and rear building envelope line and portions of the garage protrude beyond the front and side building envelope line. Mr. Elliott said the building was shifted, and the garage was rotated and moved in to the building. The size was increased from 3,051 to 3,122 square feet.

Unit No. 9 - Mr. Roberto said that portions of decks protrude beyond the rear and side building envelope and portions of the garage are outside the envelope. Mr. Elliott said that he took the garage and rotated it, decreased the kitchen and livingroom, replaced the deck to an on grade patio. The garage is detached but they were able to create a courtyard. The size was increased from 3,050 to 3,071 square feet.

Unit No. 10 - Mr. Roberto said that portions of a deck are beyond the side building envelope and portions of the garage are beyond the front building envelope. Mr. Elliott said the unit is the same as No. 5. The size was increased from 3,051 to 3,319 square feet.

Unit No. 12 - Mr. Roberto said that portions of the decks are beyond the rear building envelope and portions of the garage are beyond the front building envelope. Mr. Elliott said this entire plan was rotated 180 degrees. The size of this home was 3,146 square feet.

Mr. Morrissette, Architect, wanted to point out that it was not their conscience intention to increase the size of the homes but when they rotated the garages against the buildings it turned out to be better to have a hallway or mudroom added. The overall increase in all the homes was only 3.23%.

Jonathan Braun, 479 Scenic, felt that although the changes seemed to be minor he wanted to have additional time to look at the evelations.

Fritz Winkler, 32 Salinas mentioned that none of the homes in the area had 3 car garages.

Larry Stack, 10 Alice Way, thought that size was also an issue during the design stage and the homes have increased in size. He presented the Commission with figures from the Assessor's Parcel Role that indicate the square footage of 52 homes in the vicinity of this project, stating that the average home was 1,827 square feet. It is his feeling that the developer should have no more than the average. William Denton, 53 Miwok, felt there was a 50% discrepancy with the homes in the area and this project.

The general feeling of the Commission was that although some of the homes have increased in size, the changes seem to be minor.

Unit No. 4 - Mr. Elliott said all the homes were wood framed with cedar siding and aluminum windows. The roof pitch was 4 in 12 and 6 in 12. There are trellises to soften the front of the home and to support jasmine and bouganvillea. The finished floor and roof height are the same as originally designed except that the garage now faces the street.

Commissioner Sias thought this home was an improvement and had no objection. Commissioner Zaharoff had no objection to this design. Commission Harle felt this was an acceptable design but would rather see the garage not face the street. Commissioner Yulin asked for clarification as to why the Commission was deferring the color palate. Although she did not want to change the decision she thought the way the Resolution was written was open for interpretation. To which Mr. Roberto replied the resolution is only a draft and can be changed. Commissioner Yarish said this makes for a smaller package and pulls together the home within the building envelope. Chairman Hayes said it was a good design, has a low profile and does not exceed 18 feet in height and is a relatively small home.

M/S Sias, Harle, to approve the design review of the home on Lot 4, Quarry Mountain subdivision and reference to Exhibit A and B of staff report dated September 24, 1987, with no additional conditions and with plans submitted and dated September 28, 1987.

Motion carried. Ayes: Yarish, Sias, Zaharoff, Harle, Hayes
Abstain: Yulin, Manning

Unit No. 5 - Mr. Elliott stated that unit 5 and 10 are identical. This is a flat lot, and the height limit of 18 feet was imposed. The garage was rotated and moved into the building. There is an on grade patio in the rear.

Commissioner Yarish said the roof is low in the north elevation. Commissioner Sias felt the developer has made several changes and this is now an acceptable home within the building envelope. Commissioner Harle finds the design acceptable. Chairman Hayes was concerned about the 3 car garage but because the developer has pulled it back to the house, thus reducing the bulk, it is now acceptable. In addition, there is a tree screening it. Commissioner Zaharoff had some concerns with the 3 car garage on the east elevation being exposed but now feels that it is not a problem.

M/S Harle, Sias, to reference the Resolution stated as Exhibit A in staff report of September 24, 1987 and amend spelling of visible to "visible" and forgoing to "foregoing" with designation of Lot No. 5 in Exhibit B and in accordance with drawings of September 28, 1987.

Motion carried. Ayes: Sias, Zaharoff, Harle, Yarish, Hayes
Abstain: Manning, Yulin.

M/S Harle, Sias to continue AR-6 - Quarry Mountain Incorporated, end of Tomohawk Drive, A/P Nos. 177-220-50, 177-250-40 and 177-250-41, architectural review of three single family homes, Units 9, 10 and 12, and review of draft Resolution of Approval until a special meeting on October 14, 1987, at 8:00 p.m.

All ayes.

ROLL CALL 13

2. Town of San Anselmo Initiated amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Title 10 of the Municipal Code - Hillside Density District (R-1 H) - to establish a new application processing procedure and standards for developments proposed within the R-1 H District and review of the proposed Negative Declaration.

Mr. Roberto presented staff report, noting that he has amended Section 10-3.1203 to include the maximum density which would be allowed in the District to one dwelling unit per gross acre. The Town Council has asked staff that this be codified and that is why it is included. The only issue left to decide is the height. It was felt that 18 feet and 30 for a steep slope was a good number, having used several homes for the Quarry Mountain project as examples.

Jonathan Braun, 479 Scenic, wanted clarification on points of grade.

Fritz Winkler, 32 Salinas, would rather see 18 feet and 28 feet.

Chairman Hayes stated that what we have seen with regards to Quarry Mountain is that 18 feet is adequate for a single story and 18 and 30 on a steeper grade for a two story.

Commissioner Manning felt comfortable with the height and thought it important to make a decision tonight. To which Commissioner Zaharoff agreed and stated an Ordinance is the favorable way to proceed. Chairman Hayes suggested that they move the entire ordinance and selectively amend parts and recommend adoption to the Town Council.

M/S Zaharoff, Manning to recommend approval to Town Council the Hillside Density Ordinance attached to staff report dated September 24, 1987, including the supplemental staff report as identified as being for the meeting of June 15, 1987.

M/S Hayes, Manning to amend Section 10-3.1206(b) number 4 as follows: change (a) to (b), (b) to (c) and add "(a) That such amendment will better achieve the purposes of the ordinance."

Motion carried: Ayes: Manning, Julin, Zaharoff, Harle, Hayes, Sias
Abstain: Yarish

Chairman Hayes wanted to note that parcels covered in R-1 H pertain to one or more acres and that perhaps those parcels with less than an acre should have some restrictions. Mr. Roberto said he will bring it up in the General Plan update.

D. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Roberto stated that the Town Council has requested that a representative of the Planning Commission be present at Town Council meetings when a planning issue is on the agenda.

E. ADJOURNMENT TO REGULAR MEETING ON OCTOBER 5, 1987.

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. to the next regular meeting on October 14, 1987.

Barbara Chambers
Planning Secretary/Technician