

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order at 8:00 p.m. on September 14, 1987, by Chairman Stan Hayes in the Town Hall Council Chamber. Staff present: Lisa Wight, Planning Technician, and John Roberto, Planning Consultant.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Harle, Hayes, Sias, Zaharoff
Commissioners absent: Manning

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S Zaharoff, Harle, to approve the minutes of August 18, 1987, as written.

Motion carried: AYES: Harle, Zaharoff
ABSTAIN: Hayes, Sias

M/S Zaharoff, Sias, to approve the minutes of August 24, 1987, as written.

Motion passed unanimously.

C. PUBLIC HEARING

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 nine single family homes, Units 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12, and review of draft Resolution of Approval.

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

Steve Best, 46 Elkhorn Way, questioned whether this public hearing on the architectural review of individual homes is appropriate due to the fact that the Planning Commission approval of permitting homes to be constructed outside of the building envelopes (when warranted for a better design) has been appealed to the Town Council, to which Larry Stack, 10 Alice Way, agreed.

John Roberto, Planning Consultant, stated this hearing is appropriate as it would be speculative on anyone's part to determine what the Town Council's action will be. Mr. Roberto said in his opinion the building protrusions shown on the site plan dated August 20, 1987, are minor changes and even if the Planning Commission action is overturned, the design of the buildings could basically stand as approved with minor modifications. If the plans are required to be changed, a public hearing will be required.

Mr. Roberto presented the staff report, noting he has prepared a 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. 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conditions and modifications, if any, to the drawing contained in Exhibit A. He also stated the applicant has formally withdrawn the color matrix this evening as he desires to have the colors reviewed after construction. A condition of the building permit issuance will be that the color must be approved by the Commission prior to the granting of an occupancy permit. Staff has plan-checked all the drawings dated August 20, 1987, and all buildings, garages and decks shown on the plans comply with the minimum sideyard setback requirement in the R-1 District.

Mr. Stack questioned the contradiction between comments made in past staff reports and the current staff report dated September 11, 1987. It was pointed out to Mr. Stack that the drawings currently under review were revised August 20, 1987, and staff reports for previous drawings are not relevant. Mr. Stack said there is no reasonable justification that two out of nine homes have two stories and that the three car garages extend beyond the building envelopes.

Mr. Elliott said there are two distinct agendas: his agenda is to provide the best architectural design and the other agenda is to prolong the process. He feels the buildings are a low visual profile, the materials have been changed from stucco, and that it is standard practice for other Marin County Planning Commissions to approve construction before the colors are selected.

The Commissioners generally agreed that they preferred to review the colors after construction as they would have a better idea how the different colors would blend together. Chairman Hayes added that a Statement of Intent should be adopted by the Commission regarding the color review so that future Commissioners will be aware of the importance of the review.

Architectural Review of the Individual Homes:

Unit No. 4: A three car garage, open decks and a kitchen nook are located outside the building envelopes on the tentative map. Mr. Elliott said the construction is under 18 feet in height and explained the garage could be rotated to be within the previously approved building envelope; however, this would eliminate a proposed covered trellis and front garden area, and one would see the garage doors and a wider garage wall from the street. Mr. Elliott said only persons within the project (on this street) will see the structures and the market is demanding three car garages.

Mr. Kanis said the three car garages outside the building envelopes will be a visual intrusion on the open space area.

Bill Deer, 63 Indian Rock Road, said he would prefer to look at a corner of a garage than look at open garage doors and hobby shops from a front elevation.

Commissioner Zaharoff said this is a good design as it is adequately screened, will only be visible to persons on the street, and a larger garage may result in less vehicles parking on the pad, which can cause glare and be seen from a distance. Commissioner Sias said he likes the garage rotated and supports the kitchen nook extension into the building envelope, but feels the garage should be reduced to two car as it is overdevelopment of the lot and feels nice homes can be designed within the building envelopes. Chairman Hayes also feels it is a good design, but is still concerned with the size of the garage due to the bulk. Commissioner Harle supports the design as it will not adversely impact the community and feels it is not overdevelopment as a large portion of the property has been given to open space.

Unit No. 5: A three car garage, open decks and a kitchen nook are located outside the building envelopes on the tentative map. Mr. Elliott noted the building is sunk low and there is a loose rhythm to the building design. The proposed landscaping will provide additional texture. Mr. Morrisette added that the human view cone is such that from a distance it will not be visually obvious whether there are two or three car garages.

Mr. Deer said that his 2,800 square foot three bedroom, two bath, family room dwelling is not especially large, and the 3,100 square foot homes proposed in this project are not out of line. Mr. Kanis feels Unit Nos. 4 and 5 are belly to belly. It was pointed out that due to the fact that Unit No. 5 is set 10 feet lower than Unit No. 4, they will not appear to be close.

Commissioner Harle said the design is entirely acceptable, to which Commissioner Zaharoff agreed. Commissioner Sias said the garage is too large for the space and would prefer it either rotated or made smaller. Commissioner Hayes said the detached garage does articulate since it is setback from the street, but does not support a three car garage.

Unit No. 6: Only open decks are located outside the building envelope on the tentative map. Mr. Elliott drew a cross section of the lot and proposed dwelling, showing that the second floor is at street level. To reduce the height would result in a subterranean dwelling. Rather than leave the dwelling with exposed piers, the design is to enclose the lower area as a finished floor.

In response to Mr. Kanis' question, Mr. Roberto noted there are five trees on the east side of the dwelling; three trees to the rear of the dwelling; and 13 trees along the west side of the dwelling. Mr. Roberto said if the Commission requires the dwelling to be one story, staff recommends the siding be extended to screen the piers and trees be planted in front.

Commissioner Zaharoff said she can support this design, to which Commissioners Harle and Sias agreed. Chairman Hayes noted that due to the slope of the lot, the lower wall would be necessary anyway, but is concerned about the scale of the dwelling. Chairman Hayes questioned the variety and growing patterns of the trees, to which Mr. Roberto responded there are some slow growing and some fast growing trees.

Unit No. 7: The three car garage, open decks, the living room and master bedroom are located outside the building envelopes on the tentative map. Mr. Roberto noted that the garage is the most extreme case of extending outside the building envelope as it is only 1.5 feet from the front property line.

Mr. Elliott said it was his mistake to design the building envelope in proportion to the cul de sac. The garage couldn't be placed on the north side as it would require additional grading and would be more visible.

Mr. Stack said the house is too large for the site and the number of garage spaces are too many.

Commissioner Sias said the garage should be reduced in size and moved closer to the dwelling to provide more open area between the structures and the street. Commissioner Harle suggested the garage be cut back in this case, to which Chairman Hayes and Commissioner Zaharoff agreed. Commissioner Zaharoff suggested the reduced garage be rotated 90 . Mr. Morrissette said this rotation would block the view of Mt. Tamalpais from the dwelling.

Unit No. 8: The kitchen nook and open decks are outside the building envelopes. Mr. Elliott noted this dwelling will be approximately 2,900 square feet.

Mr. Stack said he objects for the same reasons stated previously.

Commissioner Harle said he has no objections, to which the other Commissioners and Chairman agreed.

Unit No. 9: A three car garage and open decks are outside the building envelopes. Mr. Elliott noted this dwelling will be approximately 3,000 square feet. He added that to conform the garage to the building envelope would eliminate the courtyard.

Commissioner Zaharoff said she has no problems with the application, to which Commissioner Harle agreed. Commissioner Sias and Chairman Hayes do not support the three car garage.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and staff as to when the next public hearing should be held.

Chairman Hayes explained that the crux of his concern is that he seeks to minimize construction on ridge lands, but to do this in a way that he is not denying an applicant reasonable use of property. Consistent with his goal, he feels three car garages are larger than he would like to see there. However, he would like to see the model previously presented to the Commission prior to the next scheduled meeting to get a better understanding of the impact of three car garages in the locations proposed. He stated that it might be possible his concerns regarding the garage sizes are not relevant if it can be shown that the larger garages will not be visible outside of the project, but the burden of proof is on the applicant. It was agreed that the applicants would make the model available to the Chairman.

M/S Zaharoff, Harle, to reference the Resolution stated as Exhibit A and amend to delete the language related to the color palate and color matrix; with the amendment to reference the Resolution to Lot No. 3 for approval with the additional condition that a tree be

added in the location as described in Exhibit B; with the amendment to reference the Resolution to Lot No. 6 for approval with no additional conditions; with the amendment to reference the Resolution to Lot No. 7 for approval with the additional condition that the three car garage be reduced to a two car garage (thereby increasing the open area between the garage and the street by one parking space); with the amendment to reference the Resolution to Lot No. 8 for approval with no conditions; with reference to Exhibit B, that the language in No. 2, under the heading, "Conditions Applicable To All Lots", be deleted and revised to read, "Color approval for each individual home shall be brought to the Planning Commission for approval prior to issuance of occupancy permit."

Motion carried: AYES: Harle, Sias, Zaharoff
NOES: Hayes

Audience was advised of the ten day appeal period.

M/S Sias, Harle, to continue AR-6 for Quarry Mountain, Incorporated, for review of Units 4, 5, 9, 10 and 12 and the draft Resolution of Approval to a special meeting on September 28, 1987.

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Elliott, thinking that the public hearing was closed at this hearing, requested that this be the situation at the next meeting. Chairman Hayes advised the public hearing had not been closed.

D. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION

Staff Report on Timetable for R-1 H Amendments

Mr. Roberto noted an exemption permit to the Interim Ordinance has been applied for by Peter Fraser and Mr. Roberto has concerns about processing his application under the current Ordinance. He urged the Commission to schedule a public hearing to discuss the R-1 H amendments at the next available meeting.

The Commisisoners agreed to hold a public hearing on the R-1 H amendments at the special meeting on September 28, 1987.

E. ADJOURNMENT TO REGULAR MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 21, 1987.

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:30 p.m. to the next regular meeting on September 21, 1987.

LISA WIGHT
PLANNING TECHNICIAN