

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order at 8:00 p.m. on August 24, 1987, by Chairman Hayes in the Council Chamber. John Roberto, Planning Consultant, was present representing staff.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Zaharoff, Sias, Harle, Hayes

Commissioners Absent: Manning

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - CONTINUED

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. AR-6 - Quarry Mountain, Incorporated, End of Tomohawk Drive, A/P Nos. 177-220-50, 177-250-40 and 177-250-41, Amendment to Condition A-1 of Resolution 85-1 of the San Anselmo Planning Commission to allow some flexibility in building construction outside of the building envelopes shown on the approved tentative map if warranted for a better building design.

2. 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.

John Roberto, Planning Consultant presented staff report of August 20, 1987. He also brought the three Commissioners that were absent at the meeting of August 10, 1987, up to date stating that staff was given the directive to prepare an amendment to Condition A-1 of Resolution 85-1 of the San Anselmo Planning Commission to allow some flexibility in building construction outside of the building envelope if warranted for a better building design. Staff also prepared a draft Resolution of approval of the design reviews application as shown on the staff report dated August 20, 1987. It includes basic concepts for all the homes based on public input and input from the Commissioners during general questions about the building envelope and in-depth discussion on lots 3 and 4.

In regards to the grading issue brought up at the last meeting, Mr. Roberto said the Town Engineer is bringing the matter before the Town Council, stating that the proposed revisions to the grading plan are beneficial and is recommending approval. The matter will be heard on August 25, 1987.

Commissioner Hayes suggested that since three of the Commissioners were absent at the last meeting, and a Resolution was before the Commission, it would probably be a good idea to address the building envelopes once again and then proceed on to each lot.

Mr. Roberto stated that the staff report of August 7, 1987 gave a breakdown, lot by lot, as to how they conform to the building envelope.

Chairman Hayes wanted an explanation as to why the developers had to build outside of the building envelope.

Mr. Elliott said they wanted to reduce the height from 24 feet to 18 feet to comply with the proposals before the Planning Commission for the R-1H height limit. Reducing the height of the homes creates a low visual impact however, some of the building will fall outside of the building envelope. He noted that none of the heated space, with the exception of a portion of a nook on one lot fall outside of the envelope. There is no detriment to the public and no benefit to move the houses closer together to put the garages in the setbacks.

Steve Best, 46 Elk Horn Way, felt that they should keep within the building envelope.

Carol Denton, 2530 Miwak, thought that the intent was for the development to blend in with the neighborhood but these homes are large and will stand out and therefore is opposed to expanding the envelope.

Jonathan Braun, 479 Scenic, gave much thought to the statements of the last meeting and although he was not opposed to going outside the building envelope then, he isn't quite sure now. Also, the three car garages seem to be quite large.

Gus Kanis, 46 Miwak, had occasion to visit homes in the area and said a 3,000 square foot home was not the norm and there did not seem to be any three car garages.

Larry Stack, 10 Alice Way, does not understand why the issue of building outside of the building envelope should even be brought up; the size of the homes should be reduced to 2,000 - 2,500 square feet to conform to the building envelope; feels that there are only two car garages in the neighborhood and disagrees with the three car garages; feels that any homes on the Eastern portion that will be impacted by the Town Council decision regarding the grading, should not be discussed.

Barry Spitz, 155 Los Angeles, is against the garages being outside of the building envelope; feels there is no public access to the open space with exception of the street.

Mr. Elliott said that the lots have been modified since the last meeting to meet the R-1 setback requirements with the exception of the front yard.

Chairman Hayes stated a requirement of the Tentative Map be that that public access to open space be obtained.

Larry Stack, 10 Alice Way, wanted to know if the trade off will be three car garages because we are getting public access.

Commissioner Zaharoff said that the design of the buildings is the last control we have in assuring low visual impact. If going outside the building envelopes helps achieve a better design then it should be considered.

Commissioner Sias said that it was approved with standards in place and is not sure a three car garage is necessary. He said he could not understand why the developer could not build within the building envelope and still save the ridge top. He said he could not support going outside the envelope.

Commissioner Harle said that the buildings are not outside the envelope. He felt there was no reason to put size restrictions on the homes or garages. Garages are internal and shouldn't be considered. The people who want or need homes this size will probably need this space, if not for a car then for storage. He was in support of the application.

Chairman Hayes said it looks like a major redesign to reduce three car garages to two. He has no trouble with the decks but the garages seem so large. Chairman Hayes stated that the developers had done a good job of covering parking but really would like to see the garages reduced to two.

Mr. Elliott said that their buyers are only interested in homes with approximately 3,000 square feet and a three car garage. He wants to sell the homes he will be building and to do that he has to build what the market wants. They had to push the houses out to conform to the 18 feet height and said there is no heated space outside the envelope. They have given over \$500,000 to public improvements. Also, five on street parking spaces were lost because of the landscaping and public walkways. Lots 3 and 4 will have impact only on those two homes and to no one else.

Mr. Elliot said the Schenk home was much bulkier and there was no objection from the Commission. He is trying to design fine homes in San Anselmo and has been trying to comply with the public as much as possible.

Chairman Hayes said the issue is that the homes are so large that the garages go outside the envelope so perhaps the Commission needs to look at the actual size of each home. He understands that Mr. Elliott and Mr. Berman are now down to a one story from a two story to meet the latest 18 feet height in the R-1H but wondered if a 3,000 foot plus homes are necessary.

Mr. Berman explained that there is a home on Indian Rock Road that is 3,500 feet, one on Indian Rock Court that is 3,000 square feet, and some in Sleepy Hollow that are 3,000 square feet plus.

Mr. Roberto explained that the Resolution before the Commission could be adopted without a decision being made on the size of the garages.

M/S Zaharoff, Harle move approval as stated in Exhibit A in Staff Report dated August 20, 1987, A Resolution amending condition A-1 of Planning Commission Resolution No. 85-1. approving a Tentative Map for the Old Quarry Subdivision A/P 177-250-40 and 41 and 177-220-50.

Ayes: Hayes, Harle, Zaharoff

Noes: Sias

Motion carried. Applicants advised of the ten day appeal period.

Barry Spitz, 155 Los Angeles Avenue, did not understand how the Planning Commission could overrule what the Town Council approved.

Mr. Roberto explained that this was to modify the Planning Commission Resolution. He would check with the Town Attorney as to whether or not this now has to be brought before the Town Council but stated that there was still no reason not to proceed to the individual lots.

Larry Stack, 10 Alice Way thought if there was a question of legality then the Planning Commission should not proceed until there was clarification.

Chairman Hayes said that the next order of business was to discuss the individual lots. It was decided that the cut-off time for the last item discussed would be 11:00 p.m.

LOT 3

Mr. Roberto referred to his staff report of August 7, 1987 stating that portions of the proposed uncovered decks protrude beyond the side building envelope line. The deck also protrudes one half foot into the 8 foot side yard setback in the R-1 zone. It should be noted that at the last meeting the Commission wanted to see additional landscaping in front of the building and the deck was to extend around the entire building. These changes have been made by the developer.

Mr. Elliott confirmed that the changes proposed by the Commission were done. He also said that he was using standard olympic stain over cedar siding and composition shingle siding. He wanted to use earth tones to blend in with the surroundings. Stucco is also an option but because of the cost factor involved it is not likely many buyers would be attracted to it. Although he provided a color matrix for the proposed buyers as directed by the Commission, Mr. Elliott wanted to have as much latitude as possible in making changes if necessary.

There was discussion about the color matrix. Questions were raised as to what could be done to control the buyers from changing the color after purchase. Mr. Roberto said that there could be a clause added to the deed that would restrict the buyers from changing the colors without coming back to the Planning Commission. It was the general feeling of the Commission that the darker colors were preferable, they were opposed to Nos. 1-3 on color palate, not in favor of the stucco, there were no objections to the roof or metal but would like to see the trim darker than what is shown. It was suggested that staff prepare a statement of intent in adopting a color palate for the next meeting.

Commissioner Harle is in favor of approval of lot 3.

Commissioner Sias liked the addition of trees and although the homes are not exposed to other homes he felt additional screening was necessary.

Commissioner Zaharoff doesn't have an objection to decks exceeding the envelope.

Chairman Hayes did not have a problem with the decks exceeding the envelope but gets the sense that the 3 car garage is fairly large and the height of the garage looks higher than the roof of the house.

There was discussion as to whether or not these homes were just going to be addressed and comments made and at the end of all 9 lots a Resolution passed, or, if after discussion of each lot, there be a motion for approval and a Resolution passed for each. Mr. Elliott was in favor of a decision after each lot has been discussed as he has a real need to build before the rains come. He felt that the Commission is denying him due process by not approving one by one so the work can proceed.

Mr. Roberto stated that staff has prepared a draft Resolution of approval of the Architectural design review for the homes on lots 3-10 and 12 which incorporates all the findings necessary for Architectural design review approval, and the conditions applicable to all homes submitted. The conditions previously stipulated for the homes proposed on lots 3 and 4 have been included in the Resolution and any additional conditions to the overall design of homes previously reviewed must be added by the Commission as well as conditions which may be applied to the homes yet to be reviewed. Mr. Roberto went on to say should the Commission find that one or more homes present some design questions that can not be resolved at the meeting it would be possible to amend the resolution to exclude those specific homes from an action of approval of the remainder.

LOT 4

Mr. Roberto said that portions of the decks protrude beyond the side and rear building envelope line. The side deck protrudes 3 feet into the side yard where only 2 feet is allowed in the R-1 zone. Portions of the detached garage protrude beyond the front and side building envelope, and the garage is within 9 feet of the front property line where 20 feet is required in the R-1 zone.

Mr. Elliott said that the lot is on a flat site and the controversial point seems to be the grading issue which is before the Town Council. He tried to put in as much landscaping as possible and stated that this is probably the most simplistic of all the homes. Also, he has tried to keep all garages perpendicular to the street.

Gus Kanis, 46 Miwak, wanted to see a 2 car garage.

Alfred Morrissette, Architect for Quarry Mountain Project, said that a 3 car garage is an advantage to the Town in that it will keep cars off the street. In addition, if the garages were smaller in scale, and set back 20 feet, it would affect the quality of design.

Commissioner Sias wanted to see a 2 car garage on this lot built within the setbacks however he might be agreeable to look at lot by lot for homes with garages outside the envelope but still feels a 2 car garage is adequate for all lots.

Commissioner Zaharoff had no problem with the extension of the deck or nook that extends outside of the envelope. Although 3 car garages seem unusual to San Anselmo she has no problem with a 3 car garage on this lot because of the way it works with the house design and the low visual impact.

Commissioner Harle felt it was an excellent design and has no objection to a 3 car garage. He felt if the developers want to build a 3 car garage there should be no reason why they can not. He does not see it as an issue and would like to leave it up to the developer and the buyers. He also said that many residents in San Anselmo have 3 cars but not adequate parking.

Chairman Hayes was generally not in favor of 3 car garages but had no problem with the deck. He felt this unit exceeds the building envelope more than the others and a 2 car garage will provide less stress to the building. He stated that 3 car garages are not the norm in San Anselmo but may find some circumstances that a 3 car garage could be ok.

M/S Sias, Zaharoff, to continue AR-6 - Quarry Mountain, Incorporated, End of Tomohawk Drive, A/P Nos. 177-20-50, 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 to a special meeting on Monday, September 14, 1987 with the hearing to begin on Lot 5. Also staff is to prepare a statement of intent in adopting a color palate and a Resolution which would allow them to act on each individual home in the application.

Motion passed unanimously.

D. ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT SPECIAL MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 1987.

Barbara Chambers
Administrative Secretary/Technician