

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order at 8:00 p.m. on August 10, 1987 by Chairman McPeak in the Town Hall Council Chamber. Staff present: John Roberto, Planning Consultant, Wayne Barcelon, Consulting Architect, and Barbara Chambers, Administrative Secretary/Technician.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Zaharoff, Kroot, Manning, McPeak

Commissioners Absent: Harle Sias, Hayes

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of August 3, 1987 continued to August 17, 1987.

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, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12.

Chairman McPeak addressed the Commissioners as to the method of proceeding with this application. He thought the issues at hand were 1. Plans to go outside the building envelope 2. The setback requirements in R1-H 3. The height limits 4. The designs of the buildings 5. Landscaping. He felt that perhaps there should be a general overview of the 9 homes and then a discussion of each lot with a time allotment of approximately 10 minutes per lot.

Commissioner Manning agreed with the approach and wondered if perhaps a time limit should be set for when the meeting should conclude.

Commissioner Zaharoff agreed and suggested a ceiling of midnight for this application.

Commissioner Kroot concurred.

John Roberto presented staff report dated August 7, 1987 stating that the Quarry Mountain project has already received design review approval for its' Preliminary Plan, Tentative Map and Improvement Plans. The issues before the Planning Commission are the architectural design of the buildings, and the landscaping of individual lots. Staff required the applicant to submit all this information with the application. The applicant intends to build these homes and sell them on the market. The applicant would like to leave some portions available to the prospective buyer. These options include the color of exterior materials, building colors, and in some instances the exterior finish. To provide for these options the applicant is submitting a master color palate and a range of materials which will be used in building design for Town approval. Any prospective buyer of a home in quarry Mountain would have the option of selecting from the master design palate approved by the Town. All buildings would be constructed as shown on the plans submitted with the design review application. Section 10-4.07(b) of the Town's Design Review Ordinance provides that in review of the exterior design of a building the Planning Commission shall consider the size, proportions, use, type, and quality of materials; architectural features and ornamentation; night lighting; color application; signs; site placement of all features; existing and proposed landscaping; paved areas and screening devices. Section 10-3.1210(b) of the R1-h zone requires the evaluation of the following additional criteria in the process of design review. 1. Conformance to the approved Preliminary Plan; 2. Adequacy of screening; 3. Selection of architectural features that enable the structure to blend with its' environment. As set forth in Resolution 2060, the conditions of approval of the Preliminary Plan and Tentative Map directly applicable to this application are conditions A1, A2 and A4. These conditions read as follows: A1 - That all future construction including buildings

swimming pools, decks, accessory buildings and etc., on any of the twelve lots in the subdivision be restricted to the land within the lot envelopes which are depicted with a dashed line on the Tentative Map prepared by Schwartz-Waag Inc. A2 - That all future construction within the lot envelopes be designed to minimize the use, height and visibility of retaining walls. Homes located on slopes should be designed to the existing contours and either stepped up or down. A4 - Home construction shall have a low visual profile and height limits set elsewhere in the Town shall not govern construction on this site. The Planning Commission and citizens of San Anselmo will have to determine if the architectural design of the single family homes is compatible with the immediate area and the Town as a whole. Staff has reviewed the architectural plans of the massing of the buildings, articulation and compliance with the conditions of approval of Resolution 2060. Staff has some general observations which are applicable to all of the nine homes currently under review. 1. The detached garages appear to be higher than necessary, and the height does not appear to blend well with the proposed homes. Detached garages should be no higher than 12 to 13 feet measured from the peak of the roof to finished grade. 2. The decks proposed on each of the homes provides the only usable outdoor space. There is an opportunity to possibly use some of the area between the homes and the subdivision roads for usable outdoor space. However, increasing usable outdoor space in front of the homes could end up reducing the number of cars that can be parked on the site. 3. The fireplace chimneys and stacks appear to be higher above the roof than required by code. The height could be reduced thereby improving the appearance of the buildings. 4. The downslope elevation of the buildings on lots 3, 6 and 12 have a greater massing than the homes on other lots due to topography. Landscaping and other design features should be employed to reduce the blank wall effect at the lower levels. All of the homes as presently designed do not comply with condition A1 of Resolution 2060. In most instances portions of proposed decks and detached garages are located outside the approved building envelopes. In addition there are a few situations where there is a small nook or chimney outside the approved envelope. The applicant has stated in the application that in order to keep the height of the buildings within the current parameters being discussed by the Commission for the R1-H zone the buildings were spread out further on the lot. Staff did observe that the previous two story structures proposed by the applicant were entirely within the approved building envelope. Furthermore at the time the Preliminary Plan and Tentative Map were reviewed and approved there was no established height limit in the R1-H zone. In fact at the present time there still is no height limit.

Commissioner Kroot stated that the garages could be reduced from 22 feet to 12-13 feet but felt that would be fairly low for a pitched roof. Perhaps something in between.

Mr. Barcelon said the house pitch was 4 and 12 and the garage was 6 and 12 so the garage could be reduced to be in line with the house. It was his understanding that the developer has modified the garages based on the recommendation of this staff report.

Chairman McPeak wanted clarification on whether or not the R-1 setback requirements apply to R-1H.

John Roberto cited Sec. 10-3.1208 Residential Design Review Sub. Sec. 7H and felt that although R-1 was used as a basic standard he said that a waiver can be considered upon a Planning Commission motion or upon the request of the applicant. He said if a variance was required on any of the lots he would check with the Town Attorney as to how to proceed. Also, he said that lot 11 has been withdrawn at this time by Mr. Elliott because of the problems associated with it.

Doug Elliott stated that they have a unique site plan. A year was spent just on the landscaping because there are no sideyards or frontyards and this backs up to open space. They have added tree islands to create a park like setting and the bulk of the flat area was given to the public. He thought that in the beginning stages of design the height would be 30-35 feet but in going to the Planning Commission meetings the height seems to be closer to 18 feet so they adjusted the height to come in line with what the public wanted. He stated that there was virtually no heated space outside of the building envelope with the exception of lot 8. He said that the garage in lot 4 could be turned 90 degrees but he felt that would be poor design. He probably could comply with staff in changing the decks however he feels that they have a very good design now and want to leave it as is. They have altered the garage height from 22 to no more than 17 feet.

Chairman McPeak opened the discussion to the public for general questions regarding the application.

Jonathan Braun, 479 Scenic was not opposed to the idea to go beyond the footprints however because of the configuration of the garages for lot 7 and 8 the homes were pushed out from the hillside. He felt that each lot had to be looked at carefully.

David Israel, 47 Indian Rock Road, did not have a problem of going outside the building envelope but the vertical walls on the slope are a great concern.

Mary Jo Odell, 41 Elk Horn, wanted to know if the garages would be the only thing visible looking up from Broadmoor if the 18 feet height was observed.

Larry Stack, 10 Alice Way, said that he was opposed to three car garages and that no other homes in the area have them. He also stated that there seems to be severe grading to round out and back fill the east side going on that was not part of the original plan. He felt any changes to the original plan should be decided at a Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Stack stated that the houses should not even be discussed until the grading issue is resolved. There was also no mention to square footage of the homes and they look quite bulky.

Steve Best, 46 Elk Horn Way, agreed with the comments of Mr. Stack and wondered if staff would be able to make a decision about the grading on the east side or if it had to be addressed at a Planning Commission Meeting.

Jerry Draper, 295 San Francisco Blvd, wanted to know the square footage of the homes.

Doug Elliott responded to the public by saying the buildings facing Broadmoor will all be lower than originally stated that trees will be planted to help in creating a visual break. He said that the grading that is being done by the fire road has been approved by Mr. Bala and staff. Mr. Elliott said that the average homes will be 3,000 to 3,200 square feet.

Chairman McPeak wanted clarification from staff on the grading.

John Roberto indicated there were no major grading changes that he was aware of but he would follow up on it and get back to the Commission.

Commissioner Manning stated that on the advise of the Town Attorney he would have to abstain because subsequent to approval of the Master Plan he had spoken to a Realtor and expressed an interest in the project.

Commissioner Zaharoff stated that she was first opposed to going outside the building envelope proposed in the Tentative Map because of the controversy. However, because of the lots on the east side she is persuaded by the thought that the design concept is the greatest impact and in this project if we can accommodate a good living situation with low visibility and not impact the public it seems almost foolish not to consider it. She was willing to entertain what was going on on a lot by lot basis and is receptive to discussing going beyond the building envelope in lots 3, 4, 5, and 6 and lots 7, 8, 9, and 10 is not receptive if they will visually impact the public in any way.

Commissioner Kroot agreed with Commissioner Zaharoff in that it should be looked at on a lot by lot bases. In addition the developer has been trying to conform to the proposed R-1H height requirements for the Town and has also added additional landscaping. He felt that this is an excellent development.

Chairman McPeak said that the side set back requirements for R-1 should be adhered to for garages and decks and that he didn't want to see the houses moved downhill more so he would agree to a variance in the front if necessary.

Chairman McPeak suggested then that the individual lots be discussed.

LOT NUMBER 3

Mr. Roberto presented staff report stating this is a 2 story home with a detached garage and portions of the proposed uncovered decks protrude beyond the side building envelope line. This is a downslope property and there is a 2nd level to utilize space. One way to break up the massing is by the landscaping. The deck also protrudes one half foot into the 8 foot side yard setback in the R-1 zone.

Mr. Barcelon stated that the decks also break up the walls and shadows will be created by putting up lattice work.

Alfred Morrisette, Architect for Elliott & Berman stated that although this was two stories it looks out to vacant space and will be the least amount of impact on other homes.

Chairman McPeak wanted clarification on the color palate and how the height was determined.

Mr. Morrisette said there are 6 wood siding colors to choose from plus stucco, 3 trim colors and 3 shingle colors.

Mr. Elliott said that the new owners will choose from the master design palate agreed on by the Commission. He said that by listening to the Planning Commission's discussion on height requirements for R-1H he felt that approximately 18 feet was the answer. Using an 18 foot lid at the highest point on the ridge of lot or high point, go up 18 feet and draw a flat plane and then intersect the downslope not to exceed 30 feet. This will create the envelope.

Bonnie Bompert, 32 Salinas was concerned about heavy massive buildings on the east elevation and was against stucco being used.

Jerry Draper, 295, San Francisco Blvd. thinks this is the most visible lot and it looks like a ski lodge. He felt it was very visible from across the valley and he took slides to show the Commission. It is too bulky and very visible from the east side. He thought the bulk could be reduced by reducing the size of the

house. He said that he wanted the Commission to know that he is on record for appealing the architectural review of the landscaping for the eastside because he wanted screening.

Gus Kanis, 46 Miwak, wanted to know how high is the highest point of the eastern elevation of this lot.

Mr. Roberto stated that from grade to peak the highest point was 35 1/2 feet; from the lower eve to grade it was 28 - 29 feet. Jonathan Braun, 479 Scenic wanted to see story polls for each one of the structures. He said some people will be looking down on roofs so perhaps we need to get a professional advise. Also, perhaps the natural wood that would darken to weather and perhaps a shed roof instead of gable. He felt if the garage was perpendicular it would be reduced to a 2 car garage and therefore pull the house back up the hill which will reduce bulk. John Roberto stated that by pulling the house up the hill you will pull it up on the ridge. He said the site plan doesn't show landscaping and he would like to see some in the front of the house.

David Israel, 47 Indian Rock, agreed with Jonathan Braun and also would rather go over the envelope to the cul-de-sac rather than down the hill to reduce the visual impact. He did not like the stucco, saying that it would be unsuitable left to weather because the streaking will give a look of disrepair.

Don Mansell, 90 Holstein, stated that the architect is doing what he wants by violating the setback requirements so why put requirements on landscaping and colors when he will probably not follow it.

Fred Stoker, 32 Salinas, thinks natural wood is better and would like to see it in a natural finish because is is by Open Space and it should be natural. He also feels there should be more landscaping.

Mr. Elliott said they did story polls and energy was spent on landscaping the west elevation which was the most visible. This house was the least visible. He said this wasn't an issue during the design review and should not be now. Mr. Elliott said the only visible part would be dead center on the downhill side and they could extend the deck to create a shadow. Lattice could also be used below. His intent is to build houses right away and wanted to give buyers a choice in exterior colors. Perhaps providing a color matrix that has been approved by the Commission would eliminate the mix-matching that the public is concerned about. The gray that is shown on the color palate will be much like cedar that has weathered. The stucco that is proposed is comprised of 3 colors and looks like stone. It is costly and therefore most buyers will choose the wood exterior not the stucco.

Commissioner Kroot felt there should be additional landscaping shown below the east elevation and felt the trim should be connected to the colors, roofing and stucco as shown on the color board.

Commissioner Zaharoff felt that the light exterior would be inappropriate because it would stick out in the foothills. She favored the 3 colors on the right side of the color palate. She also said that the rails would stand out by using light colors and that she did not care for the stucco. She agreed that additional landscaping should be put in to soften the area and supported eliminating one parking space in the garage to pull the house back however if it didn't have visual impact then it would be ok as it is. She had no problem with the deck protruding into the setbacks.

Chairman McPeak stated that he felt the light trim should be limited to 1x4's, the deck should be dark material and that the three colors on the right side of the palate are acceptable. He thought there should be landscaping on the east side below the windows. He had no problem with the building envelope and no problem with the deck. He wants the R-1 sideyard setbacks maintained - 6 feet for the eaves and decks and 8 feet for the buildings.

LOT NUMBER 4

John Roberto presented staff report stating portions of the decks protrude beyond the side and rear building envelope line. The side deck protrudes 3 feet into the sideyard 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. This is a single story house.

Mr. Elliott said that this home was easy to design because it is on a level mesa and because they wanted to comply with the 18 feet height they used more of the building envelope. The deck was designed to circulate around the home. The heated space however was all within the building envelope with the exception of a portion of the nook. They are trying to give the pedestrians all the walkway, therefore all parking will have to be off street. He felt that the garage creates a visual break and although they could reduce the garage to 2 cars he felt there would be no benefit to it.

Fred Stoker, 32 Salinas, liked the low profile and had no problem with the garages outside of the envelope.

David Israel, 47 Indian Rock, had no problem with the profile or going out of the building envelope and has no problem with the color palate. The gray color will look like eucalyptus.

Louette, 104 The Alameda would be more than happy to look out over these homes and was amazed at level of concern by the developer.

John Roberto said that the garage had 11 foot plate heights and wondered by they was a need for more than ten.

Mr. Elliott stated it was for storage because there was very little storage in the proposed homes.

Jerry Draper, 295 San Francisco Blvd. felt the roof slope should match the house and the homes should be scaled back 20% and still be marketable.

John Roberto said that the garage had 11 foot plate heights and wondered why there was a need for more than ten feet.

Mr. Elliott stated that 8 feet was standard in a garage but because there was very little storage space in the homes they wanted to provide storage in the garage.

Wayne Barcelon said that by keeping the garages scaled down will add to the pedestrian walkways. Also, the 8 or 9 foot plate height for the garage would be in line with the 4 and 12 house pitch.

Commissioner Zaharoff felt the 22 feet height of the garage was too high and would like to see a 8-9 foot plate with room for storage.

Commissioner Kroot felt that 9 feet would be good because with 3 cars they may not want to have a post and this additional room will give them flexibility.

Chairman McPeak is in agreement with the 9 foot plate but wondered why there was a need for a three car garage. He wanted the R-1 side setbacks enforced.

Mr. Elliott said that if the garage was reduced it would add only 10 feet and this would not cause a visual difference. Besides people really want a 3 car garage.

Mr. Barcelon said that the extra space could be used for a car, for storage or a workshop.

Mr. Roberto suggested that a Resolution be prepared by staff for the next meeting and wanted to include the specifics indicated by the Commission. He suggested there be an overall criteria for setbacks etc. and then specific modification by lot in which the Commission could fill in the blanks. He suggested another special meeting on Monday August 24, 1987 which would give staff enough time to prepare a public notice.

Chairman McPeak stated that he wanted to see the R-1 setbacks imposed on the sideyards. Other items under discussion are: front yard setbacks; kind of flexibility in the building envelope; 8 to 9 foot plate height in garages.

Commissioner Kroot had no problem with the designs as a whole and would like to look at each lot separately. He also said he feels 3 car garages are acceptable and would like to see some flexibility in the 9 foot plate height, maybe up to 12 feet. He felt the 6 in 12 garage roof slope work visually.

M/S Kroot, 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, August 24, 1987 at 8:00 p.m.

Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 p.m. to next regular scheduled meeting on Monday August 17, 1987.

Barbara Chambers, Administrative Secretary/Technician