

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 1994**

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was convened at 7:30 p.m. on July 5, 1994 in the council Chambers. Staff present: Town Attorney Hadden Roth and Associate Planner Lisa Wight.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Harle, Julin, Israel, Sargent, Hayes, Ollinger, Mihaly

B. CONSENT

Minutes - June 27, 1994 - Continued

C. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS - CONTINUED

1. **V-9417/USE AMEND. - Carolyn Handelin, 176 Tunstead, A/P 7-213-45, 1) a 16' rear yard and 3' side yard variance to reconstruct and add to an accessory building to be used for day care in conjunction with ABC Academy within 4' of the rear property line and 5' of the side property line; 2) a use permit amendment to allow day care for children in grades K-3 sponsored by ABC Academy; and 3) a parking variance to maintain existing on-site parking when expanding the use, on property located within the (R-3) Zoning District. CONTINUED TO JULY 11, 1994**

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Oak Avenue Master Plan and Development Agreement - David Hansen APN's 7-154-02, 7-154-05; Michael and Linda Gill APN's 7-154-08 and 09, 7-154-11, William Broderick APN's 7-154-10, 7-201-02, 7-201-12; The project site is located on the northeastern slope of Bald Mountain. It is bordered by Oak Avenue and scattered residential housing to the north and east, and by open space to the south and west. The subject property is comprised of 8 parcels of land totaling an estimated 16.2+ acres. The proposed project, which includes a master plan and development agreement, focuses on buildout of some, but not all, of the properties at the end of Oak Avenue. The proposed master plan and development agreement seek entitlement to construct four (4) new homes, appurtenant structures, and infrastructure improvements. The documents do not include the design level information required by the Town to approve specific homes or any of the other entitlements needed before construction can begin.**

The applicants were present.

Chairman Mihaly said the Seminary and the applicants have reached an agreement regarding water and therefore he will withdraw his motion that was made the end of the June 27th meeting.

Mr. Roth noted the following amendments based on the agreement reached by the Seminary and the applicants: Page 11 with additions as highlighted; Page 9, Exhibit I, delete first paragraph except the following; "...study shall be prepared by a qualified hydrologist at the applicants expense." Environmental Check List page 18, and letter from Cecelia Bridges, dated July 1, 1994, which is the acceptance letter; and letter of Michael Wood to Neil Sorensen

Mr. Sorensen noted that on Page 8 of Exhibit I, a line has been left out and should be included as follows: "...design review application is submitted for any existing lots in the project. The well study shall..."

M/Mihaly to withdraw his motion. Ollinger to second.

Mr. Sorensen advised the Commission that he accepts the revised language from Mr. Roth

R. Oak Dowling stated that the Seminary withdraws their objections to the Negative Declaration and any other documents involved.

Chairman Mihaly asked the Commission if there was an objection to removing the language regarding the Seminary from the conditions. Commissioner Julin has no objection to it being removed but does not agree with the conditions. There was consensus from the other Commissioners to removing the language regarding the Seminary.

Mr. Roth asked that the documentation by Cecelia Bridges be provided to his office. Mr. Dowling and Mr. Sorensen agreed to provide the information.

Mr. Sorensen made the agreement part of the record by verbally stating that the document has not yet been signed by everyone, but has agreed to the substance of the agreement. A final, signed copy will be submitted to the Town. The substance of the agreement is that the Gill's will did a well for the Seminary.

Mr. Dowling further stated that the agreement is 4 pages long and will give a copy to the Clerk.

The next topic of discussion was: The nature of the Access and signage and mapping and improvement plan

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 1994**

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was convened at 7:30 p.m. on July 5, 1994 in the council Chambers. Staff present: Town Attorney Hadden Roth and Associate Planner Lisa Wight.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Harle, Julin, Israel, Sargent, Hayes, Ollinger, Mihaly

B. CONSENT

Minutes - June 27, 1994 - Continued

C. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS - CONTINUED

1. **V-9417/USE AMEND. - Carolyn Handelin, 176 Tunstead, A/P 7-213-45, 1) a 16' rear yard and 3' side yard variance to reconstruct and add to an accessory building to be used for day care in conjunction with ABC Academy within 4' of the rear property line and 5' of the side property line; 2) a use permit amendment to allow day care for children in grades K-3 sponsored by ABC Academy; and 3) a parking variance to maintain existing on-site parking when expanding the use, on property located within the (R-3) Zoning District. CONTINUED TO JULY 11, 1994**

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Oak Avenue Master Plan and Development Agreement - David Hansen APN's 7-154-02, 7-154-05; Michael and Linda Gill APN's 7-154-08 and 09, 7-154-11, William Broderick APN's 7-154-10, 7-201-02, 7-201-12; The project site is located on the northeastern slope of Bald Mountain. It is bordered by Oak Avenue and scattered residential housing to the north and east, and by open space to the south and west. The subject property is comprised of 8 parcels of land totaling an estimated 16.2+ acres. The proposed project, which includes a master plan and development agreement, focuses on buildout of some, but not all, of the properties at the end of Oak Avenue. The proposed master plan and development agreement seek entitlement to construct four (4) new homes, appurtenant structures, and infrastructure improvements. The documents do not include the design level information required by the Town to approve specific homes or any of the other entitlements needed before construction can begin.**

The applicants were present.

Chairman Mihaly said the Seminary and the applicants have reached an agreement regarding water and therefore he will withdraw his motion that was made the end of the June 27th meeting.

Mr. Roth noted the following amendments based on the agreement reached by the Seminary and the applicants: Page 11 with additions as highlighted; Page 9, Exhibit I, delete first paragraph except the following; "...study shall be prepared by a qualified hydrologist at the applicants expense." Environmental Check List page 18, and letter from Cecelia Bridges, dated July 1, 1994, which is the acceptance letter; and letter of Michael Wood to Neil Sorensen

Mr. Sorensen noted that on Page 8 of Exhibit I, a line has been left out and should be included as follows: "...design review application is submitted for any existing lots in the project. The well study shall..."

M/Mihaly to withdraw his motion. Ollinger to second.

Mr. Sorensen advised the Commission that he accepts the revised language from Mr. Roth

R. Oak Dowling stated that the Seminary withdraws their objections to the Negative Declaration and any other documents involved.

Chairman Mihaly asked the Commission if there was an objection to removing the language regarding the Seminary from the conditions. Commissioner Julin has no objection to it being removed but does not agree with the conditions. There was consensus from the other Commissioners to removing the language regarding the Seminary.

Mr. Roth asked that the documentation by Cecelia Bridges be provided to his office. Mr. Dowling and Mr. Sorensen agreed to provide the information.

Mr. Sorensen made the agreement part of the record by verbally stating that the document has not yet been signed by everyone, but has agreed to the substance of the agreement. A final, signed copy will be submitted to the Town. The substance of the agreement is that the Gill's will did a well for the Seminary.

Mr. Dowling further stated that the agreement is 4 pages long and will give a copy to the Clerk.

The next topic of discussion was: The nature of the Access and signage and mapping and improvement plan

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 1994**

Mr. Roth provided a summary of the access issue. There is a Notice of Consent regarding the limited access easement. It sets forth all the terms and conditions. There is also the location of the gate and it is not to be promoted, but will show on Town Maps. The gates will not give the impression of a gated community and will be for pedestrian use only. The gate will be maintained by the Town. The wording on the Town maps will be "limited easement access".

Mr. Sorensen stated that there are 15 or so defendants and only 4 people are present, therefore they can not speak for all the parties. Most of what Mr. Roth said sound right but they are broad policy issues. He did not know if the applicants have given much thought to the details.

Signage:

Chairman Mihaly asked Counsel if the Commission should settle the issue of the wording on the signs. Mr. Roth affirmed.

Mr. Sorensen thought it was premature to work out the details now and should be worked out at a later date because they have not thought about it in detail. The fence and the gate will be brought before the Commission at a later date anyway at such time they are to be installed..

Kathy Sanders said she submitted a letter to the Commission and would like those issues discussed. She also said that she prefers the word "advertise" rather than "promote".

Commissioner Israel said the wording on the sign is clearly up to the Town and he does not see this as an issue at this point. Commissioner Ollinger concurred with Israel. Commissioner Julin thought the wording of the sign was very important and should be comprehensible to the public.

Mr. Sorensen pointed the location of the access easement on the map and said that they can deliver the portions of the access easement that belong to the agreement, however, they do not want to have conditions as it relates to other property owners that do not own it. Mr. Roth stated that the Town would want to enforce the easement.

Commissioner Sargent wanted to add a statement that the applicants of the four adjacent properties can not post signs that differ. Mr. Roth stated that it would be in violation of the easement agreement and therefore not necessary.

Commissioner Julin would like to see wording that incorporates Ms. Sanders's point in Number 3.

Commissioner Ollinger felt the language and the design will come up later.

M/S Mihaly/Harle proposed the following wording as a condition: The wording, design, precise location of the signage for the access will be determined prior to the Tentative Subdivision Map or the first design review application, which ever comes first, by the Planning Commission. The wording of the sign shall refer to public access in a manner understandable to the lay person and consistent with the terms of the Limited Access Easement" Exhibit D.

Commissioner Harle suggested similar wording to those signs on water district lands.

Commissioner Julin suggested the Open Space Committee review the signage.

Ms. Wight stated it could be reviewed by the Commission at the design review or Tentative Map stage, whichever comes first.

Mr. Sorensen asked who would initiate the review. Mr. Roth responded that It would be a public hearing for the Town to notify the parties.

All ayes. Motion passed.

Location of the gate:

Commissioner Ollinger felt the gate should remain where it is now and also at the MMWD Land. If that proves to be a problem in the future, then it should be discussed. Mr. Roth said the gate can be at the end of the access easement.

Commissioner Hayes thought the gate could go lower on the easement. Mr. Sorensen agreed with Commissioner Hayes.

Commissioner Hayes shared Commissioners Ollinger's thoughts. He is not anxious to see the gate at the end of the property.

Mr. Gill said that the issue of the gate has been discussed for years by previous property owners and the Open Space Committee. The need for the gate has been supported to deal with people driving up in the night, to control garbage dumping and to maintain emergency service access. As a compromise he suggested a possible gate location on the map near the redwood trees. He does not want the gate further up the road because the majority of the auto turnouts are above the redwoods and people will use them for parking and this will block emergency service access. There are gates there now but they are not used; they were put up when the road was being paved.

Chairman Mihaly suggested wording as follows: The location of the gate shall be decided at the design review stage and all parties will be notified.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 1994**

Commissioner Ollinger would go along with the motion similar to the previous one, prior to any development.

Commissioner Hayes would like a statement of principal. He reluctantly understands the need for a gate. He felt the gate will restrict access and give the impression of a gated community. There is a sense that people will not be able to go through this.

Commissioner Sargent said that perhaps the issue is design because there are gates all over the hillsides.

Jonathan Braun agreed that there are lots of barriers on the public lands and Marin Open Space District standard designs that is a very simple gate, which will not prohibit access.

Commissioner Mihaly suggested wording that the design and location of the gate will be determined by the Planning Commission and will be consistent with the limited purpose assisting in enforcing the terms of the limited access rather than in creating a gated community.

Commissioner Hayes stated that the big issue is whether or not there will be a gate, not the design and location.

M/Mihaly/Harle, the issue of the design and location of the gate shall be reviewed and approved by the Commission prior to design review or Tentative Map.

All ayes.

Commissioner Hayes said the expression of intent is that a gate be installed should a demonstration be made that there is a problem. In summary the language should be that it is the intent of the Commission that the timing, location, and design of the gate be determined by the Commission at such time a demonstration is made of the necessity for such gate.

Patrick Ritter, though it would be difficult to put the off in the future. Fire hazards and additional traffic are a great concern and better to have a gate decided now.

Mr. Roth said the language in the agreement states the gate is an option on the part of the property owners as to whether or not they put a gate in.

Commissioner Harle understands Commissioner Hayes' reservations and concerns and would have to say if there is a road, there is a problem. Gates that are designed simply to prevent vehicular access and which leave a clear access for pedestrians are appropriate he is in favor of a gate for this reason.

M/Hayes to amend Mihaly's motion as follows: The timing, location and design of the gate be proposed at such time a demonstration of necessity of such gate is required.

Died for lack of a second.

M/S Hayes/Sargent, offered a statement of principal to guide the Commission. that the proposal for the gate be consistent with the applicant's suggestion that the gate be located no further down the property than the Redwood location.

Ayes: Sargent, Harle, Ollinger, Mihaly, Hayes

Noes: Julin, Israel

Motion carried.

Commissioner Israel thought the applicants had the right to place the gate at the end of their property.

Commissioner Julin suggested leaving the motion as it is and perhaps it is better to look at the project in the future to see which will be a better location.

Chairman Mihaly asked the Commission on whether the Improvement Plan should be reviewed by the Public Works Director or Planning Commission.?

Commissioner Julin felt that because an improvement plans needs precise information it should come back to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Wight indicated that the improvement plan would include off site improvements.

Commissioner Julin stated that there are issues of environmental review during this stage, specifically plants and the access to lot 2 that addresses trees, which will be affected.

Mr. Sorensen stated that the improvement plan only looks at Oak Avenue and does not look at the individual driveways for each lot. That will be done during design review stage for each lot. The biology report and the Salem Howes amended report discusses the vegetation.

Commissioner Julin did not think the report discusses the trees.

Mr. Gill stated that only heritage trees are discussed.

Mr. Hochstrasser said the Salem Howes report dated January 30, 1994, addresses that.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 1994**

Commissioner said that the section by section analysis in the November 5th report does not mention the oak trees and they could be impacted and could be done at the design review

Mr. Sorensen indicated that page 9 talks about the heritage trees along Oak Avenue as well as eucalyptus trees.

Commissioner Julin said there are other oak trees that could be significantly impacted and if an improvement plan were to be brought to the Commission it would be helpful. She felt that the current analysis is incomplete.

Mr. Sorensen pointed out that page 24, 4B, comes from Michael Wood, Botanist talks about the replacement of heritage trees at 4 to 1.

Commissioner Julin had no objection to a review by the Planning Director although she would like to see more complete information from the applicant. However, the advantage of the Commission allows public scrutiny.

Commissioner Israel supports Commissioner Julin. The Commission has had to support such broad issues and have not had much time to focus on the roadway.

M/Julin/Israel, to add "...the Planning Commission to Exhibit I, page 6, #23.

All ayes.
Motion unanimously passed.

Mr. Sorensen said that has already been included in Condition #1

Terms of Development Agreement:

Mr. Roth stated that the applicants are asking for a ten year agreement, with a ten year option.

Commissioner Hayes felt that was too long. He would be interested in 5 years, with a preference of three years, with a 2 year mutually agreed to take it to five.

Commissioner Ollinger had a problem with ten years; there has been a substantial change in the laws over the last few years and it is not good planning to approve for so long a period of time. He would agree on three years, with a two years extension and another two year extension (with a Planning Commission discussion for each two years).

Commissioner Julin said that if the application addressed several major issues in an acceptable way she would have no problems with ten years, but it does not. Therefore she agrees with Commissioner Hayes.

Commissioner Harle Agrees with the ten years.

Commissioner Sargent stated that everyone has worked hard on this application and the Town has gotten a lot out of it. It has been encouraged by promoters of open space, and a lot of guidelines in what can take place in terms of development. To approve a shorter period would encourage development. The longer period of time could work to the benefit of the Town and would therefore work more slowly. Therefore he would approve a five year agreement with a bilateral of 5 years.

Commissioner Israel felt that a bilateral extension 5 years, for a total of 10 years is a long time. Three years will not cover the development period, therefore he would be comfortable with ten but would shorten a unilateral or bilateral. Has a problem with not being able to review the second 10 years.

Commissioner Mihaly had concerns with the substantive issues. He is used to development agreements that last 10, 20 and 30 years and are co-existing with development. An agreement of three years is too short, and ten years is reasonable but he does not support 10/10. The words missing from health and safety is "welfare". He is influenced by the discretion that the Town could enforce for fire hazards if necessary. He is comfortable with exchange of the access, is comfortable with 10 years, and favors 5 years and 5 years, unilateral on the Town's part.

M/S Israel/Sargent, to recommend 10 years for the Development Agreement.

As a general comment the Commission wanted to convey to the Town Council the actions by the Commission on all of the issues tonight.

Yes: Harle, Sargent, Israel, Mihaly
no: Julin, Hayes, Ollinger
Motion carried.

Commissioner Julin would support a ten year agreement if there were not substantial public policy issues that have not been addressed by this application.

Index:

Commissioner Israel said the figures were arrived at by George Davison's calculations and then the estimates were doubled.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 1994**

Mr. Gill said that the issue of the public is addressed by Ann Chaney and before the improvement plan is proposed there will be a public process.

Chairman Mihaly stated that by making changes, he is afraid they will unwind what has been done.

Commissioner Israel felt there have been several expressions of doubt about the dollar amount assessed.

Commissioner Hayes had concerns about what it will cost if everything has not been factored in. Although he has confidence in George Davison's figures.

Commissioner Ollinger said the calculations have been changed from CPI, there has been discussion on this issue, and the applicants do have a figure to work with and hopefully the figures were adequate.

Commissioner Israel said that the long term improvements could take place after the homes are built.

Commissioner Ollinger added that some of the short term improvements will already have been done.

Chairman Mihaly asked the Commission if they wanted to put in "fair share" or leave in \$940?

Mr. Gill said that the formula used here was used for the Fraser Project.

Commissioner Sargent asked Gill if he would be willing to go along with the fair share. Mr. Gill said he would also have to go along with Davison's figures.

Chairman Mihaly took a straw vote on those who favor the fair share versus the fair share with an adjustment if necessary, or the Davison numbers.

Fair share: 34
Fair share with an adjustment if necessary
Davison numbers 3

Commissioner Israel wanted to change vote to "fair share".

There was additional discussion of fair share versus the Davison numbers.

Commissioner Israel suggested using the \$940 but assessing a fair share at a later time if necessary. He is not comfortable leaving it to the future.

M/S Sargent/Harle, to retain the staff recommendation of \$940.

Ayes: Harle, Ollinger, Sargent, Mihaly
No: Julin, Israel
Motion Carried.

Sanitary Sewer:

Commissioner Julin cited page 9, C1 and letter from Mr. Hochstrasser, page 4, regarding connections to public sewer. She questioned what would make the public sewers infeasible? In other words, how real is it that the sewer is not feasible.

Mr. Gill said that all owners will probably hook up to sewer unless the Sanitary District feels it is not feasible.

Mr. Sorensen explained that they do not know of a reason it would not be feasible to hook up with the Sanitary District.

Chairman Mihaly said this does not allow them any rights to build houses with septic systems.

Commissioner Julin cited page 46, of Negative Declaration - last bulleted item - Would Mr. Gill be required to hook up to the Sanitary District when it is pavailable.?

Mr. Gill said the item referred to by Commissioner Julin relates to the Anderson Sewer project and this should be removed. The Planning Director just copied this information from the Sanitary District environmental review for the Anderson project. However at the advise of the district's attorney, the Sanitary District Board did not require all properties with septic systems to connect to the public sewer when they approved the Anderson project. This language should be eliminated.

Mr. Sorensen noted that the bulleted items are not mitigation measures.

Commissioner Israel said there is less impact on springs if septic systems are used as stated by Mr. Dwyer. He thought that argument had validity to it although he is not suggesting this be changed.

Cumulative water/well issue:

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 1994**

Commissioner Julin cited Section 4.5; page 11 of Development Agreement. She asked for clarification from Mr. Roth on how MMWD would kick in.

Mr. Roth said the guidelines are that when there is available water distribution from the line that is not more than 600 feet away from the property. His thinking on this has gone no farther than the guidelines.

Mr. Gill said that none of the lots are within the water main. All of the lots are above the elevation therefore, those lots cannot hook up to the main by definition per MMWD's revised Ordinance which states you cannot have low pressure systems. So, if one of the lots is within 600 feet it is a moot point because it is a low pressure system. He thought MMWD indicated that same situation applies to Fraser's lots. The lot is above the hydrant, is above the tank, and is a low pressure system and MMWD will not allow service to a low pressure system.

Commissioner Julin stated that by looking at the guidelines "...when the nearest water distribution line is not more than 600 feet along the road or utility easement to the nearest property lines..." she asked how far is the nearest water distribution line?

Mr. Gill said that the first thing is that the distribution line must be established. If the line that is there at the hydrant is not considered a water distribution point because of the elevation, then you would have to go to the tank.

Commissioner Julin asked where the nearest available water distribution line that would meet their criteria?

Mr. Gill answered that there are none. He pointed to the map on the wall and showed the location of the tank and the last hydrant on the hill. He explained that all the lots are at a higher elevation. So by MMWD's definition, as was discussed at the Planning Commission meeting but was not in the minutes, should be clarified; by definition you cannot include the water distribution line, even if the lot is within 600 feet because it is not considered available because it is a low pressure system. Therefore, it precludes it. In summary, there are no main service lines up to these properties.

Commissioner Julin said that her question for that guideline is that in order for this to kick in someone would have to construct a high pressure system that does not exist anywhere on Oak? Mr. Hochstrasser affirmed and stated that is why it goes to the second guideline, except when there are water pressure constraints, which is exactly what is happening on Oak Avenue.

Commissioner Julin questioned what change would have to occur to have the property owners connect to MMWD water service in terms of the second guideline which sets a minimum 50,000 gallon water tank? She questioned why the sentence is in there because she did not know what would be different in the future from what exists now.

Mr. Roth said probably the guidelines that apply on the Well Ordinance are operative here.

Mr. Gill said that none of the lots can hook up to MMWD because even though they are within 600 feet, there is a low pressure system and MMWD will not take them. There are no main service lines to any lot.

Commissioner Julin questioned what change would have to occur to have the property owners connect to MMWD water service.

Mr. Hochstrasser said that it was his recollection that during discussion on the Well Ordinance the Commission and the Council did not support use of wells for domestic water on properties in the lower elevations where near high pressure MMWD lines are available.

Mr. Gill explained that two scenarios could change the MMWD water condition on Oak Avenue; first, a new tank can be built and, second, MMWD can rebuild the lower tank and waive restrictions to connections where low pressure exists. He said that from a practical standpoint, he thought that after a few homes are built, MMWD will rebuild the tank and permit hook-ups on a low pressure system because it is the only way MMWD will get \$16,000 for hook ups.

Commissioner Julin strongly believed that a public water supply should be required. She asked how many other undeveloped parcels would need to be served by water. Mr. Gill said there was somewhere between 9 and 13 homes. Commissioner Julin said this water issue would set the stage for future homes. It is a major public policy issue. She is very reluctant to mold important public policy to this project.

Commissioner Israel said we have adopted a Well Ordinance for a reason. The Well Ordinance was specifically mandated by the State.

Mr. Gill explained that the Oak Avenue plan has been reviewed and approved by the Fire Chief; like others he would probably like MMWD but in short, he would prefer some water now rather than wait for 10 years to MMWD. The Commission should take note of that.

Mr. Hochstrasser passed out a packet to the Commission. He explained that public water is not available for this area and letters and data in the packet demonstrate why it is not available at this time. He also noted that the Town's biologist has addressed the question of well impacts on vegetation. Furthermore, he noted that the project includes a specific design to recharge groundwater with surface runoff.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 1994**

Mr. Gill stated that the packet contains a detailed letter from Mr. Wood that clearly address all the concerns identified by Commissioner Julin and others.

Jonathan Braun said there are positives and negatives to public water. Negatives seem to outweigh the positive effects in his opinion. He said that under one or two scenarios discussed as an alternative to the previously proposed high pressure system and 120K gallon water tank, a system of smaller tanks would be located on MMWD watershed land. The environmental effects of the alternatives would be very difficult to mitigate. Public water development would require huge cuts for access, vegetation removal and have associated impacts for water main development. He has very serious concerns about pushing the project in the direction of public water development.

M/S Mihaly/Harle to move approval of the Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Plan, Exhibit I and Amendments:

Commissioner Julin still had questions in her mind and water is a very important issue, not just for this project, but for future projects.

Chairman Mihaly said that he can't help but realize that the Seminary has raised issues for him and it is very complex. He does not believe they should move ahead with the Bald Hill Plan without looking back on this issue. At the same time he feels that these units have a particular story of their own and there is a basic quid pro quo of this proposal. He is willing to go ahead and approve this project in the absence of being completely satisfied on the water issue. He does not want to delay this project further. There have been a lot of policy issues. The benefits of the project outweigh his concerns.

Commissioner Hayes respects the patience of the applicants in this process - the applicant has been a model of patience and thoughtfulness. However, he will not support the project for the following reasons: 1. The ten year term is too long - many changes have been made in the last 10 years; views have changed. Regarding quid pro quo - what has been decided by the law suit is really a cease and desist and it is unclear who is giving up what and therefore does not subscribe to the quid pro quo. 2. The fair share formula should be in there; he does not feel comfortable with making a dollar amount without public review. Whether these are the right improvements, or if the improvements at all, remains to be seen. 3. The gate: He understands the applicant's concerns but feels there should be a need to show the gate should be moved. 4. Regarding the well issue - he agrees with Commissioner Julin and is uncomfortable about the wells.

Commissioner Ollinger said that looking at the process we seem to be reacting rather than planning ahead. If there was no court order would the Commission have acted differently? There are some water issues that are greater than this process and should be addressed at the Bald Hill meetings. However, while expressing some reservations he will go along with the project.

Commissioner Julin said it was very troubling to her not to be able to support what so many people have spent so much time on. The limited access easement was a benefit worth pursuing but not at any price. Because it revolves around major water issues that price may be too great. There have been too many things that have not come together for her to support the project. The parties that have been involved, have resulted in presenting a package where some important planning issues have been relegated to the side and she feels that her role is in the planning arena and not the political arena. She did not feel recommending approval would be an honest statement of her to make even though there has been some very fine work done. However, there is a major general plan issue of hooking up to the MMWD and a minor general plan issue related to the 15 foot roadway standard. The water should be fully addressed and the roads, although a lesser public policy issue, should also be addressed. Therefore she can't support the project.

Commissioner Harle said that he shares some of the disquiet of Commissioner's Julin and Hayes but the developments proposed would probably have been agreed with anyway. The density has been lowered, an agreement on public access is a benefit and he senses that it will be good for ten years. He is content with seeing it settled as he would on a house by house.

Commissioner Sargent supports the project and is sympathetic with his colleagues. He was impressed with the amount of information received. He would prefer not to see development on the hill because of fire hazards. They are granting the project where each of the developments will still have to come back to the Commission. The Commission is granting lesser development and getting an access easement but they will still have to come back for lengthy reviews.

Commissioner Israel appreciates the applicants for being so easy to work with. With regard to fair share, he is perplexed about the \$940 and is still uncomfortable and will be interested to see what will happen. Regarding the Well Ordinance. His policy issue is with MMWD, not with this applicant. He does not think they are reasonable with applicants and is placing undue burdens on Towns and property owners. Regarding the public access easement: He is glad the Town is getting that. Regarding the gate: He has less of a problem at the end of the property and signage is very clear, and access is to be provided. He would like to review the gate during design review and not discuss the gated community. Regarding the roadway improvement coming to the Commission: He is happy about that. Regarding the lot 2 driveway: He will look at it quite closely. The project has gone through some major changes and he supports it.

Chairman Mihaly supports the project.

Chairman Mihaly wanted to thank Ann Chaney for all of her work. He also wanted to thank the Bald Hill Committee and Mr. Gill for being creative and to also thank the Commission for all their hard work. He shares his colleagues concerns very deeply but does not take away from his approval; this is a reduction issue.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 5, 1994**

M/S Mihaly/Harle, to approve the Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program for Oak Avenue.

Ayes: Ollinger, Israel, Hayes, Harle, Sargent, Mihaly
Noes: Julin
Motion Carried.

M/S Mihaly/Harle, to recommend that the Town Council approve the attached draft Ordinance and Exhibit I - Conditions of Approval for Oak Avenue Master Plan and Development Agreement - David Hansen APN's 7-154-02, 7-154-05; Michael and Linda Gill APN's 7-154-08 and 09, 7-154-11, William Broderick APN's 7-154-10, 7-201,02, 7-201-12; The project site is located on the northeastern slope of Bald Mountain. It is bordered by Oak Avenue and scattered residential housing to the north and east, and by open space to the south and west. The subject property is comprised of 8 parcels of land totaling an estimated 16.2+ acres. The proposed project, which includes a master plan and development agreement, focuses on buildout of some, but not all, of the properties at the end of Oak Avenue. The proposed master plan and development agreement seek entitlement to construct four (4) new homes, appurtenant structures, and infrastructure improvements. The documents do not include the design level information required by the Town to approve specific homes or any of the other entitlements needed before construction can begin.

Ayes: Ollinger, Harle, Sargent, Israel, Mihaly
Noes: Hayes, Julin
Motion carried. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

F. GENERAL DISCUSSION

There was none.

G. REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL

There was none.

H. ADJOURNMENT TO THE SPECIAL MEETING OF July 11, 1994

The special meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:20 p.m. to the next special meeting on July 11, 1994.

BARBARA CHAMBERS