

The Special Meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Dan Goltz at 8:00 p.m. in the City Hall on May 19, 1975. Representing City Staff: C. R. Leitzell, Planning Director and Al Solnit, Advance Planner.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Bolles, Goltz, Fairchild, Ragan, Strassman
Commissioners Absent: Ainsworth (on vacation)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 5, and 12, 1975

M/S Ragan, Strassman that the minutes of May 5 be approved as prepared by the Planning Secretary. (See motion at end.)

M/S Ragan, Strassman approval of the May 12 minutes as prepared by the Planning Secretary. Passed unanimously.

3. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

A. PUBLIC HEARING: Continuation of the public hearing on the Proposed General Plan

Chairman Goltz announced that since there had been only a few people at the last public hearing on the General Plan the hearing had been held over for further public input. The meeting was opened to the public. (There were approximately 30 people in the audience.)

Barry Ivers, 261 Los Angeles Blvd., felt it was confusing having what is described as "Public Open Space" cross through public, and private lands both on the Open Space map. Commission told Mr. Ivers that this line was just a boundary line defining geologic hazards or natural characteristics on lands held privately (or institutionally) which could overlap public lands. Mr. Leitzell stated that if this was confusing perhaps the map could be revised to exclude the public areas.

Carl Baumsteiger, 1 Monterey Terrace had two comments. 1) According to the Open Space map, his undeveloped land was shown as private open space which he requested it be removed from. Mr. Leitzell stated Mr. Baumsteiger's land was in an area designated for public acquisition. The Planning Commission will review areas in this category.

2) Mr. Baumsteiger also felt that alot of people were looking at the General Plan for the first time and he suggested the Commission have more public hearings.

Mr. Baumsteiger questioned the "Introduction" of the plan which stated the new belief of progress was "let's not lose any more of what we have". He wondered if this was necessary.

He also felt that the statement in the Community Character Element of the citizens wanting to "Leave it as it is" being the sentiment among the citizens of San Anselmo and Sleepy Hollow really did not have any place in the General Plan. He felt people were now more concerned with economics and possibly this would mean San Anselmo would stagnate. The statement would imply all development is bad.

Mr. Baumsteiger suggested that the dwelling unit figure for 1974 mentioned in the Community Character element was due to the city imposed moritorium.

Mr. Baumsteiger asked for clarification on some of the following points, suggested changes and additions:

1. In the Land Use Element he felt the recommendation of restricting development on "undeveloped" hillsides should be changed to "unsubdivided";
2. The addition of a 5th goal in the Land Use Element such as: "Protect the property owner by compensation for any loss of his land."
3. Questioned why in the Land Use Element "30%" slope was considered possibly an unstable lot and 1 unit per 10 acres was required.

Mr. Solnit commented that the 30% slope was considered the beginning of unbuildability. He felt the 1 in 10 density was justified based on the fact that this not only was to protect against development of unstable sites, but also because these hillsides would provide a setting for the town to retain its character. The County was also using a density of 1-10 for the same area.

4. Felt the recommended average growth of "30" units per year should be taken out of the Plan.

Mr. Solnit did comment that the "30" units per year was an existing policy when he began the General Plan. He was working with the physical holding capacity rather than the per year figure.

5. Two additional goals should be added to the Open Space Element as: (F) "Insure that the burden of preserving private open space is shared equally among communities who benefit rather than solely by the owner." (G) "Single family lots of record will be excluded from Open Space preserve zones".

6. Felt the trails adjacent to residential areas should be taken out of the plan. Property owners who now used these trails would have it opened up to others. Everyone would know about them because they would be on a map. It would open up the privacy and possibly to burglary. Could have littering, erosion, maintenance and liability problems. There should be something in the plan stating trails would be within a certain distance from subdivided areas (He suggested 1,000 yds. + CRL)

7. Felt an additional goal in the Housing Element under the Goals Relating to Existing Housing should be added, as follows: "(D) Develop procedure to discriminate communal occupancy of single family housing." For Correction
Page 67

Gary Armor, 43 Allyn Ave., stated he would like to see the Planning Commission vote on the General Plan after the election on the Creek Ordinance.

Mr. Armor questioned why there was so much negative language in the General Plan. He objected to the word "typical" in the sentence "Unlike the single income class, and the parents rearing children group so typical of all too many bedroom suburbs..." in the Community Character Element.

Mr. Armor also felt the major thrust of the plan (Housing) should be on senior citizen housing.

John Brunswig, 67 Yolanda, questioned what the "exclusive bus lane" on Center was going to be. Mr. Solnit stated it would be a lane reserved at peak hours for buses only. Chairman Goltz also told Mr. Brunswig that the "exclusive bus lane" was only a recommendation based on the research that was done by the Planner. There was nothing on the drawing board, as yet.

Mrs. Hazel Erwin, 238 Saunders Ave., questioned whether any of the future ordinances were connected with this plan. Chairman Goltz stated the Ridgetop, Creek and the Health & Safety Ordinances had reflected the General Plan.

Mr. Jerry Whitcomb, 21 Yolanda, questioned the recommendations of the Circulation Element concerning an "exclusive bus lane" on Center Blvd. He wanted to know how many buses went in to Fairfax now?; What are the alternatives?; How many people will this bus lane serve?

Mr. Whitecomb felt the Planning Commission should have been ready to provide alternatives. He felt the Commission was

setting up policies without any idea of how to implement them.

Chairman Goltz told Mr. Whitcomb that was exactly what a public hearing was about. Commissioner Ragan suggested he give the Commission an idea of what alternatives he would like to consider.

Mr. Whitcomb felt that 1) there would be a bottleneck at Ross until there was a bus lane through it, 2) Center Blvd. could be a one-way street and Sir Francis Drake Blvd. could be another one-way street; or 3) you could leave it the way it is. He felt that if the Commission had nothing planned then the recommendation should be removed from the plan.

Patrick Pollock, 73 Angela Ave., questioned why in the Parks and Recreation Element one of the recommendations was to incorporate the Log Cabin at Memorial Park into the park system.

planning

Mr. Leitzell stated this recommendation grew out of the Parks & Recreation Committee's. They felt that when the log cabin was available it would be a logical acquisition for public use.

Dick Blackman, 57 Yolanda, asked if this was how San Anselmo would look in the future

for Correction
page 64
Mr. Solnit stated Sir Francis Drake and Miracle Mile had been getting freeway volumes of traffic. At one time Route 17 was recommended to relieve this traffic, but the residents of San Anselmo and San Rafael were opposed to it.

In the County-wide plan a cut-off at White's Hill was discussed. This would move some of the through traffic off Sir Francis Drake, but its environmental consequences were such that San Anselmo asked that it be removed from the plan.

Mr. Solnit stated that anything that would increase the carrying capacity of the streets would be counter-productive to the Town. By creating efficient bus movement through the town transit might become more attractive. In talking to the MTC, they state there are no priorities for additional traffic lanes in the Upper Ross Valley, but there are priorities for transit improvements (availability of funds).

Mr. Leitzell stated that Center Blvd. could not handle buses now. Additional money would have to be put in, either in adding additional asphalt or by reconstructing the whole road in order to make a bus lane structurally feasible. Mini buses could be considered in lieu of those changes.

Commissioner Bolles stated the Board of Supervisors in San Francisco had proposed a revision to Doyle Drive which would mean less lanes. Therefore, the bus issue was close at hand.

Mrs. Hazel Erwin, 238 Saunders Avenue, asked whether the Town had a Noise Ordinance. Mr. Leitzell stated there was one, but vehicular noise control was pre-empted by the State.

Mr. Barry Ivers, 261 Los Angeles Blvd., felt horse trails should be kept away from residential areas. He also felt the mention of "hitching posts" as an amenity shown on the Open Space map should be removed. He felt horses were a traffic problem, hazardous, and he did not want them in the residential areas.

Mr. Leitzell felt there could be a distinction between horse trails and hiking trails.

Phil Bundschu, 421 The Alameda, stated he saw no mention of alternate roads over the hill into Terra Linda/Civic Center. He would like to see such a road to save time for northbound traffic from San Anselmo.

Mr. Leitzell stated this road was discussed by the Circulation Committee but there was so much opposition it was left out of the plan, except as an emergency fire road. Mr. Leitzell noted that the map didn't even show a fire trail connection now.

Carl Baumsteiger, 1 Monterey Terrace, felt there was a conflict between slow growth and the housing element. He felt the plan shouldn't use the terms "no growth" and "slow growth".

Hearing was closed to the public at this point.

Mr. Solnit stated he would like to acquaint the Commission and the audience with what lies ahead with the General Plan. He stated that after the plan was adopted the zoning would need to be brought into conformity. If for some reason a particular piece of property should be zoned differently the Commission can amend the General Plan to fit that zoning. It will be a continuous effort on the part of the Commission to keep the zoning and the General Plan in line. The General Plan can be amended three times a year.

Commissioner Ragan suggested that when the minutes were typed everyone should get a copy and make sure everything is correctly stated.

Chairman Goltz stated that on the next public hearing he would like to proceed chapter-by-chapter on the plan.

M/S Ragan, Strassman the public hearing on the General Plan be continued to 8:00 p.m., June 9th in the Council Chambers which will be the final time that the public hearing will be open for public comment. Passed unanimously.

Mr. Leitzell mentioned to the Commission that they were going to have to review the maps and have more public hearing on them. Mr. Solnit stated there had been three meetings on the map and Sleepy Hollow had been given the chance to thoroughly go over the maps and make any changes.

M/S Ragan, Strassman that the Commission reconsider the minutes of the meeting on May 5 regarding the abandonment of Freda Lane. Passed unanimously.

M/S Ragan, Strassman that the motion made May 5th regarding the abandonment of Freda Lane be rescinded in view of the memo received from the Planning Director. Passed unanimously.

5. ADJOURN

M/S Ragan, Bolles we adjourn to the meeting of June 2, 1975. Passed unanimously. 11:00 p.m.

DAN GOLTZ, CHAIRMAN
SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION

By Catherine Carpenter
Catherine Carpenter
Planning Secretary

DDB863