

118 The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order on March 15, 1982, at 8:00 p.m. in the Town Hall Council Chamber by Chairman Hayes. T. J. Robbins was present.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Harle, Hayes, McPeak, Ollinger, Peterson, Ragan, Signorelli
Commissioners Absent: None

2. Approval of Minutes - March 1, 1982

M/S McPeak, Peterson, to approve the minutes of March 1, 1982, as written.

Motion carried; Commissioners Hayes and Ragan abstained.

At the end of the meeting Commissioner Signorelli asked that the following be inserted in the minutes of March 1, 1982: " Commissioner Signorelli said the proposed Housing Element is in conflict with the Land Use Element of our General Plan, which provides for a maximum density of one unit per acre in the Conservation Zone. The proposed Housing Element provides for 12 to 20 units per acre on Sunny Hills and Shaw Drives; both are in that zone. The State Guidelines provide for concurrent amendments to both the density ordinance and the Elements of the General Plan, and this should be done. The question was postponed to March 15th."

M/S Peterson, Signorelli, to add this portion to the minutes of March 1, 1982.

Motion passed; Commissioner Ragan had left the meeting and Commissioner Hayes voted no (Staff note: Commissioner Hayes was not present at the March 1, 1982, meeting).

Commissioner Hayes said he is opposed in principle to putting in in-depth statements in approval minutes, as he too wishes he could have had some elaborated statements in the minutes in the past, but has refrained.

3. Resignation

Commissioner Ragan informed the Commission that after 18 years of public service, he is resigning from the Planning Commission and plans to move to Spokane, Washington.

At the end of the meeting, the following motion was passed:

M/S Peterson, Ollinger, to respectfully advise the Town Council that Commissioner Ragan has resigned from the Planning Commission after 18 years of valuable service to the Town and hope the Council will recognize him appropriately.

Motion passed unanimously; Commissioner Ragan had left the meeting.

4. OLD BUSINESS

A. SR-330 - Spotless Cleaners, 42 Red Hill Avenue, A/P 6-201-02, sign variances for a reader board: a sign with changeable copy that exceeds ten square feet in size and does not include a listing of uses; the location of the sign will be on the 'Tailoring and Alterations' shop and it will serve the entire cleaning complex; and the proposed sign will exceed the maximum square footage for the building on which it is to be located (62.25 square footage permitted; an existing sign is 48 square feet, leaving a remainder of 14.25 square feet).

Daniel Boyter, representative, present.

Mr. Boyter said a ten square foot sign would only hold five words with letters ten inches high, which is not long enough for a message. He again stated that if the reader board is approved, the paper signs will be removed from the windows.

Commissioner Ragan said he will not approve a reader board as it is not necessary if the business is successful.

Commissioner McPeak feels the sign is too large and perhaps it should be referred back to the applicant to reduce it.

Commissioner Ollinger said it is difficult to find a hardship. He also feels the number of signs on the premises are out of character with the intent of the Code and referred to the sign at United Market, which is small in comparison even though the store is large.

Commissioner Peterson said he does not like the reader board idea and fears a precedent could be set. He suggested that the size be reduced and then he might consider it.

Commissioner Harle pointed out that the purpose of the Sign Ordinance is to avoid sign competition and obtrusiveness of signs.

Commissioner Signorelli said he is reluctant to deny the reader board; however, will not consider the size over 20 square feet.

Commissioner Hayes said he had difficulty with the reader board idea, regardless of the size and noted that reader boards are normally used for a listing of uses rather than messages.

M/S McPeak, Signorelli, to refer SR-330 back to the applicant with the understanding that resubmittal of this sign application should be of a size not to exceed 20 square feet, and that he will be subject to the findings of hardship.

Motion failed: AYES: McPeak, Signorelli
NOES: Harle, Hayes, Ollinger, Peterson, Ragan

Commissioner Harle asked the applicant what is unique about the premises that require such a reader board. Mr. Boyter's response was that they have tried other advertising, i.e., newspapers, etc., which are not as effective.

M/S Ragan, Peterson, to deny SR-330 for Spotless Cleaners, 42 Red Hill Avenue, A/P 6-201-02, sign variances for a reader board, for the reason that the application does not comply with the hardship provisions of the Sign Ordinance.

Motion carried: AYES: Harle, Hayes, Ollinger, Peterson, Ragan
NOES: McPeak, Signorelli.

Applicant's representative was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- B. C-187 - Angela Pierce, 224 Greenfield Avenue, A/P 6-173-17, design review of a second floor addition on a commercial building.

Doug Anawalt, architect, present.

Mr. Anawalt said the concrete along the bottom will be in a neutral tone, deep sepia brown stucco on top, with a natural redwood recessed banding, and the spandrel will be a muted blue color.

M/S McPeak, Signorelli, to approve C-187 for Angela Pierce, 224 Greenfield Avenue, A/P 6-173-17, design review of a second floor addition on a commercial building, with the exception of landscaping which can be made at a later date under this application; the design review is based on the drawings dated March 1, 1982.

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Anawalt was advised of the ten day appeal period.

4. NEW BUSINESS

- A. V-1001 - James A. Gonsman, 400 Greenfield Avenue, A/P Nos. 6-213-01 and 6-213-02, four foot and six foot frontyard variances to construct a covered porch and stairs within 16 feet and eight feet of the front property line, respectively.

Jim Gonsman, applicant, present.

Mr. Gonsman said the porch cannot be accommodated without a frontyard variance. The covered porch will provide him with more living space and keep the rain water from draining into the basement. Mr. Gonsman stated that construction of this porch will be over the south side property line; however, as he is the owner of that next door lot, he plans to merge the two.

Commissioner Ollinger suggested the stairs appear to come thrusting down from the house and recommended they be moved to come down facing the northerly side. Mr. Gonsman agreed to this recommendation.

M/S Peterson, Harle, to approve V-1001 for James A. Gonsman, 400 Greenfield Avenue, A/P Nos. 6-213-01 and 6-213-02, a four foot frontyard variance to construct a covered porch within 16 feet of the front property line, on the grounds that it is necessary for the enjoyment of substantial property rights; it is necessitated by the placement of the structure on the property; it is necessary in order to preserve the architectural integrity of the structure; and it will not be detrimental to the neighborhood.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- B. V-1002 - Russell A. Damos, 117 Scenic Avenue, A/P 7-064-03, a four foot sideyard variance to construct a living addition within four feet of the side property line.

Russell Damos, applicant, present.

Mr. Robbins said staff has no problems with it, pointing out that the west next door neighbor's deck is close to the property line, but since their house is set back this addition should not affect them detrimentally.

M/S Ollinger, Ragan, to approve V-1002 for Russell A. Damos, 117 Scenic Avenue, A/P 7-064-03, a four foot sideyard variance to construct a living addition within four feet of the side property line, on the grounds that it is necessary for the enjoyment of substantial property rights; it will not be detrimental to the neighborhood; and due to the placement of the structure on the property and the limited available area.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- C. V-1003 - John Silletto, 30 Sierra Avenue, A/P 5-191-16, a three foot sideyard variance to construct a living addition within five feet of the side property line.

John Silletto, applicant, present.

Mr. Robbins said the north side next door neighbor's carport is on the property line; however, the house is ten feet away so this addition should not be a detriment to them.

M/S Ragan, Ollinger, to approve V-1003 for John Silletto, 30 Sierra Avenue, A/P 5-191-16, a three foot sideyard variance to construct a living addition within five feet of the side property line, on the grounds that it is necessitated by the configuration of the lot the addition cannot be placed else-

where; it will not be detrimental to the neighborhood; and it is necessary for the enjoyment of substantial property rights. Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- D. SS-247 - Jerry Dal Bozzo, located between Redwood Road and Laurel Avenue, A/P 7-131-15, 7-142-01 and 7-182-03, parcel split for four single family dwellings.

Jerry Dal Bozzo, applicant, not present. Joe Grippi, surveyor, John Betonte of Copple Foreaker, and Michael McCormac, owner, present.

Mr. Grippi explained the building sites have been shifted slightly from that presented to the Commission and Council when the property was rezoned last October. The building sites on Lots 1 and 2 have been moved near Laurel Avenue so that access is off that street, rather than Redwood Road. The site on Lot 3 is unchanged, and Lot 4's building site has been shifted to the east slightly, with access for both sites off Redwood Road. These changes have been made as a result of cost studies, soils stability, etc.

Peter Fraser, 100 Oak Knoll Drive, submitted copies of a letter written to T. J. Robbins on March 9, 1982, stating that there are currently three proposed projects in the area (Kroot, Dal Bozzo and Fraser/Horn) which will add to that part of Redwood Road and part of Oak Avenue in terms of traffic. He noted that he had a traffic study done which took into account these projects, and their impacts, and it suggested some mitigation measures. Mr. Fraser feels if these applications were studied together, a combined improvement program could be formulated.

Commissioner Ollinger suggested this be scheduled as a separate agenda item.

Commissioner Ragan said he is unsure the neighbors in the area realize there has been a change in the proposed access for two of the four homes. He expressed concern about the Fire Department's trucks ability to reach these homes. Mr. Robbins noted the Fire Department's requirements will have to be met.

M/S Peterson, McPeak, to approve SS-247 for Jerry Dal Bozzo, located between Redwood Road and Laurel Avenue, A/P Nos. 7-131-15, 7-142-01 and 7-182-03, parcel split for four single family dwellings, and reserving for subsequent review for the Commission at the time of the use permit review the question of off-site improvements to the roadway, and the question of whether the Commission and Council want to approach this by a prorated formula to encompass other projected developments. This approval is based on the fact that it is consistent with the General Plan and with our earlier rezoning; it is based on the map dated February 24, 1982.

No vote taken as it was suggested that SS-247 and the proposal for improvements should be separate motions.

M/S Peterson, McPeak, to approve SS-247 for Jerry Dal Bozzo, located between Redwood Road and Laurel Avenue, A/P Nos. 7-131-15, 7-142-01 and 7-182-03, parcel split for four single family dwellings, with the findings that it is consistent with the General Plan and the prior rezoning approved by this Commission; based on the map dated February 24, 1982.

Motion carried: AYES: Harle, Hayes, McPeak, Ollinger,
Peterson, Signorelli

NOES: Ragan

Applicant advised of the ten day appeal period.

M/S Ollinger, Peterson, to continue for discussion to the meeting of April 19, 1982, to consider Mr. Fraser's proposal for improvements along Redwood Road relative to all property owners.

Motion passed unanimously. §

5. DISCUSSION

A. Scope of Work Review For Hillside Density Consultant

Mr. Robbins explained to the Commission that upon their request the draft of the Request For Proposals to consultants for hillside density, as prepared by staff, has been given to them for any additions or considerations.

Bill Cordingley, 10 Elkhorn Way, said he supports the proposed RFP and is glad to see Item 5 included (public input). He agreed that situations vary from neighborhood to neighborhood and the need to study them individually is important. Regarding Item 3B, this will force the developer to give proof that he is making certain mitigations in order to get that maximum density. He added that cost is not really an issue here; the issue is what's best. One item that he feels is not well thought out is LE soils stability. During the visual recognizance of each parcel, he wondered at what point the Town will determine the information is adequate or not.

Jonathon Braun, Scenic Avenue, said he has no qualms with Section 1; the discussion of maximum density is the stumbling point. The way it is set up, the minimum is the real figure that will apply and there will be problems of interpretation if a maximum figure is also used.

Peter Fraser, 100 Oak Knoll Drive, questioned the anticipated cost of this proposal as there will basically be a full EIR on each parcel. If so, then the consultant should have the benefit of the Town's EIR checklist. He said the absence of criteria makes this proposal meaningless and asked how this relates to existing zoning and density. Mr. Fraser suggested there are information items in the Citizens Committee's Report that can be used by the consultant.

Commissioner Signorelli questioned at what time did the Council direct Alan Bruce to engage a professional consultant as he sees no record in the minutes, to which Commissioners McPeak and Peterson agreed. Commissioner Signorelli said he is adamantly against spending money on this proposal. He feels Item 1B is irrelevant.

Commissioner Peterson suggested the Commission and Council have a joint meeting. He said he was told that this proposal could cost a minimum of \$50,000 and if that is the case, perhaps the Town should do full neighborhood plans as were done in San Rafael. He is also concerned about Item 4 which refers to an Environmental Impact Statement, which is a federal document; unless this is to take the place of the state's EIR, it should be referred to as an EIR. He said there is no mention of a consultant for recommending amendments to the General Plan to conform to zoning. Commissioner Peterson feels the most significant problem is Item 3 - there is no guidance as to what the Town considers factors in determining minimum and maximum densities. He feels the process is unending and an insult to those citizens who keep attending the meetings.

Commissioner Ollinger said he would also like some idea of the cost and the Citizens Committee's Report should be utilized. He has concerns about the slope policy, General Plan, and the previously accepted density ordinance as there has to be some consistency with the Land Use Element and revised Housing Element of the General Plan.

Commissioner McPeak said that if we go back and look at the problems with the density ordinance it was numbers and with this proposal we will have only bought numbers. He also suggested there be a joint meeting with the Council to discuss this proposal as he questions the need for a consultant.

Commissioner Hayes suggested there might be three steps when looking at the parcels - 1. requiring little mitigation; 2. moderate mitigation; 3. substantial effort.

Commissioner Harle said that perhaps the Town should retain the PD zoning as the necessary information is obtained through that process. With the latest proposal of reviewing each lot similarly, some lots would get too much study and other, more difficult, lots may not get enough study.

M/S McPeak, Harle, to recommend to the Town Council a joint meeting to discuss the means of developing a catalyst for coming to grips with density and identify what input we have and what is lacking, so that consultants can establish their budget in the proposals.

Motion failed: AYES: Harle, McPeak, Peterson
NOES: Hayes, Ollinger, Signorelli

Commissioner Ollinger voted no as he feels a meeting with 12 people will not be productive.

Mr. Robbins read from the Planning Commission minutes indicating that staff has supplied to the Commission exactly what they requested at their meeting on January 11, 1982.

M/S Peterson, McPeak, that the Town Council advise the Commission whether they still want to proceed with the consultant approach and if they do, how much can they budget for?

Motion failed: AYES: McPeak, Peterson, Signorelli
NOES: Harle, Hayes, Ollinger

Mr. Cordingley told the Commission that they must not put cost first, but rather what is best for the Town for planning for developing the hillsides.

Commissioner Peterson said it is irresponsible and questions the ethics to just test the water on cost when the Town knows it cannot afford a consultant.

Commissioner Ollinger suggested the Commission give the Council a range - what studies are possible at the different cost levels. Both Commissioners Hayes and Ollinger stated that the Council is only asking the Commission to put together an RFP and it is up to the Council whether or not to send it out.

After wording by Commissioner Hayes,

M/S McPeak, Ollinger, that this issue be brought up once again in the discussion portion of the April 19th meeting, and that the Commissioners each try to come up with some ideas to be more definitive about the scope of work.

Motion passed unanimously.

- B. Two Commissioners Needed to Assist in Evaluating Redwood Hills (Fraser/Horn) EIR Proposals to Select Consultant.

Volunteers are Commissioners Harle and Signorelli.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:15 a.m. to the next regular meeting on April 5, 1982.

Lisa Burgli

LISA BURGLIN
PLANNING ASSISTANT