

A special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order on January 27, 1986, at 8:00 p.m. by Commissioner McPeak in the Council Chambers. John Kottage, Director of Public Works/Planning, and John Roberto, planning consultant, were present.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Harle, Hayes, McPeak and Zaharoff

Commissioners Absent: Heubach, Sharp, Chairman Kroot

Workshop to discuss status of the Town's parking ordinance

John Roberto, the town's planning consultant, presented information on residential and commercial parking requirements in other jurisdictions compared with San Anselmo's standards. San Anselmo's commercial parking requirements are tied to structure size at the time of construction or expansion whereas most municipalities base the parking standards on the type and number of uses in the structure. Furthermore, the town code lacks specific parking standards such as layout patterns, handicapped parking and screening requirements. The town's residential parking standards are below those of other communities and lack provisions for guest parking.

Commissioner Harle noted that cities such as Novato were developed recently and therefore have modern parking and other development standards whereas San Anselmo was developed as a community of summer homes in the hills; this difference in the type and era of development should be considered. He furthermore noted that the sharing of households in response to high housing costs adds to the parking congestion.

Mr. Roberto said that one strategy is to base the off-street residential parking requirements on the street width, so that the wider the street, the greater the availability of on-street parking and the fewer off-street spaces required. Regarding increases in traffic in Marin County, recent studies have shown that this is less a result of a population increase than a rise in the number of cars per household.

Commissioner Harle said that the General Plan studies occurred at a time when there were strong environmental concerns and high gasoline prices, the use of automobiles was discouraged and it was presumed that more residents would walk or use bicycles and that public transport would be much better provided for.

Mr. Roberto noted that the town has adopted policies that use of cars is not encouraged but lacks programs for alternate means of transportation.

John Kottage reported that the town has encountered problems because the commercial parking code is not geared to the number of businesses in a building or the intensity of the uses. If parking is not addressed appropriately, patrons may shop elsewhere or park in residential neighborhoods. Inadequate residential parking can create problems and tensions that otherwise would not exist.

The Commission discussed creation of an in-lieu fee or assessment district parking program. Commissioner Harle questioned the usefulness of an in-lieu parking program if no land is available. Furthermore, many San Anselmo businesses involve just browsing or the purchase of small items; if high in-lieu fees are charged, these small businesses may be replaced by higher volume establishments with larger sale items that can afford the in-lieu fees, which in turn will generate more traffic.

Commissioner McPeak asked about new commercial development where the uses are still unknown. Mr. Roberto responded that the town could limit the uses to not exceed a certain number of spaces based on the development's aggregate demand; however, this places the Town in a policing role and takes time.

The Commission discussed how existing buildings and uses would be affected by changes to parking requirements. The Commissioners generally agreed that some allowance should be made to "grandfather in" existing uses but that increases in intensity of uses should be

reviewed under new parking standards. This policy issue will be further discussed at the next meeting on the parking revisions.

Mr. Kottage recommended that while a specific in-lieu fee or assessment district parking program will not likely be included in the current parking revisions, the ordinance should include provisions for future establishment of such programs.

The Commission requested an inventory of the number and location of public parking spaces.

Commissioner McPeak suggested the establishment of parking districts so that commercial areas with different needs be addressed differently. He noted that the parking issues the Commission will have to address include requirements for changes in use or in intensity of use, establishment of parking districts, and enforcement.

Commissioner Zaharoff said that residential parking requirements need to be addressed since two spaces per unit is unrealistic and parking demands depend on the number of bedrooms. She noted that an in-lieu parking program seems like a good idea but is moot if the Town has no land available for such use. She favored tying the commercial parking requirements to use with the review triggered by application for business license with consideration given to existing uses.

Joe Miller, representative of owners of a portion of the former Shell Station property at 805 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, said that strict commercial parking requirements will make it difficult to rebuild commercial buildings on small lots.

Mr. Kottage explained that under an in-lieu fee program, new merchants are charged a fee for each parking space they lack in meeting the parking standards and this fee is usually related to the cost of constructing these spaces. An assessment district differs in that all the merchants involved, including existing businesspersons, contribute on an ongoing basis.

Staff was directed to bring an ordinance to the Commission amending the parking requirements in response to tonight's discussion.

Consideration of rezoning alternatives on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard properties currently in the C-3, General Commercial District, zone

Town Attorney Hadden Roth has advised that rezoning the property at 805 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard to PPD C-3 would take approximately the same amount of time as amending the uses permitted in the C-3 zone. The rezoning of this one particular property may be perceived as spot zoning. If a permit application for development of this lot is submitted to the Town, the Town Council may, by a 4/5 vote and findings that an emergency exists, pass a moratorium on processing this permit for a reasonable amount of time to effect amendments to the C-3 zoning.

Joe Miller, representing the family that owns a portion of the property at 805 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, said they would like to avoid the PPD C-3 zoning. He explained that the lease of the property with Shell Oil had expired, the owners of the two parcels could not reach an agreement on the use of the gas station or property and therefore the station was demolished. He said there was no urgency on the part of the owners he represented and asked what types of uses the Commission was trying to avoid and what type of development the Town would allow without enacting a moratorium.

The Commission responded that they could not provide him with specific uses they would allow or disallow, but informed him they were concerned about any increase in intensity of use or traffic on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard.

M/S, Hayes-Zaharoff, to rescind our direction to staff of last meeting regarding the advertising of 805 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard for possible rezoning.

AYES: Harle, Hayes, McPeak, Zaharoff

M/S, Zaharoff-Harle, to direct staff to prepare a draft ordinance amending the C-3 zoning to require use permits for certain uses in areas along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard.

AYES: Harle, Hayes, McPeak, Zaharoff

Consideration of a special meeting date in February to address Dancewonder use permit application

M/S, Harle-Hayes, to set a special meeting date on February 24th to address the expected Dancewonder application.

AYES: Harle, Hayes, McPeak, Zaharoff

Clarification on the definition of low and moderate income housing

The Commission's action on January 20th on a rezoning application for 57 Ross Avenue included direction to the applicant to submit a proposal for two low income units on the property. Staff was asking the Commission for clarification of "low income" housing since the Housing Element provides for both low and very low income housing. "Low income" is defined as 50 to 80% of the median income in the Bay Area while "Very Low" is less than 50% of the median income.

It was the general feeling of the Commissioners present that they would be willing to consider a proposal for low income housing in the 50 to 80% low income range. The Commission expressed concern that if the median income rental rate is equal to market rate, the existing rents may be lower than the rents established under a low income housing agreement.

ADJOURNMENT - On a motion duly made and seconded, the Commission adjourned at 11:00 p.m. to the regular meeting of February 3, 1986.

Beth Calamar