

City of Larkspur

CENTRAL LARKSPUR SPECIFIC PLAN COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

Meeting #10

May 18, 2000

*Fellowship Hall
Redwoods Presbyterian Church
110 Magnolia Avenue*

Specific Plan Committee

William Broughan
Debora Busse
Scott Churchill
Nancy Curley
Monte Deignan
Maryjane Dunstan

Susan Gilardi
Helen Heitkamp
Larry Lanctot
Shawn Nazari
Myles O'Dwyer
Maurice Palumbo

Neil Reeder*
Judy Saffran
Molly White

**Alternate member*

Absent

Deborah Lundberg
Joan Lundstrom

Cyndi Niven
Joe Stone

City of Larkspur

Robin Anderson, Recorder
Thomas Cooke, Planning Consultant

Robert Pendoley, Planning Consultant
Jan Vazquez, Planning Director

Welcome

Susan Gilardi, Committee Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:40PM. **Gilardi** briefly reviewed the meeting agenda. **Gilardi** stated that the Committee would discuss possible locations for the various planning options (agenda item #2) until 8:30, when we would take a five minute break. After the break the meeting would be opened for public comment After everyone who wants to speak has given their input, the Committee will provide direction to staff and the consultants. **Gilardi** said the Committee wants to hear from everyone. She asked that people refrain from clapping because it takes up time people could be using to make comments, and it gives the meeting an emotional element that tends to intimidate people with differing opinions. **Gilardi** concluded by asking for everyone's cooperation.

The March 16 Meeting Notes were not available.

The May 4 Meeting Notes were accepted with one change. The last paragraph under the "Options Assessment Workshop" section was changed to read as follows: "After these comments were received, the Committee deliberated on which options should be retained. The Committee's decisions are recorded in the two right hand columns in the attached chart."

Options Assessment Workshop Part II

Tom Cooke, planning consultant, introduced the discussion, explaining that the Committee should give direction on possible locations within the project area for the various land uses that were selected by the Committee on May 4 for further study. **Cooke** proposed that the Committee develop a list of land uses that should be considered for each of the five subdistricts in the plan area. Cooke referred to the table titled "Comparison of Consistency Options and Planning Principles" from the May 4 meeting.

Debora Busse objected, stating that the Committee had not fully evaluated the options listed in the table. She said the Committee should determine whether it agreed with the conclusions in the table as to whether the planning options are consistent or inconsistent with the

Committee's planning principles. The Committee should conduct its own evaluation of the planning options.

Robert Pendoley, planning consultant, said that the consistency evaluation is the consultants' opinion. The recommendations on consistency were provided to help the Committee decide which of the planning options should be retained for further consideration. **Pendoley** suggested that the relevant point is the Committee's decision to retain or reject options. He suggested that a note be inserted into the table to make clear that the consistency evaluation is the consultant's recommendation. He pointed out that the Committee had spent four meetings studying the planning options and had voted on which to retain for further study at the May 4 workshop.

Busse stated she agreed that changing the chart would be helpful, but that the Committee had not had adequate opportunity to evaluate the planning options.

Nancy Curley said that we reviewed each option at the last several meetings. She felt she did not need to evaluate each "X" and "C" on the table to make a decision on the planning options.

Maryjane Dunstan felt that we should move forward because the Committee had spent several meetings discussing the options.

Neil Reeder said that we should review each "X" and "C" on the table. He asked why we should have plans drawn up that may not be appropriate. **Debora Busse** agreed.

Bill Broughan said he was satisfied that we had evaluated the options at the preceding meetings. He said he agreed with **Dunstan** that we should move on.

Scott Churchill stated he agreed with others who feel the options have been evaluated adequately for now and that we should move on to the next level of the study.

Larry Lanctot stated that we have not evaluated each option in detail.

Miles O'Dwyer said the Committee had considered the consultants' opinions, done its homework, and come to a decision. He saw no need to evaluate the "X's" and "C's"

Helen Heitkamp felt that the Committee had tied the planning principles to facts in order to make decisions about which options should be retained for further study.

Shawn Nazari stated he felt that the consultants had given an unbiased recommendation and that he respected their work.

Monte Deignan said that the last meeting ran late. Maybe we need more time to consider the issues further. He would like to see more discussion.

Pendoley suggested that the Committee vote on whether it wanted to reopen the discussion of which options to retain for further study. The Committee voted with 2 members in favor of reopening the discussion and 10 members voting “no.”

Cooke introduced a discussion of subdistrict “D” explaining the land uses that were recommended as “highly suitable” or “suitable” in the Site Suitability Assessment” table on page 7 of the Option Assessment Workbook. Individual members asked clarifying questions and commented on the recommendation. The discussion of subdistrict “D” was not complete when we took a break.

Break

The floor was opened for public comment. Speakers introduced themselves, and are identified by first name below.

Leon Attended May 4 meeting as well as tonight. The hostility in the audience does not serve the community well. We need a true, large sampling of the entire community to find out what people want. Notification needs to be broader. The process should be more democratic: minutes should be published in advance, more people need to be involved and the audience should be more supportive of the Committee.

Rick Clapping should not be prohibited (the speaker asked people who agreed with him to stand; a portion of the audience stood). He complained that the City Council refused to appoint neighborhood representatives to the Committee.

Charles Too bad the fire station has been taken off the table. The City parking lot should be left as is or a plaza should be placed on the corner of Ward and Magnolia. There is a redwood grove on the Niven property which should be protected.

Robert Objected to the flier by Citizens for Rational Growth.

Kendrick There should be time limits on public comment so that no one monopolizes the process. The notification process is adequate; he is on the list and

receives the agendas. You can call City Hall for more information. The public should review the committee’s accomplishments – they have done a lot since they started. Why not explore roof top parking? Give us information on how the uses are inter-related; show us on sketch plans.

Robert Thanks for taking the Legion property off the table. (We corrected this. The Legion property has been recommended for inclusion in the plan, but if changes in land use are recommended, they would be contingent on the Legion deciding to put the property to another use).

Ed We should encourage the retention of a well maintained gas station on the corner of Doherty and Magnolia. Preserve the wonderful view of the redwoods on the Magnolia Avenue corridor by keeping the buildings low.

Barbara The hostility level is high because we are not allowed to speak to the issues. Improve the notification process.

Steve When the Committee makes its recommendation to the City Council, how will the public comment? (Staff responded that there will be public hearings at the Planning Commission and the City Council on the Committee’s recommendation as well as on an EIR that will be prepared).

Rick We are angry! The consultants don’t live here, we do. Stop the negative changes. Send a letter to every resident for each meeting. We should be allowed to clap. The traffic and parking problems are impossible.

Jean Traffic is the number one concern. We should be able to bicycle through town. Don’t preclude important opportunities. Please introduce the Committee members and other participants.

Bob Show us the interrelationship of uses. We should be able to bicycle to the library, civic center and park.

Mary There is frustration because the Committee doesn’t seem to be reflecting on the input they are receiving from the audience. Are these options consistent with the General Plan? Where is the serious discussion of the pluses and minuses of the various options. The list of options needs to be shortened. It will cost too much to draw plans reflecting all of the options on the table.

(name not taken) Maintain downtown’s two-story charm and views.

Scott The flyer brought me out. The discussion of why we can't clap is taking more time from the meeting than the clapping. The Committee's body language is very negative toward the audience. You should be considering the context of the surrounding land uses and development. Allow through access from the surrounding streets.

Jackie Drop the idea of roundabouts.

Lorraine If soccer fields are built, people will come from all over the County. 30 parking spaces will not be enough.

Dan People love Larkspur. You should reflect what people are saying. We don't feel included.

Kelly Your highest priority should be to survey the people. You should publicize the process.

Ed Reduce the traffic and keep the community's charm. The plan should focus on pedestrian and bicycle circulation and the creek. The plan should be put to a vote of the people.

Steve Don't squelch questions from the public or the Committee. There should be a none-of-the-above option.

Tim This should be a representative democracy. Consider aesthetics: remove the blight and fix what we

have. Also consider economics; there is a high vacancy rate in offices and additional retail is not viable. What do we get out of that kind of development?

(name not taken) We could do an unbiased, representative survey with volunteers. The Committee should get a cost estimate.

The discussion was returned to the Committee.

Pendoley suggested that Committee members share any comments they had to offer and that the meeting adjourn due to the lateness of the hour.

Debora Busse asked for the following information:

- The cost to do a survey
- How much has been spent to date on CLASP and the 2050 project?

Busse also said that the mailing list should be expanded.

Helen Heitkamp expressed her support for the chair, **Susan Gilardi**, and thanked her for managing the meeting under difficult circumstances.

Close

We adjourned at 9:50pm.