

City of Larkspur

CENTRAL LARKSPUR SPECIFIC PLAN COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

Meeting #7

February 17, 2000

*Healy Hall, St. Patrick's Parish Center
409 Magnolia Avenue*

Specific Plan Committee

Alan Bear*
William Broughan
Debra Busse*
Scott Churchill
Monte Deignan
Maryjane Dunstan

Susan Gilardi
Chris Hartzell
Helen Heitkamp
Larry Lanctot
Joan Lundstrom
Shawn Nazari

Cyndi Niven
Maurice Palumbo
Joe Prickett
Neil Reeder*
Gary Rulli*
Molly White

**Alternate member*

Absent

Nancy Curley
Deborah
Lundberg

Myles O'Dwyer
Judy Saffran
Joe Stone

City of Larkspur

Thomas Cooke, Planning Consultant
Joan Lamphier, Planning Consultant

Robert Pendoley, Planning Consultant
Mark Schatz, Architect
Jan Vazquez, Planning Director

Welcome

Susan Gilardi, Committee Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:35PM.

We accepted the February 3 Meeting Notes. **Helen Heitkamp** noted that she had not been able to attend the December meeting when archeological resources were discussed. Helen would like further discussion on the possible location of middens on the Niven property. **Bob Pendoley** said that he would schedule **William Self**, archeological consultant for a future agenda.

Pendoley gave a progress report on the 2050 project. The 2050 Committee received a presentation on space needs for Twin Cities Police and the Corporation Yard at its February 10 meeting.

Planning Options

Tom Cooke gave a presentation on planning options. He began by reviewing the process that is being used to prepare the Specific Plan. The remaining steps include:

- *Explore Options* – consists of identifying specific land planning design and transportation ideas. The purpose is to identify proposals for possible inclusion in the Specific Plan before the content of various alternative plans becomes too fixed.
- *Assess Options* – The Committee will evaluate which options are worthy of further consideration.
- *Prepare Alternative Plans* – The consultants will work with the Committee and property owners to develop several alternative plans built around the options the Committee decides are worthy of further consideration.
- *Assess and Select Preferred Plans* – the consultants will prepare an in-depth assessment of the alternatives and submit it to the Committee for consideration. The Committee will select a preferred plan.
- *Prepare Final Plan and EIR* – The preferred plan will be filled out in detail and the EIR will be prepared.

Cooke and **Mark Schatz** reviewed the first 11 options in the “Initial Option Workshop” document, which was distributed at the February 3 meeting. *(Please note: a slightly revised version of the document was distributed at the February 17 meeting. Some members chose to use*

the February 3 version because they had made notes on the document).

The Committee and audience had the following questions and comments:

Q: Do the costs for public facilities discussed in the report include the cost of land?

A: No

Q: Which of the public facilities is needed most?

A: The 2050 Committee is assessing community facility needs.

Q: What were the costs for the Tiburon City Hall and Library?

A: \$1.5 and \$2.3 million respectively.

Q: Is there a seismic risk to locating police and/or fire facilities on Doherty Drive? (This question relates to bay mud, which underlies some parts of the specific plan area).

A: The consultants will report back.

Q: Option #7 relates to the possibility of providing parking under buildings that would front on Magnolia Avenue. Has parking demand been calculated?

A: Not yet.

Q: Can we develop an option for a park?

A: Yes; an option will be prepared for the Committee’s consideration.

Q: Re option #4, which shows a 40,000 sq. ft. plaza: how would the property owner be compensated?

A: The plan must allow the property owner enough floor area ratio to make the plaza economically feasible, or the City must pay for the plaza or otherwise compensate the property owner.

Comment: The plan needs to emphasize our small town character and avoid traffic. There should be an option that generates the least amount of traffic.

Response: The work program calls for development of alternatives that the Committee will evaluate before it selects a preferred plan. The alternatives will provide a range of amounts of development and combinations of uses for the Committee to consider. The emphasis in all the alternatives will be on small town scale. This approach is required by the planning principles the Committee has adopted.

Comment: We need smaller options such as a 15 room bed and breakfast.

Comment: Your plan is tilting toward too much development.

Response: This is not a plan. These are *options*. “Options” are specific ideas, which the Committee will assess to determine whether they should be considered further for inclusion in alternative plan. Once alternative plans have been prepared, the Committee will also evaluate them. Based on that evaluation, a draft Specific Plan will be prepared for the Committee’s evaluation. The Committee will probably make further adjustments to the draft plan before the Committee forwards the plan for consideration by the City Council.

Q: Is there a minimal approach to public facilities that we could consider? Do we need as much space as is suggested in the options?

A: This is a first cut analysis, so it may change on further study. However, the public facility options that have been presented so far really are minimal. The 2050 committee is charged with determining public facility needs.

Comment: Traffic is a primary concern.

Response: Right. Traffic is one of the criteria that must be considered in all options.

Comment: We need more information on parking.

Answer: A detailed parking analysis will be done for each plan alternative.

Q: What are the height standards for downtown?

A: 25 feet, which is two stories. A third floor can be permitted in certain circumstances.

Comment: We need an open space option.

Response: OK.

Q: Does the housing option include market rate housing?

A: Yes.

Comment: A hotel may generate less traffic than other uses.

Response: That’s correct.

Comment: The plaza needs to capture views.

Response: The plaza shown in the concept is designed for a view of Mount Tam.

Comment: The options need to consider that the ownerships may not change. A single developer may not build the Niven, Nazari and Larkspur Plaza properties.

Response: That’s a good point. A good plan will provide incentives for the property owners to work together.

Next Steps

Our next meeting is scheduled for March 16, 2000. We will continue reviewing planning options for properties in the area.

Close

We adjourned at 10:00pm.