

mont  
SEP 1 1959  
to Hear  
Plan Outline

BELMONT — The general plan of the Belmont Master Plan will be outlined for the public tonight during a hearing before the planning commission at 8 o'clock in city council chambers.

Planning Consultant John Boucher, who prepared the plan, said he hoped the council hall would be full of interested citizens.

The plan will be explained by City Manager John Watts and members of the commission. Boucher will be present to answer questions.

General Plan  
RW City Times  
Sept. 1. 1959

# Massive High Rise In Belmont Hills?



—Tribune Photo

## Where Once Were Hills

Preliminary grading work for Hallmark Homes, one of three residential subdivisions in the hills behind Belmont, has changed the contour of the area. Dirt from the projects is hauled down Ralston Ave-

nue. Dirt hauling, once subject of a grand jury investigation, is one of the most sensitive issues surrounding the April 14 election.



# Charge Aimed At Councilmen

By BRUCE B. BRUGMANN, Tribune Staff Writer

**BELMONT**—High rise apartments, long a smouldering issue on the Peninsula, are being quietly planned on a massive scale for the western hills area here, Mrs. Eve Sterry charged.

City officials today rejected the charges and contended, in effect, that city businesss was being conducted properly.

Said Mrs. Sterry in a prepared statement:

"This City Council has acted to keep this proposed development from the public and kept related issues as concealed as possible.

"Who knows, for example, that high rise apartments are being planned, involving high density and eating up acres and acres of land?

"Who knows that a million-dollar sewer and drainage bond issue, the biggest in the Belmont history, is in the works to expedite the project?

"Who knows that the city has four development plans for the hills, that it has accepted one without public hearing and that it uses them all in the spirit of the three-shell game?"

Mayor Raymond Faber said the council has heard nothing about high rise apartments and that they're "not planned as far as I'm concerned." He said that "nobody has talked to me, officially or unofficially."

Questioned about high rise, Norman Hansen, city engineer, said: "I don't care to comment." John McInerney, chairman of the planning commission, said that at one session "everyone there seemed to think we would be moving toward high rise." City Administrator John Watts said: "I wouldn't know, really."

Mrs. Sterry said that a member of the Planning Commission had told her that all of the plans for the hills contained high rise apartments. Area developers and real estate men were also aware of high rise plans, she said.

She said that a San Jose developer had told her that the Millbrae engineering firm of Wilsey, Ham and Blair had drawn up plans for him supporting high rise for this area. Hansen, a member of the firm serving as city engineer, confirmed today that the firm had done work for the developer.

# Belmont Planning High Rise Project?

(Continued from Page 1)

but said he didn't know if it supported high rise apartments.

"Everybody seems to know about the high rise except the citizens of Belmont," she said. Mrs. Sterry is a candidate for City Council.

Mayor Faber and Councilmen Wallace Benson and Henry Huges represent pro-high density on the council, she said. They voted recently that Belmont needs more apartment buildings. Councilman Robert Fitzgerald's position is that Belmont has enough apartments. Faber denied he favored high density. Benson and Huges could not be reached today. High rise refers to apartments of more than three stories.

Wilsey, Ham and Blair made the report on the hills development. The report showed a dramatic increase in multi-family units: up 439 per cent from 1950 to 1960. In 1955, 94 per cent of the dwelling units constructed in Belmont were single family; in 1961, only 37 per cent were single family.

Such high density development, Mrs. Sterry said, "has impoverished the school district and depleted our finances."

"Last year, we ended up with a school district that reached maximum impoverishment, a special self-taxing election and depleted city finances."

"We also have patched-up streets and sidewalks, a deplorable lack of recreation facilities and so few policemen that a man can't be spared for a few moments to direct traffic in front of the new Central School."

Mrs. Sterry said that taxpayers will now be asked to finance a million-dollar bond issue that "will primarily benefit others—real estate men and developers—thus decreasing our chance of getting facilities we need ourselves."

Little has been heard of the progress of the sewer project or the prospective bond issue since planning documents were approved last June by the council.

Documents submitted to the Housing and Home Finance Agency show construction was planned to begin in January, 1965, and that it was to be financed by general obligation bonds for \$973,500. When construction begins, the city must repay a \$13,900 non-interest loan to the government.

The project has been held up

until after the election and the council will then decide on whether a bond issue or other means will be sought for financing, Watts said. Previously, the city's biggest bond issue was in 1948 for \$200,000 for the San Carlos-Belmont sewage disposal plant.

Faber said that the council had "no intention of putting on a bond issue at the moment," that the issue "had not been discussed at the council," and that nothing had been done "to start construction in January, 1965." He said a drainage study had been approved because "there's going to be some problems" in the area.

Mrs. Sterry asked why the council okayed the Cipriani and Hallmark Homes developments in the hills before the bond issue had been passed and the sewer project approved. The city must have known it needed extensive work, she said.

(The Wilsey report warned "that any development and increased runoff in the West Hills area would aggravate the existing drainage problems" and that present drainage flows into Notre Dame lake "where there are inadequate controls as to terminal runoff . . ." It recommended additional sewerage and drainage facilities.")

Regarding multiplicity of plans in Belmont, Mrs. Sterry pointed out that the past master plan had been shelved amid bitter controversy in 1959 before it was brought to public hearing. The plan was killed because it said there were enough apartments in Belmont, she charged.

The multiple hills plans allow "the council and planning commission to pick and choose as they wish," she said.

McInerney, chairman of the Planning Commission, said that Plan B had been informally adopted at a joint study session of the council and Planning Commission. There was no vote, but general agreement—"a head-nodding situation," he said.

However, said McInerney that Plan B was not used to approve the Hallmark Homes development. Grading for the Hallmark subdivision has been extensive although Plan B, according to the Wilsey report, assumes "a minimum amount of, or no, grading" and that it would maintain the area's "hilly, wooded character."



## Master Plan for Belmont?

BELMONT — City officials and a group of citizens went through preliminary move in city hall this week to formulate master plan advisory committee for Belmont.

Councilman Victor G. Wand-  
ayer, who presided at the  
meeting, named committee  
heads. They will be contacted  
before the next meeting set  
Tuesday at 8 p.m. to determine  
they will serve.

Mrs. John A. Gast, member  
of the city planning commis-  
sion and of the steering com-  
mittee on the master plan, said  
today that Arthur L. Lundin,  
1530 Escondido Way, had ac-  
cepted chairmanship of the  
residential committee.

While only 25 citizens ap-  
peared at the session, many  
had previously volunteered to  
serve on committee and will be  
at the coming meeting when it  
is hoped that full committees  
will be organized.

In addition to a committee on  
residential development, com-  
mittees will form on parks,  
waterfront and recreation, in-  
dustrial and business develop-  
ment.

General Plan  
Redwood City Tribune  
Sept. 1958

## Belmonters Begin Master Plan Study

BELMONT—A citizens' com-  
mittee working on a Belmont  
Master Plan got a general view  
of the city's problems last  
night.

Consultant John T. Boucher,  
who is organizing the develop-  
ment of the master plan, said  
the committee will devote a  
major share of its time to  
studying the following prob-  
lems:

1. How can the city obtain  
better control over its indus-  
trial area? Does the city want  
to invest money for improve-  
ments of the industrial area in  
order to make it more attrac-  
tive to investors?

2. What will be done with the  
hundreds of acres owned by  
Thomas Valerga in the western  
part of the city in the light of  
the new Junipero Serra Free-  
way?

3. Will it be necessary to  
widen Alameda de las Pulgas  
to four lanes north of Ralston  
Avenue?

4. What will be the eventual  
status of Ralston Avenue?

5. What is the ultimate devel-  
opment of the downtown busi-  
ness center?

6. Where will the new civic  
center be located after the pres-  
ent city hall becomes too small?  
Boucher said the present city  
hall is adequate for only about  
five more years.

An estimated 30 advisory  
committee members turned out  
for the meeting, plus a few  
members of the planning com-  
mission.

Main object of the meeting  
was to inform the committee  
members of the problems and  
to instruct them in how to go  
about conducting the master  
plan study, said Boucher.

## Belmont Master Plan Ready for Study Next Spring

BELMONT — The Master Plan  
for the city of Belmont proba-  
bly will be ready for considera-  
tion by the city council some-  
time early next spring, accord-  
ing to Planning Consultant  
John T. Boucher.

Most of the written reports  
from four citizens committees  
will be submitted to the plan-  
ning consultant this week.

These ideas will be correlated  
and summarized by Boucher.

The best parts of these re-  
ports will be included in the  
master plan," Boucher said.

The master plan study as far  
as the lay committees were con-  
cerned was divided into four  
parts — commercial, industrial,  
residential and parks and har-  
bors.

An estimated 50 citizens have  
been working on the reports in  
the project for several months.  
All committee reports were  
submitted to the planning con-  
sultant last week.

In the meantime, the city  
council is considering an in-  
terim zoning ordinance to help  
maintain status quo while the mas-  
ter plan is being formed.

The proposed ordinance  
would give the council the

power to freeze a zoning appli-  
cation until it can be consid-  
ered on the basis of new zon-  
ing ordinances established by  
design of the master plan.

The proposed interim ordi-  
nance proposed that the city  
have the right to freeze any  
land use proposal which will  
interfere with proposed public  
improvements which can rea-  
sonably be anticipated in the  
near future in the vicinity of  
said use."

The interim ordinance would all uses until such time as a  
provide, the proposed docu- new or revised zoning ordinance  
ment reads, "for revaluation of is adopted."



# Belmont Plan Called Guide, Not Binding

SEP 2 1959

**BELMONT** — The general plan of the Belmont Master Plan is only a guide and in no way is binding.

This is the message Planning Consultant John Boucher and members of the planning commission tried to put over last night at about 40 persons turned out for the first public review of the plan.

"The plan is not being used to shove anything down anybody's throat," said Mrs. John A. Gast, one member of the commission.

Floyd E. Sampson, of 3611 Hillcrest Drive, wanted to know how closely the planners and city council would follow the plan.

"I would say that will be up to the planners and the city councils of the future," answered Al Kaiser, planning commission chairman.

Boucher's plan maps out a complete land-use program for the city for the next 20 years.

Some of the members of the audience were worried that Boucher's ideas on land use could not be altered.

Edward Drotleff, local business real estate man and a recent candidate for the council, objected to the location of the school site near Alameda de las Pulgas and Ralston Avenue.

He said it appeared from the map that the school itself would be located right in the middle of expensive apartment house properties.

Boucher explained that the blackened area noted on the map as a school site indicated only a heavy attendance area of the future.

"The school itself could be located 400 feet either way or a half mile away for that matter," said Boucher.

"The area bears no relationship to any particular property."

An Emmett Street resident

wanted to know how the city could finance such a plan. He was talking primarily about the provisions for increasing the downtown shopping district.

Kaiser explained that there were no provisions for financing.

"The plan is something to shoot for, but it will be carried out piece by piece," he said.

"It's possible," he said, "that development downtown could be done through an urban redevelopment plan with state and federal aid. I don't know."

There was no sustained controversy over the general plan.

The major debate is expected to come when the zoning and subdivision ordinances, more detailed phases of the master plan, will be submitted for public perusal.

The master plan timetable suggested by Boucher is as follows:

September 15—Second hearing and adoption by the planning commission of the general plan.

September 29—First hearing of the general plan before the council and final action.

October 5—First hearing by the planning commission of the zoning and subdivision ordinances.

October 19—Second hearing of the zoning and subdivision ordinances before the planning commission.

November 3—Hearing before the city council and final action.

"If everything goes along smoothly these will be the dates," said Boucher.

However, if any portions of the zoning or subdivision ordinances stir up a controversy the dates will be changed.

"We will stick to the timetable as closely as possible," said City Manager John L. Watts.

# Master Plan Group Opposes Consultant

**BELMONT** — The residential committee of the Belmont Master Plan study and Planning Consultant John Boucher crossed words last night on the question of future apartment development in the city.

Committee members who worked up a report for a general meeting of the planning advisory committee believe the density of population should not be increased in the coming years by increase in the number of apartments.

Boucher believes more apartments are a good thing for the city.

And the committee submitted a newspaper story which indicated that the San Mateo County cities which have the highest assessed valuation per average daily attendance at their schools are the cities with the least industry and the fewest apartments.

Hillsborough, Woodside, Burlingame and Menlo Park rated the highest in this regard, figures submitted by the committee showed.

Industrial towns like Redwood City, San Mateo, South San Francisco and San Bruno all showed a lower assessed valuation per ADA than Belmont's \$10,471.

The committee also brought out figures indicating that Belmont is going beyond the normal percentage of land zoned for apartments.

They presented figures which

showed that 150 acres in Belmont are now zoned for apartments while San Carlos has only 19 acres and expects less than 100 by 1970, the year upon which its master plan is based.

The commercial committee during the meeting pointed out an immediate need of a downtown parking area bordered by Emmett and Ralston Avenues and El Camino Real and Sixth Avenue.

The committee also proposed purchase of the Central School area for commercial parking and store development.

Another proposal was to extend Laurel Street south to Ralston Avenue and north to Middle Road to increase the circulation of downtown traffic.

A final proposal by the committee was the extension of O'Neill Avenue west to Chula Vista Drive to allow residents of Carlmont subdivision a more direct route over the hill to the downtown districts.



*General Plan  
Redwood City, Trebune  
Apr. May Aug. 1959*

## Belmont Ends Service Of Planning Director

MAY 12 1959

BELMONT — Planning Consultant John Boucher's services during planning commission meetings were officially terminated last night.

The action was taken by the city council in order to eliminate a \$50 a night fee for work

it felt City Engineer Robert E. Roberts could do.

Boucher, warned of the action two weeks ago, countered with a press statement saying he felt the city should hire a full-time planning consultant instead of firing the part-time consultant.

Boucher, however, is still under contract with the city conclude the preparation of a city master plan.

In regard to planning, the council also took an interesting step by making a double decision on an application by E. E. Cunningham and Charlotte Alford Stone for rezoning to allow them to build apartments.

The council chose to turn down Mrs. Stone's application because she refused to dedicate a 40-foot strip to the city to provide for a parking lot. However, the adjoining piece of property, owned by Cunningham, was approved for rezoning.

Attorney Kenneth Dickerson, acting on behalf of Mrs. Stone, said the furthest his client would go would be a 25-foot dedication strip.

In other business the council:

Adopted a joint recommendation by the city engineer and former city engineer, Raymond Murphy, that Herman Christensen and Sons be required to post \$2,500 in cash and a \$7,500 surety bond to assure the city the subdivider will carry out the required public improvements in Montebello subdivision.

Herman Christensen Jr. was on hand to protest what he called a high cash requirement, but there was no debate.

Authorized the city engineer to proceed on plans for the \$60,000 North Road sewer trunk line which will switch residents of that street from the San Mateo sewer system to Belmont.



# Planning Consultant Draws Belmont Blast

APR 28 1959

**BELMONT** — Councilman Warren R. Mendel teed off on planning consultant John Boucher last night.

The former mayor accused Boucher of mishandling the master plan for the city now in the late stages of preparation.

He asked his cohorts to consider establishing a committee of councilmen to investigate the master plan and stop payment on all "external expenditures" not already authorized in the master plan contract.

The council decided to do it a different way after Councilman Victor G. Wandmayer indicated he felt the \$50 a night fee Boucher gets for attending planning commission meetings is an unneeded expenditure.

"Most of those duties can henceforth be done by the city engineer," said Wandmayer.

So the city fathers decided to ask the planning commission for a recommendation to cut off the \$50 retainer plus other costs for specific assigned duties given the consultant.

Mendel said he believes Boucher, in his master plan preparation, has failed completely

to reflect the needs of the city of Belmont.

"My fear is that he has taken parts of other plans, and revised them slightly to conform to the physical provisions of Belmont," said Mendel.

Boucher told the Tribune last December that the master plan would be ready for consideration by the council by early spring.

Written reports from a group of citizens' committees were turned over to him before the beginning of the new year.

So far, Boucher, employed by Pacific Planning and Research in Palo Alto, has turned over to the city only the zoning phase of the master plan.

His first zoning proposal was turned over several weeks ago, revised by city officials, and a second version arrived in their hands again yesterday.

Boucher was not in his office today because of illness and was not available for comment.

The master plan contract calls for an expenditure of \$10,000 of which \$5,000 is provided by federal government matching funds.

# Belmont Master Plan Due

AUG 20 1959

**BELMONT** — After many months of waiting, Belmont residents will have a chance to take an official look at the Belmont Master Plan on Sept. 1.

On that night, the planning commission will hold a public hearing on planning consultant John Boucher's general plan.

Tribune readers have had more than a month to think about the plan which was previewed on July 10 complete with maps and a thorough analysis of the proposal.

The plan is designed for an ultimate population of 20,000. The current population figure is 11,400.

The general plan has seven primary objectives:

1. To provide high standards for new development.
2. To develop a civic center adjacent to the downtown shopping area.
3. To encourage water-oriented recreation type development, both public and private, on lands to the east of Bayshore Freeway for the use of people of Belmont, as well as to attract visitors who will add to the city's total economy.
4. To protect and improve the present downtown business district.
5. To provide research development for the "west hills" area.
6. To protect and preserve from development the precipitous canyon slopes which are a major contribution to the attractiveness of the city.
7. To provide a thoroughfare system, designating residential collector streets and recommendations for their improvement.

One of the primary projects covered in the plan is the widening of Ralston Avenue to four lanes.

But there are other interesting facets concerning major thoroughfares.

For example, Boucher foresees a two-way loop system of Alameda de las Pulgas to facilitate traffic between San Carlos and San Mateo. This would require widening of Alameda.

An overpass at Ralston and El Camino also is in the provisions of the plan and Boucher also recommends an overpass at Ralston Avenue and South Road to give south hill residents better access to the shopping district.

One of the basic needs, according to the plan, is in the park and recreation category.

Boucher notes that, with its three acres at Belameda Park, the city has only one quarter of an acre per 1,000 population. Redwood City, in contrast, has 2½ per 1,000; San Carlos 2, San Mateo 2.83, and Menlo Park, 2.2.

The civic center proposal would require 4.3 acres.

A study of the downtown "trade area," the general plan shows, would require a possible total need for eight to 10 acres of retail commercial land within the trade area.

"This means that commercial development should not extend further than Waltermire Street to the south and Sixth Avenue to the west, with El Camino and the new street to the proposed overpass forming the two remaining boundaries," says the plan.

Boucher was assisted in the formation of the plan by a citizen group. "Many of their ideas were incorporated into the general plan," he said.



General Plan  
Redwood City Tribune  
Feb 24, 1960

## Master Plan Outline Approved in Belmont

FEB 24 1960

BELMONT — The Belmont City Council accepted a general outline of the Belmont Master Plan last night.

But Councilman Charles L. Judd still wouldn't give up the contention that there are inconsistencies in the document.

Judd had been criticizing the "general plan" since it was presented last summer. He said the statistics were inaccurate, the maps were inconsistent.

Consultant John Boucher of Pacific Planning and Research, Palo Alto, had revised the plan taking into account Judd's objections.

But Judd still didn't like the map and he wondered why Boucher had used 12,000 as the population figure in one section, instead of 14,000, now generally considered to be a more up-to-date figure.

Judd had asked for the consultant to include a paragraph explanation giving the reason for using the 12,000 figure. Boucher said he originally had included such a paragraph, but the planning director at Pacific Planning and Research had deleted it.

Judd voted for acceptance of the plan, but "with reservations."

There was a brief flareup in the beginning from the audience which questioned whether the outline had ever been submitted to public scrutiny.

"Was it published and available to the public?" asked John Schmorde, 2600 Ralston Ave., a candidate for the council in the April election.

Councilman Wallace Benson assured Schmorde that citizens' committees had worked on the document, the planning commission had gone around on it for months and it had been available at City Hall all the time.

"Do you think we should go to the expense of having it printed in the newspaper?" Benson asked Schmorde.

Schmorde said he thought not.



General Plan  
Redwood City, California  
April 8, 1964

**ESTIMATED COST OF PROPOSED PUBLIC WORK**

**(a) Architectural/Engineering Services**

Preparation of Preliminary Plans . . . \$ 13,900  
Preparation of Final Plans . . . 25,400  
Supervision of Construction . . . 15,000  
Sub-Total . . . 54,300  
Borings . . . 10,000  
Surveys . . . 64,300  
Total A/E Fee . . . \$ 71,000

**(b) Land and Rights-of-Way** . . . 784,800

**(c) Construction** . . . 53,400

**(d) Equipment** . . . 973,500

**(e) All Other** . . . 685,000

**(f) Total** . . . \$ 973,500

**(g) Maximum cost limit set by Applicant in Item 4(f) of Form CFA-401, Application** . . . \$ 685,000

(If 7(f) is greater than 7(g), attach detailed explanation.)

8. Show approximate month and year when applicant plans to undertake construction: Jan. 1965  
from that in Item 5(g) of your application, Form CFA-401, attach explanation.)

Mention any factor on which construction depends other than those in Items 5, 9, and 11:

**9. (a) Site for proposed public work has been**

☐ ACQUIRED ☐ SELECTED ☐ PLACED UNDER OPTION ☒ NOT DEFINITELY SELECTED

**(b) Condemnation proceedings started** . . . (Attach evidence thereof.)

**10. CONTEMPLATED METHOD OF FINANCING PROPOSED PUBLIC WORK**

**A. Anticipated Cash\*** . . . \$

**B. (1) General obligation bonds authorized** . . . 973,500  
**(2) General obligation bonds to be authorized** . . .

**C. (1) Revenue bonds authorized:** . . .  
**(2) Revenue bonds to be authorized:** . . .

**F. (1) Assessment or improvement bonds authorized:** . . .  
**(2) Assessment or improvement bonds to be authorized:** . . .

**E. Other Sources (specify each):**

**(1)** . . .  
**(2)** . . .

**Total - Lines (A) through (E)** . . . \$ 973,500

\* Attach statement of sources of anticipated cash (building fund, etc.)

(Attach explanation if method of financing shown above differs from that in Item 6 of your application.)

## Controversial Document

Belmont city officials have insisted that the council has not discussed a \$1 million sewerage and drainage issue and that no date has been set. These executed planning documents, available in City Hall, show that construction of sewerage facilities was proposed to begin in January, 1965, and that it was to be financed by general obligation bonds for \$973,500. The documents were sent as required to the Housing and Home Finance Agency after, the council resolution states, they "have been carefully studied."



# Mrs. Sterry's Aide Asks Spot on Agenda

BELMONT —Robert Brown today laid a request before the council "to test whether a citizen of Belmont can speak to the council at a public council meeting."

Brown, an unsuccessful council candidate in the last election, wrote a letter to Mrs. Catherine Heartsner, city clerk, requesting permission to speak at the April 13 meeting. Copies of the request are being sent to the news media "because, as has been true of so many well-intentioned citizens in the past, I may be gavelled down before my questions can be raised," Brown said.

Mrs. Eve Sterry, a council candidate, had tried unsuccessfully to gain the floor at the last meeting to raise pointed questions concerning what she had charged was quiet planning by the council of high rise apartments in the hills and a \$1 million sewer and drainage bond issue for the valleys.

The meeting was abruptly adjourned after Mayor Raymond Faber said that Mrs. Sterry was a political candidate and that the council would not allow her "platform" to be aired before the council. Brown, Mrs. Sterry's campaign manager, said at the time that he would

formally request to be heard as a citizen, not a campaigner.

Faber was not available for comment today, but City Administrator John Watts said: "We will place him (Brown) on the agenda." He said the council had never barred anyone from speaking if proper permission had been requested in advance. The meeting is the night before the municipal election.

The council, he said, will no doubt answer Brown's questions. "No members are reluctant to answer, but they will not want to get into a debate," he said. Longtime council observers say that persons are normally allowed to speak without permission, but many have complained of arbitrary treatment.

Brown's questions, all arising from Mrs. Sterry's charges and Mayor Faber's answers published in local newspapers:

"1. Why does Mayor Faber claim that there are no plans for a \$1 million bond issue when the council has submitted documents to the federal government showing such plans? To whom is Mayor Faber telling the truth—the people of Belmont or the U.S. government?

"2. Why is the council so reluctant to obey the state law to hold public hearings on the sectional plans for the hills when these plans have been in the hands of the council for over a year?

"3. The Wilsey, Ham and Blair report has said that Plan B, which is being used in developing the hills, maintains the 'hilly wooded character' of Belmont. If this ephemeral plan is being used, why are the woods and hills being trucked out of Belmont?

"4. Why did the council ignore a petition for a zoning moratorium? Why are they now refusing to consider Councilman Fitzgerald's plea for a moratorium on apartments? Why can't further apartment zoning wait until the taxpayers can attend public hearings on the hill plan? The citizens paid for these plans. When will they be allowed to review them. (Councilman Wallace Benson said there would be public hearings but did not say when.)

"5. Mayor Faber said that Belmont has been operating on a high density formula for years. Councilman Benson has said that high rise apartments are planned for the hills. The people of Belmont have not been consulted about this kind of development.

"Is the council willing to hold public hearings on any plans for Belmont, even if public opinion would force a reversal of previous council policy? If so, will you set a date for the hearings now?"

General Plan  
Redwood City Tribune  
April 10, 1964



## Audience Hoots:

# Belmont To Sell Dump to County

<sup>SC</sup>  
AUG 11 1964

BELMONT — The City Council voted 3-2 last night to sell the Belmont refuse disposal site to San Mateo County.

Negotiations on price are expected to start soon.

Councilman Joseph Zucca cast the decisive vote that would allow what Walt Worthge called "the Big Stink in Belmont" and a "wet garbage dump" and what County Manager E. R. Stallings called "a sanitary land fill operation." The vote approved the county's action in taking over the land.

The operation would be located on about 72 acres of Belmont land near its present dry fill and cover operation to the east of Bayshore freeway. It would be visible from the freeway.

The vote was preceded by a presentation by Stallings, a technicolor movie showing similar fill operations near Los Angeles, and considerable lively discussion. When Zucca announced his vote, the audience hooted, and he stuck his thumbs in his ears and waggled his fingers.

The dispute centered on whether Belmont should give up what Worthge, opposition spokesman, said would be more than 50 per cent of Belmont's industrially zoned land to the county for an interim sanitary fill operation and an eventual recreational facility, possibly a golf course. Considerable controversy has been generated here over the issue since it was quietly introduced several meetings ago under communications.

City Council —  
Redwood City Tribune  
Aug 11, 1964



## Belmont Candidates:

# Cleric Demands, Gets Poll on Fair Housing

By BRUCE BRUGMANN  
Tribune Staff Writer

**BELMONT** — An Episcopal minister dramatically injected civil rights into the council campaign here last night.

Rev. John E. Daley, rector of the Good Shepherd Episcopal Church, strode through the audience at Candidates' Night, charged that his question on the Rumford Fair Housing Act had not been asked by the meeting chairman and demanded to raise it personally to the eight council candidates.

The question: Do you approve — "yes or no" of open (fair) housing?

Daley rose to "a point of personal privilege" in his clerical dress after the question and answer session. He said that he had come to the session half an hour early, that he had given his question to the meeting chairman (Donald G. Daiker, president of the sponsoring Belmont Junior Chamber of Commerce) and that he wanted it answered. He asked whether the question "had been lost."

There was a flurry of activity at the table where the Jaycees had been screening written questions from the audience. Daiker, after consulting with them at tableside, replied that the question had not been lost, but that it had not been posed because similar questions were presented to individual candidates.

Daiker granted Daley the privilege of raising the question, with the proviso that each candidate could make explanatory statements.

The roll call: Yes, with some statements that the law (meaning the Rumford Fair Housing Act) was the law—Herman Hinrichs, Robert Fitzgerald, Mrs. Eve Sterry, Joseph Zucca, Hen-

ry Hughes and Edward Vallerga. No—Martin Schneider, who said that a property owner should have the right to sell or rent to "whoever he pleases." Mrs. Margaret Scott said: "I will do what the people decide to do."

Daley said after the meeting

that he felt that his question had been purposely withheld. The Belmont Jaycees have supported in a resolution the initiative petition which would nullify the Rumford Act.

Daiker denied Daley's remark

and reiterated that the panel had decided against the across-the-board question because of similar questions to individuals. The panel members were Eugene De Wree, George O'Brien, Gill Armando and Len Schumacker.

Before the session, the Jaycees introduced Mayor Raymond Faber, City Attorney Kenneth Dickerson, Councilman Wallace Benson and Vincent O'Connell, a member of the planning commission. John McInerney, president of the planning commission and a frequent council critic, was not introduced as well as members of the recreation commission, which has been feuding with the council.

Daley's dramatic entry into the meeting at the Carlmont High School highlighted an otherwise placid meeting, which contrasted with one of the hottest Belmont campaigns in memory. More than 350 persons turned out in what veteran observers said was the largest Candidates' Night ever.

As always, the candidates in general favored lower taxes, sound government, lots of planning and the attraction of light industry and smart downtown shops to widen the tax base. Questions were pointed. Their capsule comments:

Hinrichs: More recreation . . . more downtown parking . . . more cooperation between the council and other government bodies . . . must "adopt space techniques" to deal with "complex problems that require complex thoughts" . . . should follow the "lead of industrial management."

Fitzgerald (incumbent): "The council legislates through the people" . . . Belmont's growth should be "decided by the people, not the council" . . . "any citizen has the right to speak" at a council meeting . . . the city "should not be run like a business" . . . reiterated his demand for an apartment moratorium . . . said he knew nothing about a \$1 million bond issue (which the council has been charged with planning quietly) and that he expected that high rise apartments would be proposed "after the election."

Zucca: Said Zucca meant "Big Squash" in Italian . . . wanted "a workable master plan" . . . the hubbub over high rise apartments is "symptomatic of a lack of planning" . . . need "planned growth in downtown area" . . . asked for expansion of city services . . . "it's tough to walk along many thoroughfares" . . . called for more sidewalks to assure pedestrian safety.

Sterry: Said there was "a lot of talk about planning," but all master plan proposals had been defeated . . . supported a master plan and up to date zoning ordinance to preserve Belmont's character, which is "fast disappearing" . . . city budget has been depleted \$50,000 in less than four years as apartments have gone up . . . sidewalks are "like porice sticks" . . . must have a unified and better government."

Hughes (incumbent): . . . Renewed council accomplishments such as marina park, ballpark, library . . . said the council had not discussed the \$1 million bond issue and that it was "up to the people" . . . said at one time at the downtown area had begun to "rest but not deteriorate" . . . called for a review of downtown development.

Scott: "Belmont is a pretty good example of what is wrong with this country—caught between political expediency and mind agitation" . . . "squeezed between bigotry and injustice on both sides" . . . "extremism on both sides" . . . "need leaders who act with God-given tolerance and moral" concern . . . "can't sell our souls or liberty for a mess of pottage."

Vallerga: Assure the "utmost efficiency and economy in government" . . . broaden tax base

in three ways (1) annex unincorporated county area to East of County Road; (2) commercial development of the downtown area and (3) reserve a portion of Western Hills for non residential, tax producing government independent candidate, but would accept backing from Faber and Benson if offered . . . said he was no relation to Thomas Vallerga, who owns much of the

Schneider: Said Belmont was a growing community and that its council must plan accordingly . . . unify the council with various commissions . . . cut out friction between civic agencies



City Council  
Redwood City Tribune  
March 23, 1964

# 'High Rise' Charge Faces Councilmen

BELMONT — Charges that the city council has been quietly planning high rise development in the hills and a big drainage project in the valleys will be pressed at a council meeting this evening at 8 in city hall.

A study session precedes the council meeting at 7:30 p.m. in the council chambers.

Mrs. Eve Sterry, candidate for councilwoman in the April 14 election, said she would detail her recent charges at the session.

Wallace Benson, councilman and former mayor, said that the citizens of Belmont would not be expected to finance a \$1 million sewage and drainage bond issue, as charged by Mrs. Sterry.

The Western Hills area would be formed into an assessment district and the money for the work would assessed against the property owners, he said.

"We certainly don't intend to tax the city of Belmont for extra sewage facilities for any developer that comes into Bel-

mont," he said. That would be suicide."

(Documents approved by the council and sent by the city to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., showed that construction was planned to begin in January, 1965, and that it was to be financed by general obligation bonds for \$973,500. A copy of the documents is on file in city hall.)

The Hallmark Homes project was okayed before the sewer and drainage project was approved because it is only building 60 residences in its first phase and existing facilities can handle this, Benson said. Its second phase will require enlarged facilities, he added.

Mrs. Sterry had also charged that the council had accepted a development plan for the hills without a public hearing, but Benson in effect, contended that it had been "accepted but not adopted." He said it was accepted largely because of Mrs. Sterry's insistence upon a master plan.

Benson said that Mrs. Sterry had pushed for a plan which now includes provisions for high rise apartments. He said there would be public hearings on the plan, which calls for "minor grading of the site and development of a balanced mixture of residential uses and employment sources."

Mrs. Sterry replied that the original master plan was shelved before it reached public hearings because it called for low density development. The later plans for the hills are not "a master plan, but a precise plan," she said.

"Public hearings on a plan of any kind in Belmont will be a milestone," she said. "Let us be thankful."

(Article 11 of the state planning law provides: "Before recommending a precise plan, or regulation to the legislative body or any amendment to it for adoption, the planning commission shall hold at least one public hearing." Master plans require at least two such hearings.)



General City Council  
Plan Redwood City Tribune  
March 24, 1964

# Council Critic Gaveled Down

By BRUCE B. BRUGMANN, Tribune Staff Writer

BELMONT—Amid protests and one loud cry of "let's take a vote," Mrs. Eve Sterry last night was gaveled down by Mayor Raymond Faber and the City Council before she could raise what she later called "serious questions concerning the integrity of the council and the welfare of Belmont."

After the explosive ending to an otherwise peaceful meeting, about 15 angry citizens gathered around Mrs. Sterry outside City Hall and made such comments as:

"That was just like the commissars."

"They always cut us down from the knees."

"This was a scandal. Why not picket the next meeting?"

"Did you see the Boy Scouts in there getting a civic lesson?"

"Business as usual in Belmont."

The meeting was abruptly adjourned — "an old council trick," one citizen exclaimed afterward — after Mrs. Sterry came before the council at the point on the agenda marked "communications." She started to speak, but Faber cut her off and asked if she were going to discuss "high rise."

Mrs. Sterry said yes and that she would also speak on a \$1 million sewer and drainage bond issue. Mrs. Sterry, a candidate for the council in the April 14 election charged last week that the council was quietly planning high rise apartments for the hills and a massive sewer and drainage bond issue to expedite them.

Faber noted that Mrs. Sterry was a candidate and said: "This is your platform and I feel as mayor this is a city business meeting and I feel we're not going to turn the city council into a political platform." The remaining seven candidates would then have a right to similarly speak, he argued.

Although Mrs. Sterry had spoken at this spot on the agenda only a few weeks before, Faber said that she could not speak last night because the item was not on the agenda and no formal request had been received to put it on.

Faber said that Mrs. Sterry would be answered through the

(See Belmont, Pg. 2, Col. 5)

## No Answers

Mrs. Eve Sterry attempts to get floor at Belmont City Council meeting last night. Mrs. Sterry, who had planned to ask some pointed questions, was cut off by the mayor's gavel and the meeting was adjourned.



MAYOR RAYMOND FABER  
Gaveled down Mrs. Sterry



ROBERT BROWN  
... He'll petition council



# Belmont Councilmen Spurn Mrs. Sterry

(Continued from Page 1)

same media in which she is issued her charges — the newspapers. Councilman Benson then said: "I move we adjourn."

Mrs. Sterry, who had been seeking a point of order without response, replied: "Isn't a million dollar sewer and drainage issue public business?"

Faber reiterated his position, at one point saying the council "shall not subject the people of the audience" to Mrs. Sterry's questioning. A citizen immediately rose and asked for a vote, but Faber overrode him and the council unanimously voted adjourn.

Mrs. Sterry said she had planned to ask these questions:

1. "Why haven't taxpayers been told that work on a \$1 million sewer and drainage project is planned to start next January and that a bond issue was planned to finance it?"

2. Why did the council zone for 20 acres of apartments on the Cipriani property and for the Hallmark Homes after the sectional plans for the hills said any new development and increased runoff would aggravate existing problems and that a new sewer and drainage system would be needed?

3. Why did the council zone for these developments when we couldn't possibly pay for a new sewer and drainage system and when no provision to pay for it had been made?

4. Why did the council zone for these developments without public hearings on the plans for the hills?

5. Why did the council zone for these developments without public hearing on the sewer and drainage study?

Preceding her questions, Mrs. Sterry's prepared statement

noted the planning for high rise and the bond issue and said: "But nobody seems to know about it — city government members have said yes, no, maybe, I don't know and no comment."

Faber, after the meeting, was questioned directly by a reporter on Mrs. Sterry charges and asked why such matters — involving public policy and public money — shouldn't be properly discussed before the citizens of Belmont at a council meeting. Faber, a county probation officer, said he would reply in a formal statement to the newspapers, as Mrs. Sterry did.

He was asked why he didn't have a statement then for the newspapers. Faber replied: "I don't have it prepared." Mrs. Sterry's charges were published five days ago on Friday.

Mrs. Sterry said today that she had made her charges in the Redwood City Tribune because she was afraid that she would be gavelled down as she was last night. She charged that the council was holding off these explosive issues until after the election.

However, Robert Brown, unsuccessful council candidate in the last election, said today that he would formally file a communique with the council, as a citizen, and press Mrs. Sterry's questions himself at the April 13 meeting. The municipal election is the next day.

City officials outside Belmont said today that councils have wide discretion in allowing persons to speak on issues not on the agenda, but that it is normally allowed. Many city councils and school boards on the Peninsula call for additions to the agenda at the beginning of the meeting to give members of the audience a chance to speak.

Belmont council observers say that citizens often have been allowed to speak in the past on issues not on the agenda. Such important matters as the resignation of Kenneth Dickerson as mayor and councilman to become city attorney and the appointment of Wallace McClaren as council member at a meeting last summer were not placed on the advance agenda.

Benson has confirmed the existence of high rise plans, but other city officials — City Engineer Norman Hansen, City Administrator John Watts and Faber — have thus far refused to confirm them.

All deny that a bond issue is in the works. However, government documents approved by the council at the June meeting and submitted to the Housing and Home Finance Agency show that the construction is planned to begin in January, 1965, and that it is to be financed by general obligation bonds for \$973,500. A report by the Millbrae firm of Wilsey, Ham and Blair recommends general obligation bonds.

A press release, dated Jan. 4, 1963, and issued by Commissioner Sidney H. Woolner of the Community Facilities Administration in Washington, D. C., confirms the plans in large part.

The resolution passed by the council says that the planning documents "have been carefully studied and are considered to comprise adequate planning of the public work essential to the community and within the financial ability of the City of Belmont to construct."

Benson has maintained that the plan was to form an assessment district and tax the property owners, not the citizens.



# Mrs. Sterry, Benson Clash

FEB 25 1964

BELMONT — Councilman Wallace Benson charged last night that "a citizen of Belmont"—later identified as Mrs. Eve Sterry—had gone to the district attorney's office in an attempt to have the council arrested and led over a secret meeting dispute.

Mrs. Sterry heatedly rejected the charge.

Benson at first refused to identify the person, but he leveled his charge moments after Mrs. Sterry stood before the council and questioned a decision by Kenneth Dickerson, city attorney. The decision said that the council's longtime policy of holding unannounced pre-meeting sessions was "proper" and did not violate the Brown Anti-Secrecy Act.

"It is regrettable that a citizen of Belmont" went to the district attorney and tried to have the council thrown in jail, Benson said. Nodding toward Mrs. Sterry, who had returned to her seat in the audience, Benson said that he hoped, if she were elected a councilman, that no one would go to the district attorney and try to have her thrown in jail.

Mrs. Sterry, who announced her candidacy last week by charging "there's a fantastic mess at City Hall," marched back to the microphone and asked Benson about whom he was talking. "I know who, but I won't say," he said.

Mrs. Sterry returned to her seat. Mayor Ray Faber asked: Isn't it true, Mrs. Sterry, that you contacted the chief deputy district attorney? She replied: No, it is not true.

Mrs. Sterry has charged that the council has been holding secret sessions, in violation of the Brown Act, before its regular meetings for several months. The Planning Commission has been holding similar unannounced sessions.

Benson was questioned by a reporter after the meeting as to the basis for his accusation. He said Faber told him. Faber, a county probation officer, said that Robert E. Carey, chief criminal deputy in the district attorney's office, had told him (Faber) that Mrs. Sterry had asked Carey about the legality of the city's sessions.

However, Faber denied that he knew anything about "the jail part" or that he had told Benson this. "Don't get me

# Councilman Levels Charge

FEB 25 1964

(Continued from Page One)

mixed up with anything Benson said," Faber said.

He was then asked why he had brought out Mrs. Sterry's name in a question after Benson had made his unnamed charge. Faber said he had made no imputation other than that Mrs. Sterry had contacted the district attorney's office.

Benson, confronted by a reporter with Faber's disavowal

"about the jail part," said: "Then I'm sorry and I misunderstood him." Benson was sharply criticized after the meeting by Mrs. John Mills, wife of the president of the local school board. She described Benson as "crude and infuriating" and said "I don't know why anyone comes to these meetings."

Mrs. Sterry, visibly upset by the charge and question, said after the meeting that he had contacted the district attorney's office, as well as some other officials, in an attempt to get an opinion on whether the council had been holding secret sessions. Mrs. Sterry said she believed she did not give her name to Carey.

"I was within my rights as a private citizen," she said. "It is one thing to make an inquiry and another to put persons in jail. I resent this being made a personal attack on me in a public meeting."

Carey confirmed today that a woman had called, but said that she was asking about the Brown Act and how she could get an opinion. He said he couldn't be certain whether the caller was Mrs. Sterry. Nothing was said about jailing councilmen, he said.

Carey said he mentioned the inquiry on secret sessions to Faber. Carey said he could not be certain whether he gave Faber the name of whether Faber came up with it himself.

Dickerson, in his opinion, said: "On occasions, the Belmont City Council has held study meetings for the purpose of studying various problems confronting the administration of the city together with the staff members of the city government."

"These meetings have been called by the mayor with the acquiescence of the other members of the council. The time of the meetings has varied to accommodate the schedules of the council members. Prior to each meeting, each councilman has received written notice of the meeting."



service of the notice has either been by mail or by personal delivery by an officer of the Belmont Police Department. A survey of the city records by the city clerk reveals that no request for written notice of special meetings has been received from any local newspaper, radio or television station." (The Brown Act provides that news media request notice in writing.)

"The study meetings have always been open to the public and have normally been attended by one or more reporters representing local newspapers."

In an opinion on premeeting sessions, Atty. Gen. Stanley Mosk said on Sept. 24, 1963:

"Meetings of a city council with the city manager, assistant city manager, city attorney and planning director for premeeting brief sessions are subject to the open meeting requirements of the Brown Act. . . ."

David N. Schutz, Tribune editor, reiterated today that, after the Brown Act was enacted in 1953, the Tribune requested notification of meetings from all government bodies, including Belmont. Mrs. Catherine Heartsner, city clerk, said she did not remember such a letter, but that it could have gone to the then city administrator, Fred Nelson. She said she would check his old files.

Mrs. Sterry asked at the meeting whether there was conflict of interest in the opinion of Dickerson, former Belmont mayor. She questioned whether Dickerson wasn't giving an opinion on actions he had taken as mayor. Dickerson replied that he was only applying the council's actions to the government code on secret sessions.

After the session, Mrs. Sterry asked how the city could justify its actions, legally, on the basis of whether papers had submitted requests for notification in writing more than 10 years ago.

But Mrs. Sterry said she wouldn't press the issue because she had won it. She pointed to the City Hall bulletin board, which announced for the first time that study sessions would be held at 7:30 p.m. before council meetings.



General Plan  
Redwood City Tribune  
June 28, 1965

## Council Will Study Master Plan Proposal

BELMONT — City councilmen tonight will hear a proposed plan for hiring a professional planner to prepare a city master plan.

Councilmen also will set a hearing date for the application of Daniel J. McNeil to rezone property at 544 Ralston Avenue from apartment use to commercial to allow an ambulance service there.

The planning commission approved the application, thereby pulling a reverse on its previous stand demanding a moratorium on rezoning until after completion of a master plan.

The council will consider the planning commission's recommendation for the introduction of an ordinance adding a professional zone to the city code. The code addition would allow professional use permits in areas zoned single family and apartment.

City Manager Arthur Brandow will ask the council to adopt his proposed salary plan for city employees.

The Parks and Recreation commission will ask the council to consider organizing a Parks and Recreation Department with responsibility for maintenance and landscaping of the city's parks. The recreation department currently is under the authority of the Department of Public Works.



General Plan  
Redwood City Tribune  
Feb 2, 66

## Belmont Zoning Vote Planned for Tuesday

BELMONT — Planning commissioners approved several of the suggested amendments to the city's proposed zoning ordinance Wednesday night and then put off a vote on the issue until Tuesday night.

On a suggestion by Commissioner Victor Wandmayer, commissioners agreed to hold off on a vote on the zoning map and ordinance until the return of Commissioner Bob Webb, who had been called out of town. However, commissioners closed the public hearing on the proposed ordinance.

Chairman Milton Tromborg commended the commission for the nearly two years of work on the general plan and companion zoning ordinance and map and said he hoped at Tuesday's meeting "we can put this ordinance to the city council."

Council approved the general plan, which is a map and statement of city policy for the next 25 years, a week ago.

Commissioners approved only controversial amendments, written by planning consultant Harold Atkinson, last and held off on the "hot" until the full commission present. However, during the public hearing, which had been continued from a previous special session, the long-standing controversy was renewed over Acilman Morton L. sky's property on Ralston being shown as execu-

tive office instead of residential. Mrs. Claire McVay of 2704 Coronet Blvd., whose home is near Dr. Podolsky's house, located near the Alameda de las Pulgas intersection, restated her and her neighbors objections to having the Podolsky property rezoned and questioned the method by which the parcel received the executive zone on the proposed map.



city council  
Redwood City Tribune  
July 9, 1974

## At Belmont council meeting

# Plumbing changes stir debate

JUL 9 1974  
By OTTO TALLENT

A debate flared at last night's Belmont City Council meeting over what a plumbers' representative called a lowering of code standards and a denial by the city's building official.

Another code, calling for extraordinary security measures in new construction, drew little comment.

Tom Hunter of Belmont, business manager and financial secretary-treasurer of Plumbers, Steamfitters, Refrigeration Fitters Local 467, spent almost 1½ hours, by oratory and demonstrations, trying to convince the council that certain items have been taken out of a new uniform plumbing code that should have been left in.

The debate came during a public hearing on amending an ordinance by adopting the 1973 edition of the Uniform Plumbing Code adopted by the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials.

Hunter particularly blasted the use of plastic plumbing, declaring that Poly Vinyl Chloride (PVC) pipes put a real risk upon the citizens. He said they not only are flammable but that handling them can be harmful.

"The plumbing system in some of the homes in Belmont is a disgrace," he declared. "The local city council has the

authority and power to make changes."

Building Official Alex Hokamp denied that the code had been downgraded, declaring that the 1973 code is not much different from the 1970 code.

"I don't see anything wrong with this code," he said.

Hokamp declared there had

not been any trouble with plastic plumbing in Belmont since it was first used in 1965.

"The material has proved itself," he said.

Mayor Ferdinand Giuliani said that Hunter "has raised enough questions in my mind" that he wanted to study the code further. Upon motion of

Councilman Edward D. Valerga the public hearing was continued to the next regular meeting July 22.

The council also is considering ordinance amendments which would adopt the 1973 edition of the Uniform Building Code and the Uniform Mechanical Code.



1176

Place UP FROM PAVEMENT ADJACENT TO BELL MARKET

8 PM

Takis L. Vourvoulis

## FINALLY, THE TRUTH!

We, the undersigned, have prepared this statement because the voters of Belmont must not be misled by unwarranted, unproven, capricious and untrue charges.

Some challengers have deliberately amplified and distorted the foregoing allegations of "diminished public input" to appear as secret actions to discredit incumbents seeking re-election. This type of irresponsibility allows no time to refute these false charges. Furthermore, it also blemishes the integrity of the entire City Council and erodes the confidence of the public.

The Redwood City Tribune in its opinion page on February 27th challenged the integrity of the Belmont City Council as a means of justifying its candidate endorsements.

The allegation that people have had less voice in the Council's deliberations is unfounded because we have leaned over backwards to encourage citizen participation in decision making. During our tenure in office there have been numerous Ad Hoc committees:

Noise Abatement

Twin Pines

Heritage Trees

Historic Buildings

Downtown Design Control

Police Department Relocation

Swimming Pool

In fact, this last committee required nine months of public study and discussion that culminated in a city wide straw vote. The council then upheld the decision of the majority. Public input on the police department relocation extended over six months, and again Council decision reflected majority opinion.

Contrary to the Tribune's comments, the Councilmen of Belmont encourage citizens to speak out on every agenda item, whereas many legislative bodies permit public participation only on duly noticed public hearings.

*Bob Jones*  
*Bill Hardwick*  
*Eugene Sullivan*

ROBERT A. JONES, MAYOR  
WILLIAM H. HARDWICK, VICE-MAYOR  
EUGENE P. SULLIVAN, COUNCILMAN



1977

William E. Moore of  
892 Holly Road was  
appointed to the  
Planning Commission to  
complete the unexpired  
term of Donald Costello.  
Steven C. Vartan of 3110  
East Laurel Creek Road  
was named to replace  
Costello on the General  
Plan Review Com-  
mittee.

The council  
unanimously adopted a  
resolution requiring the  
filing of minutes of all  
meetings of com-  
missions, boards and  
committees with the  
city clerk.

SEP 13 1977



*General Plan  
Redwood City Tribune  
May 9, 1978*

## **Belmont won't halt variances**

②  
MAY 9 1978  
An attempt to hold "in abeyance" all applications for variances, encroachments and subdivisions in Belmont failed last night by a 3 to 2 vote of the Belmont City Council.

The motion by Councilwoman Pamela Ketcham received the support of Councilwoman Meg Buckley but the three men on the council voted against it.

Mrs. Ketcham's motion came after former mayor and councilman Robert Jones declared the city has not had an overall review of the General Plan since 1972 and proposed the imposition of a moratorium on building until completion of a General Plan study.

Former Councilwoman Eve Sterry supported Jones, declaring, "I hope the council will adopt a moratorium." She said zoning was not consistent with the General Plan in many respects.

John Stoddard, chairman of the review committee, said the group is in the process of taking recommendations to the Planning Commission. A second meeting of the Committee with the commission will be held tonight.

Stoddard said most important part of the study on "whether we can or cannot build" has to do with restraints — sewage, water and street capacities, noise level and water runoff.

The council heard former mayor and councilman Joseph J. Zucca describe the operations of the South County Garbage and Refuse District. He said rates at the Marsh Road Dump probably would have to be raised and predicted that "unless something happens" in the next year or so the district probably will be phased out.

The council decided to take no position on tax initiative Proposition 13 or Proposition 8 on the June 6 ballot.

Mayor Walter Worthge read a memorandum from City Planner Neal J. Martin in which he stated he felt allegations by former Councilwoman Sterry in regards to land-use actions by the council were unfounded. Mrs. Sterry said she felt the memo was "no reply."

The council will meet tomorrow at 7:30 p.m. at the Twin Pines Lodge with the Finance Commission for preliminary review of the 1978-79 budget, problems relative to the city's computer, and Sugarloaf annexation proposal.



General Plans  
Redwood City Tribune  
June 13, 1979

## Belmont's growth is studied

JUN 13 1979

**BELMONT** — The future of this city's growth will be the focal point tonight at City Hall as proponents for both measures A and B on the July 17 special election ballot meet to discuss the virtues of their respective issues.

The meeting, a joint endeavor by the McDougal, Central and Cipriani Hills Homeowners Associations, will be held

at 7:30 p.m. in the Belmont City Council chambers, 1365 - 5th St.

Measure A, if approved by the voters, would limit the rate of new residential developments to 56 a year. Measure B, a last-minute alternative, would place growth rate determination in the hands of a council-selected citizen's committee each year.

## Belmont City Council apparently abandons general plan committee

The plan consists of nine parts, outlining the city's future growth.

The review committee has been doing the groundwork for the past two years, according to chairman Joe Stoddard, and is now ready for the final work on the plan.

Disbanding it now would bypass citizens' contribution, he said, leaving only what the city planner is submitting for consideration.

It's too little and too late, said to Councilman Walt Worthge.

"The council wanted to move," he said. "We made a policy decision a few months back. I don't see a reason to re-establish a General Plan Review Committee."

The council wants to have the plan up for a public hearing within two months, he said.

He noted resignations cut down the committee's effectiveness. Councilmember Frank Gon-

By John Raess  
Times Tribune Staff

**BELMONT** — The city's General Plan Review Committee, which has complained before of neglect, apparently was abandoned by the City Council Monday night.

By unanimous vote, with Councilwoman Pam Ketcham absent, the council directed the Planning Commission alone to assess the job of expediting the General Plan.

Vice Mayor Margaret Buckley went along but added that without the committee, citizen participation in government is limited.

Her view was not shared by others on the council.

"My feeling is we should abandon the General Plan Review Committee and give it back to the Planning Commission to set up," Mayor Bill Hardwick said.

salves said he didn't want to reinstate the committee because of the "undue pressure" it previously had placed on the council.

Among those who left the committee, due to differences with the council, was Mark Reeves, co-author of Measure A, a growth-control ordinance passed by Belmont voters in the recent special election.

Reeves told the council he and the other members who resigned would return to the committee if the council reinstated it.

"It is now a moot question whether that committee was a no-growth committee or pro-growth committee," he said, raising the issue that often split the group.

The city's zoning must be radically changed to fit the requirements of Measure A, and the Planning Commission does not have the time to do it, he said.

MAY 18 1979

## Belmont 'jig' off beat

MAY 18 1979

I have respectfully resigned the position I hold on the Belmont General Plan Review Committee.

In addition, I have withdrawn my offer to make a gratis geological survey of the city of Belmont. This offer, incidentally, had not yet been considered and acted upon by the City Council.

My reasons for withdrawing my services are multifold:

1. I find it unbecoming of a committee member, if he is sincere, to dance the council's tune simply because it is the council's stance that he should do so.

2. Even at the request of 2,600 citizens, the council will not accept more than half a dance with Belmont citizenry-at-large because it wishes instead to continue its ongoing romance with land speculators and developers.

3. I find intolerable the existing conditions, judged from evidence that continues to mount, of countless decisions within the council made by handshakes behind the scenes before meetings convene.

Committee work within this frame is a kind of servitude which I refuse to accept.

John B. Miller

BELMONT

## Interest runs high in special election

JUL 5 1979

**BELMONT** — By one of the few indicators available — absentee ballot applications — interest in the special election here is running higher than last year's general election, when a majority of the council seats were at stake.

City Clerk Jim McLaughlin said Monday that applications for absentee ballots for the election July 17 already exceed the total number of absentee ballots applied for in last year's election. The deadline for applying for the ballots is not until 5 p.m. Tuesday, he said.

The election will give voters a choice between

two "growth control" initiatives, Measures A and B.

So far, McLaughlin said, his office has received 160 applications for absentee ballots.

On the basis of the interest expressed in the issues, he predicted turnout could be more than 30%. Turnout in a city election is usually closer to 25%, he said.

The petition endorsing Measure A was signed by more than 15% of registered voters in city, he said.



Aug 8, 1979

## General Plan Review Committee to be revived

AUG 8 1979

**BELMONT** — Belmont's General Plan Review Committee, disbanded after being beset with resignations for two years, will be revived with new membership.

The City Council Tuesday night voted 4 to 1 to allow the Planning Commission to appoint the new members. The council appointed the first

group.

The committee was orphaned last month by unanimous council vote with Councilwoman Pamela Ketcham absent.

The general plan consists of nine parts, outlining the city's future growth.

Mrs. Ketcham, casting the lone negative vote Tuesday in a joint coun-

cil-Planning Commission meeting, termed abandonment a "slap in the face to all those with expertise who have served on the committee."

Mayor William Hardwick disagreed.

"We (the council) erred when we appointed a committee to help the

Planning Commission," he said. "It makes sense that if the committee is to advise the Planning Commission, then the commission should appoint the members."

Planning Commissioner Donald Heiman, impatient with "all the fuss," said commission members had informally agreed to

invite all those on the prior committee to join the new committee.

Mark Reeves, author of the ordinance limiting growth in Belmont, who resigned his committee position over disagreements with the council, did not indicate if he planned to apply for membership on the new committee.

## Belmont review body reinstated

By John Raess  
Times Tribune Staff

AUG 21 1979

**BELMONT** — The city's General Plan Review Committee, disbanded by the City Council last month, has been resurrected with a membership four times greater than it had originally.

Planning Commission Chairman Alex Fletcher read a list of 51 potential members of the community who were asked to participate on the committee.

The committee is to review the nine parts of the city's general plan, which outlines the community's future growth.

Of those, 23 already have agreed, Fletcher said, including Mark Reeves, author of Measure A, the city's growth-reducing initiative passed by voters July 17. Reeves had been a member of the old committee and resigned from it in protest.

Also included in the new committee was John Stoddard, who chaired the new group's predecessor.

The committee will draw its membership from a wide range of the community, including business, homeowner and service groups, as well as from public and private institutions.

Twelve committee members were drawn from the citizenry at large.

Citing inaction, the council pulled the rug from under the old committee after it had labored on its review of the city's general plan for two years.

After resignations, the committee had shrunk to a mere handful of members.

On a split vote the council decided to have the Planning Commission re-establish the committee if it saw fit.

The commission agreed a week ago to broaden the committee's base, including all the former committee members as well as new ones.

The new group will have two months to review the general plan drafts being prepared by Neal Martin, the city's planning consultant.



## New Belmont General Plan Review board

**BELMONT** — Three residents have been appointed to head the newly formed General Plan Review Committee, an advisory body charged with reviewing nine elements of the city's general plan. **SEP 2 4 1979**

The committee elected James Wheeler chairman, Mark Reeves vice chairman and Louise Hooey secretary.

The new General Plan Review Committee was established late last month by the Planning Commission to take the place of another committee of the same name. The old General Plan Review Committee, which spent about two years reviewing the general plan's constraints and recommending changes to

the City Council, slowly fell apart after becoming embroiled in city politics.

The new citizens advisory committee was established to work more directly with the Planning Commission. It is made up of an unspecified number of residential and business interests.

It will meet the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month to individually tackle each element of the general plan.

The elements the committee will review are land use, traffic circulation, housing, noise, open space and conservation, seismic safety, storm drainage, sewage and public safety.

## Despite growth limits, Belmont housing OK

By Ann Gibbons  
Times Tribune Staff

**BELMONT** — Despite an anti-growth ordinance that limits development to just 56 residential units a year, the city's Planning Commission Thursday night approved plans for a 48-unit housing subdivision. **OCT 1 9 1979**

Three months after voters approved Measure A, the Planning Commission approved the plans that if approved in total, would use up most of one year's allotment for residential building permits. By choosing to approve the subdivision plans, the commission passed the burden of growth control to the City Council.

The council currently is incorporating the ceiling on residential development into its new general plan. Few city officials, however, will predict how the council will allot the precious 56 permits each year.

Despite the prospect of likely setbacks, the developer of the 48-unit housing subdivision will forge ahead with plans for construction of the homes near the Bayshore

Freeway and the San Mateo City border.

"We want to develop in Belmont. We've been working for two years to do that," said John Wyro, assistant development manager of Shapell Industries of Northern California Inc.

When one commissioner suggested development may only proceed at the rate of five approved housing unit permits each year, Wyro said Shapell Industries would back out of the project if that happened. Wyro said his company would need the 48 housing permits within two years to make the project worthwhile for Shapell Industries.

The 9.6-acre site with 48 homes would be part of a larger 292-unit development, most of which will be built in San Mateo, according to Wyro.

He said construction plans are moving ahead much faster in San Mateo, however.

Presidents of two homeowner's associations, whose members would become neighbors of the subdivision, spoke in favor of the proposed development.

"The land has been vacant for many, many years. It's an eyesore and the City of Belmont should develop it," said Dallas Knudson, who is the president of the 175-member Sterling Downs neighborhood group.

Wyro estimated the 2,200-2,600-square-foot homes would sell for an average price of \$175,000 if they were placed on the market next year.

In other action, the commission revised a use permit to allow roller skating at Ralston School. Last July, the commission approved a permit for roller skating two evenings each weekend on the school's playground.

The school district requested the permit be changed to allow roller skating Friday nights in the school's multi-purpose room. The commission unanimously approved the revision.

The commission also renewed the use permit for Twin Pines Manor Building which houses the San Mateo County Arts Council. The permit is subject to annual review.

## Belmont

## voter

JUN 4 1979

## deadline

**BELMONT** — Residents interested in determining this city's future growth rate in the special election July 17 must be registered to vote by June 18, according to City Clerk James McLaughlin.

Belmont residents wanting to help shape the future of their city may register in the city clerk's office at City Hall, 1365 Fifth Ave., at either of Belmont's two fire stations on Ralston Avenue, at the county clerk's office in the County Government Center on Marshall Street in Redwood City, at the County Elections Department, 40 Tower Road, San Mateo, or at any city hall in San Mateo County.

Any residents who intend to be out of town on election day but still wish to participate in the vote may request absentee ballots from the city clerk's office. There is one catch though. Applications for absentee ballots must be returned to City Clerk McLaughlin by July 10. Application forms will be in the voters pamphlet mailed to every registered voter.

Absentee ballots will be sent out after June 18 to those who have made requests, McLaughlin assures.



# Belmont general plan revisions feedback lag frustrates panel

By TERRY ROBERTSON

An unhappy General Plan Review Committee expressed frustration last night at the Belmont Planning Commission's apparent unresponsiveness to the committee's efforts to revise the city's general plan.

Committee member John Stoddard said he was perturbed that the Planning Commission had not given the review committee any feedback on a series of reports the committee had submitted last April and again in August concerning constraints on sewage planning.

Other committee members echoed Stoddard's frustrations.

These concerns and others were aired at a joint meeting of the review committee, the city council and the commission at the Lodge Building in Twin Pines Park.

Purpose of the meeting was to gain a perspective on the direction of the city's general plan revision. The committee, formally an arm of the Planning Commission, has been working on the revision since last November.

Stoddard pointed out that the General Plan Review Committee had tried to meet with the Planning Commission in study sessions on three occasions, but failed because of a lack of a Planning Commission quorum.

"Still, there was no feedback," he said. "It's as though nobody gives a damn."

Both the Planning Commission and the City

Council responded by unanimously giving the review committee a vote of confidence and by scheduling a study session between the Planning Commission and the review committee for Nov. 1 in Belmont City Hall's Council Chambers.

The City Council and Planning Commission also promised quick responses to recommendations by the review committee. (Recommendations will be sent from the review committee to the Planning Commission and then to the City Council for review.)

Chairman Alexander Fletcher explained that the commission had not responded to the piecemeal reports in April because they first wanted a full report.

He also said that the full packet of constraints the review committee had submitted in August had come up before the commission at its Oct. 2 meeting, but was continued until the Nov. 6 meeting to allow newly-appointed commissioner Joe Green time to become familiar with the subject.

The City Council decided also to send letters to the city's Citizens Advisory and General Design Committees, and to the Finance Commission to solicit representatives from each body to participate in the general plan review.

Stoddard said the participation of the finance commissioners was essential because the review committee hopes to present a revised general plan with some indication of what future city planning will cost.

One review committee member, former planning commissioner Howard Mann, complained that the constraints submitted to the Planning Commission represented a "no growth" philosophy.

However, his point was refuted by two members of the review committee who said the report was based strictly on the future growth data for Belmont the committee had come up with.

"The input we gave to the commission is based strictly on what we came up with in the data, not by any political bias," said committee member Mark Reeves. "We have not been adjusting data to fit any political need."

Mayor Walter Worthge assured them that the final decision on whether the constraints are backed up by the data would be made on the council level.

Committee member John Miller admitted to a "controlled growth" philosophy and said he doubted that "no growth" could be legislated.

But he said the delay in completing the general plan review could give enough time for far-sighted developers to build as much as they can.

*General Plan  
Redwood City Tribune  
Oct 19, 1978*