

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order on August 3, 1981, at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Ollinger in the Town Hall Council Chamber.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Harle, Ollinger, Peterson, Signorelli
Commissioners Absent: Hayes, McPeak, Ragan

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - July 20, 1981

Item 3F, paragraph 10, change " . . . with the General Plan; however, the southerly ridge is also prominent and, therefore, construction on it could be considered inconsistent . . ." to " . . . with the General Plan; and construction east of the north ridge would also be inconsistent . . ."

Item 3F, paragraph 10, change " . . . ruling from the Town Attorney." to " . . . ruling from the Town Attorney as to density transfer and economic viability."

M/S Peterson, Harle, to approve the minutes of July 20, 1981, as amended.

Motion passed unanimously.

3. NEW BUSINESS

- A. V-967 - Mrs. Marcelle Krutch, 110 Calumet Avenue, A/P 6-071-04, 3½ foot and seven foot sideyard variances to construct a carport within 4½ feet and one foot of the side property line.

Peter Anderson, representative, present.

Commissioners Signorelli and Ollinger expressed concern about the tightness of placing the carport in this location.

Mr. Anderson said the neighbor would be more concerned if the carport were placed in the front of the lot.

M/S Peterson, Signorelli, to approve V-967 for Mrs. Marcelle Krutch, 110 Calumet Avenue, A/P 6-071-04, 3½ foot and seven foot sideyard variances to construct a carport within 4½ feet and one foot of the side property line; on the grounds that it is necessary for the substantial enjoyment of property rights; it will not be detrimental to the neighborhood; it is required by the location of the existing building on the property; and this is the best location for the carport; as shown on the drawing received by the Town on July 2, 1981, which will not be detrimental to neighbors on the south side of the property who would object if the carport were placed between the house and street.

Motion carried: AYES: Harle, Peterson, Signorelli
NOES: Ollinger

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- B. V-968 - Dee and Casey Poole, 181 Scenic Avenue, A/P 7-032-20, a seven foot frontyard variance to construct a kitchen/breakfast room addition within 13 feet of the front property line.

Suzanne Deutsch, designer, present.

Ms. Deutsch showed photographs of the existing structure on the property, pointing out that the house is small and in need of repair.

M/S Harle, Signorelli, to approve V-968 for Suzanne Deutsch, 181 Scenic Avenue, A/P 7-032-20, a seven foot frontyard variance to construct a kitchen/breakfast room addition within 13 feet of the front property line, on the grounds that it will allow substantial enjoyment of property rights; it will not be detrimental to the neighborhood; and is necessitated by the placement of the existing buildings on the property.

Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Deutsch was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- D. V-970 - Kazuo and Kazuko Nii, 31 Longview Avenue, A/P 6-152-42, a three foot sideyard variance to construct a living addition within five feet of the side property line; and a third story variance.

Kazuo Nii, applicant, present.

Mr. Nii said he has the support from his neighbors on both sides.

Commissioners Harle and Ollinger suggested constructing the addition within the setbacks in a different design.

Commissioner Signorelli stated that staff is fully aware of someone else who has a third story (without variance approval) and have done nothing about it so he feels this applicant should not be discriminated against.

Howard Stubblefield, 24 Longview Avenue, expressed his support of this proposal.

Don Loomis, architect, said he feels this design will present continuity in terms of support.

M/S Peterson, Harle, to approve V-974 for Kazuo and Kazuko Nii, 31 Longview Avenue, A/P 6-152-42, a three foot sideyard variance to construct a living addition within five feet of the side property line; and a third story variance, on the grounds that it is necessary for the substantial enjoyment of property rights; it will not be detrimental to the neighborhood; and it is necessitated by the small size and slope of the lot, the position of the existing structure on the lot, and the interior design of the living room with the beamed ceiling.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- C. V-969 - Robert Craven, 170 Prospect Avenue, A/P 6-192-08, 12 foot and ten foot frontyard variances to construct a kitchen addition and fireplace within eight feet and ten feet of the front property line, respectively; and a third story variance to construct an attic storage area.

Robert Craven, applicant, and Dan Coleman, architect, present.

Mr. Coleman showed the Commission elevations of the proposed construction superimposed on photographs of the existing building. Mr. Craven said he has verbal support from his neighbors.

M/S Harle, Peterson, to approve V-969 for Robert Craven, 170 Prospect Avenue, A/P 6-192-08, 12 foot and ten foot frontyard variances to construct a kitchen addition and fireplace within eight feet and ten feet of the front property line, respectively; and a third story variance to construct an attic storage area; on the grounds that this construction will allow the substantial enjoyment of property rights; it will not be detrimental to the neighborhood; the location of the additions is dictated by the arrangement of rooms in the house.

Motion carried: AYES: Harle, Peterson, Signorelli
NOES: Ollinger

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

Commissioner Ollinger said there is room on the lot to move the additions within the setbacks.

- E. V-971 - David M. Kasdan, 172 Barber Avenue, A/P 6-191-15, a five foot frontyard variance to enclose an existing porch within 15 feet of the front property line.

David Kasdan, applicant, present.

Mr. Kasdan said by enclosing his porch it will increase the size of the living room. He added that his neighbors support this application.

M/S Signorelli, Peterson, to approve V-971 for David M. Kasdan, 172 Barber Avenue, A/P 6-191-15, a five foot frontyard variance to enclose an existing porch within 15 feet of the front property line, on the basis that it is necessitated by the configuration of the house on the lot; it will enable the substantial enjoyment of property rights; and will not be a detriment to the neighborhood.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- F. V-972 - Sara Godwin, 51 Hillside Avenue, A/P 7-115-25, a 20 foot frontyard variance to construct a parking deck within zero feet of the front property line.

Sara Godwin, applicant, present.

Ms. Godwin said this deck will help ease the parking problem on her street and will be used for storage of materials later this year when she re-roofs her house.

David Corsi, 60 Hillside Avenue, said he does not object to the parking deck; however, he feels there are two living units on the property and this is why additional off-street parking is needed.

Lisa Burglin explained that staff had received a complaint about a possible second living unit and was arranging with Ms. Godwin to set up an inspection of the property. She added that there are no more allowable units in that neighborhood and that matter should have no bearing on this variance request.

Robert Pettijohn, 61 Hillside Avenue, complained about the parking situation and suggested the applicant supply more than four parking spaces.

M/S Peterson, Harle, to approve V-972 for Sara Godwin, 51 Hillside Avenue, A/P 7-115-25, a 20 foot frontyard variance to construct a parking deck within zero feet of the front property line, on the grounds that it is necessary for the substantial enjoyment of property rights; it will not be detrimental to the neighborhood; it is necessitated in order to provide additional off-street parking in a neighborhood that has a severe parking shortage; and is further necessitated by the slope of the lot and placement of structures on the lot; further move, to grant a parking size variance for two spaces to be 19 feet in length.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

4. DISCUSSION

Commissioner Signorelli requested a response from the Town Attorney as to why he feels the proposed Density Ordinance is in conflict with the General Plan.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 9:26 p.m. to the next regular meeting on August 17, 1981.

Lisa Burglin

LISA BURGLIN
PLANNING ASSISTANT