

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Vice Chairman Jeff Kroot at 8:00 p.m. on October 21, 1985 in the Council Chamber. John Kottage of staff present.

1. ROLL CALL;

Commissioners Present: Harle, Hayes, Heubach, Kroot

Commissioners Absent: Bergeson, Sharp (One appointment not filled)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 14, 1985

This item continued to next meeting.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. V-2083 - Allan and Joy Widenhofer

This item continued to the next meeting at request of applicant.

B. SR-348 - Ross Valley Veterinary Hospital

Dr. Mike Kluse, co-owner of the Ross Valley Veterinary Hospital was present. He said the past few years they have been plagued with vandalism and a 3 foot addition to the height of the sign would make the bottom of the sign 9 feet from the ground and would hopefully prevent vandalism.

There was no one in the audience to comment on the application.

After a brief discussion among the Commissioners in which they agreed it was a sensible idea and they had no problem with the application, it was M/S Heubach, Hayes to approve SR-348, application of Ross Valley Veterinary Hospital, 190 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-241-06, for a sign variance to permit a free standing sign to be 14 feet in height on the basis that the granting of such application will not adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare or be detrimental to or endanger or depreciate the property located in the surrounding area. Passed unanimously. Applicant notified of the ten-day appeal period.

C. SR-349 Intavideo

Jane Roberts, co-owner of Intavideo, said her customers approaching on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard cannot see the existing signs. She said the building is set at an angle.

There was no one in the audience to comment on the application.

Commissioner Hayes said he was concerned about the other tenants of the building. He said they might desire a similar sign on the building and since there are 6 units, this could mean 6 additional signs.

Commissioner Heubach said he had the same concerns as Commissioner Hayes; he was sympathetic to the applicant's desires. He said he would like to see the tenants work together so all could benefit from such a sign.

Commissioner Harle said the application was not offensive to him, but he had the same reaction as the others. He was not deeply impressed with the hardship.

Commissioner Kroot said the signs would still be below the allowance in square footage.

Commissioner Heubach suggested referring the application back to the applicant for consideration of how all of the tenants could benefit from a sign on this particular wall.

Commissioner Harle said he would be amenable to allowing the sign now with the understanding that upon the application of other tenants for a sign on the same wall of the building, the total signage be limited to the frontage allotment and the final allowance would be equitable to each tenant.

At the applicant's request it was M/S Heubach, Harle to return the application to the applicant for further consideration of how the proposed sign could benefit any or all other tenants of the building. Passed unanimously.

D. V-2091 Tom and Linda Bleshevel

Staff reported applicant had originally applied for an administrative variance for the fence; however one of the applicant's neighbors has appealed the decision to approve the application and therefore the applicant had made the formal variance application to the Planning Commission. The appellant subsequently withdrew his appeal.

The consensus of the Commission and staff was since the appeal had been withdrawn the original approval of the administrative variance would stand and this application was summarily dropped from the Planning Commission Agenda. It was understood the applicant's additional \$90.00 fee would be refunded.

E. SR-350 - Mobil Oil Corporation]

There was no one present to represent Mobil Oil Co.

Staff reported there was no problems with the signs above the pumps, but he was somewhat concerned about the proposed sign on the light pole.

Commissioner Heubach said he was also concerned over the light pole sign.

Commissioner Harle said it appears to be a product sign.

Commissioner Kroot agreed, saying a can of oil was a product.

M/S Harle, Heubach to continue SR-350, application of Mobil Corporation, 631 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-101-05, for a sign variance amendment to permit a free-standing sign

and two price signs above the pumps be continued to the regular meeting of November 4, 1985. Passed unanimously.

F. V-2092 - Jon A. Marchant

Staff pointed out only the deck was being considered at this meeting since the building had been approved at a previous meeting. The application was to continue the deck to the side property line rather than to cut it off six feet from the property line. The deck is proposed where presented there is a shed-type roof overhang.

Jon Marchant introduced the property owner, Bud Marchant, and said this was an aesthetic consideration. They felt a deck would contribute to the courtyard effect they were striving to achieve.

There was no one in the audience to comment on the application.

Each of the Commissioners stated they supported the application.

M/S. Harle, Hayes to approve V-2092, application of Jon A. Marchant, 65 Ross Avenue, A/P 6-284-05, for a six foot each sideyard variance to construct an open deck within zero feet of the east side property line, on the basis granting of the variance will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property involved and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in said neighborhood; granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; the geometry of the existing building makes this a logical extension. Passed unanimously. Applicant notified of the ten-day appeal period.

P/C 10-21-85

G. V-2093 Meigs and Gilda Lee

Staff explained this application was for three variances:

1. For a carport in the frontyard setback and right-of-way;
2. Construction of a living room expansion in the frontyard setback;
3. Construction of a family room and bedroom in the rearyard setback.

Staff said they have no objection to the construction.

Mr. and Mrs. Lee were present. Mr. Lee said the proposed construction in the rear was not going beyond the present line of the building, it would be on the second level. He said he had spoken to all of his neighbors, and none of them had any objections to the construction.

There was no one in the audience to comment on the application.

Commissioner Hayes said he agreed with the staff memo. He had some concern about the second story and the effect it may have on adjacent neighbors; however, no one was present to object to the construction.

Commissioner Heubach said he was uneasy about the second story, especially in the setback, but noted the neighbors most affected by it apparently are not concerned. However, a lack of opposition does not necessarily mean the variance is not detrimental.

Commissioner Kroot mentioned the house already exists, mostly the second story is over what is now existing.

Commissioner Heubach asked what the current square footage of the dwelling is and what the square footage of the addition will be.

Mr. Lee said presented the house is around 1100 s.f. and an addition of 700 s.f. will bring it to about 1800 s.f.

When Commissioner Hayes asked Mr. Lee if he had any discussion with the neighbor to the south, Mr. Lee said he had several. He also said there was a very large oak tree that already obscures the vision from that particular house.

Mrs. Lee said she had 3 small children, and there is no other area possible where they can add a third bedroom without going up. She said they live next door to a house that has been used for a church for many years, and they have visitors Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Sunday every week.

M/S Harle, Hayes to approve V-2093, application of Meigs and Gilda Lee, 97 Hawthorn Avenue, A/P 5-128-03, for a 3'6" frontyard variance to construct a living room addition within 16'6" of the front property line; and a 12'3" rearward variance to construct a family room and bedroom within 7'9" of the rear property line, and a parking variance to formalize the encroachment of the long-standing of the existing carport into the right-of-way on the basis that to allow the proposed construction would be the most appropriate means of achieving the needed increase in living area and granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property involved and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements; plans approved in accordance with plans dated October 7, 1985. Passed unanimously. Applicant notified of the ten-day appeal period.

P/C 10-21-85

4. At 9:25 p.m. the meeting adjourned to the special meeting of October 28, 1985.

Thelma Foster