

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF OCTOBER 15, 1990**

**A. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners present: Harle, Julin, Sias, Mihaly, Hayes, Kroot and Yarish

**B. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Approval of Minutes for October 1, 1990

Commissioner Kroot requested that the minutes be taken off the consent agenda and placed at the end of the meeting for discussion.

**C. PUBLIC HEARINGS CONTINUED TO FUTURE MEETINGS**

1. **V-9023/AR-9006 - Jean Brunswick, 22 Magnolla Avenue, A/P 7-212-34, 1) a 1'0" front yard variance, a third story variance, and a building height variance to construct a professional office building; 2) a variance to exceed the maximum allowable lot coverage of 60% and 3) a parking variance to allow inadequate parking, and design review, on property located within the "P" Zoning District: CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 5, 1990.**

**D. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **V-9032 - Stephen and Carol Rahn, 25 Rancho Drive, A/P 5-062-93, 1) a 7.5' frontyard variance to construct a covered porch within 12.5' of the front property line; and 2) a 3.5' frontyard variance to construct a living addition within 16.5' of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 zoning district.**

The applicants were present along with their Architect, David Israel.

Assistant Planning Director Anderson presented the staff report.

Commissioner Julin asked staff to discuss the future proposals of the site that are not currently before the Commission but that could have an impact on the overall application.

Assistant Planning Director Anderson stated that the future proposal is to subdivide this parcel into three separate parcels and there is a subsequent tentative map pending. He explained how the applicants propose to split the lot.

Commissioner Julin felt that good planning dictates processing the Tentative Map prior to any variances for this parcel. There should also be a discussion of sidewalks, drainage channels, and the other parcel adjacent to this that will be developing in the future. She felt that processing this application first would be putting the cart before the horse.

The consensus of the Commission was to proceed because this variance is such a small intrusion and would not affect future development.

Mr. Rahn stated that he felt the land almost requires a subdivision to adequately maintain it. The issue of the subdivision is approximately two to three years away. He said that he felt the variance was necessary for the following reasons. They were just continuing the existing front lines of the house and they would be unable to expand to the rear because of the large bay tree. The house was currently six to eight feet away from the root system and to go any closer could damage the tree.

David Israel stated that the house and setbacks currently exist and they are just following the existing lines of the house. The large bay tree to the rear of the property precludes construction in that area. With regard to the front porch, the original entry was to the side of the house and this design is more aesthetically pleasing.

Brian Ross, 3 Rancho Drive, was in favor of the variance, adding that the Rahn's addition will be beneficial to the neighborhood. There have been four owners of the property in the last seven years and it is a pleasure to have current owners that care about the property.

Chairman Yarish asked what measures would be taken the flood channel. Mr. Anderson stated that there will be conditions placed on the Tentative Map if it is approved. Mr. Rahn stated that it was to his benefit to ensure that no flooding occurs. He noted that the red house on the property has acted as a retaining wall and at that point, the channel is rather deep.

Commissioner Sias was inclined to support the application. He did not see what would be gained by removing the tree so the addition could go to the rear.

Commissioner Mihaly supported the recommendation of denial of the addition by staff although he understood why the applicants did not want to remove the tree. The lot is very large and

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF OCTOBER 15, 1990**

there are many possibilities for expansion. He noted that the house has been almost entirely demolished already and the applicants have the opportunity to place the house elsewhere on the lot. He stated that he was less bothered by the porch variances.

Commissioner Harle could not come up with the special circumstances for granting the variance for the porch and with regard to the addition, the house is practically being rebuilt and therefore could be moved elsewhere on the site. However, the addition could also be considered just an extension of the existing house and the Town does not like to see heritage trees removed.

Commissioner Julin concurred with staff's recommendation to deny the variances because the parcel is quite large and it would be possible to build elsewhere within the Town setbacks and not endanger the heritage tree.

Commissioner Kroot was inclined to support the application. The kitchen addition is only about 12 square feet at the most and he agreed that the heritage tree should be saved. The addition of the entrance porch to the front of the property instead of the side will add quite an improvement to the house. He did not think the variance would be a detriment but would improve the facade of the house and the neighborhood has a lot to gain.

Commissioner Hayes noted that the variance was for such a small area and he would not want the variance to impede the natural drainage swale to the rear of the property or endanger the heritage tree. He felt that reorienting the porch from the side of the house to the front is conforming to what other houses have. He supported the variances for those reasons.

Chairman Yarish agreed that there were special circumstances to grant the variances, specifically the heritage tree to the rear of the lot, the shape of the lot, the addition to the kitchen was really just filling in a notch, and the added benefit to the neighborhood to create aesthetic interest to the front of the house with the porch entry.

M/S, Hayes/Kroot, to approve V-9032 - Stephen and Carol Rahn, 25 Rancho Drive, A/P 5-062-93, 1) a 7.5' frontyard variance to construct a covered porch within 12.5' of the front property line; and 2) a 3.5' frontyard variance to construct a living addition within 16.5' of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 zoning district on the basis: (a) Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under an identical zoning classification, and the granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated; specifically, the location of the structure on the lot and the location of the front yard setback and yard to the large tree and injury or loss of the tree would be a detriment. The relocation of the front entrance to the house from the side is more in conformance and the kitchen is a minor intrusion to the setback and the spirit of the zoning ordinance is met and the actual setback is at least as great, or greater, than the code; (b) The granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner; (c) The granting of such variance, under the circumstances of the particular case, will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood; specifically the variances are minor in nature and will not cause a detriment to the neighborhood. This approval is based on the drawings dated May 29, 1990.

Ayes: Harle, Hayes, Kroot, Yarish

Noes: Sias, Mihaly, Julin

Motion carried. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

2. **AR-9001/V-9033 - Steven Hoertkorn, 9 Summit Avenue, A/P 7-031-43, 1) architectural review of a 1,388 square foot living addition; and 2) an 18' frontyard variance and a 7' east sideyard variance to raise the roof of an existing dwelling within 2' of the front property line and within 1' of the east side property line, on property located within the R-1C zoning district.**

The applicant was present.

Planner Wight presented the staff report.

Commissioner Julin stated there was a "pop out" shown on the elevation plan but not on the floor plan. Ms. Wight stated that it was not part of the application.

Mr. Hoertkorn stated that the roof is presently non-conforming and the increased height was to bring it into conformance and also to allow access to the back bedroom. With respect to the exterior color, he thought gray was considered an earth tone but would be willing to consider other colors.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF OCTOBER 15, 1990**

Cathleen Evangelista, 5 Francis, thought the house was fairly close to the street and would loom.

Susan, 8 Francis, wondered if the foundation will have to be reinforced and if a soils engineer would be required because of the steepness of the lot.

Mr. Hoertkorn stated that there is an extensive soils report already prepared.

Brenda Bark, 1 Summit, wondered if the addition will be any closer to her driveway than it already is. Mr. Hoertkorn stated that it would not.

Commissioner Mihaly concurred with staff recommendations to deny the exterior building color and roof change and approve the proposed addition.

Commissioner Harle supports the application because the raising of the roof is necessitated by the need to access the rear bedrooms and the exterior color was acceptable to him.

Commissioner Julin concurred with staff recommendations and felt that the addition could take place without the need for the variances. She also felt the drawings were very conceptual and difficult to interpret.

Commissioner Kroot had no objection to the exterior color but the applicant stated he would use a darker color. He had no objection to the addition, however the roof is fairly close to the street and would loom, so he would like to see the roof reduced.

Commissioner Hayes supported staff recommendations. He felt the roof addition was a substantial intrusion into the setback and is quite bulky. He wondered if the stairway could be brought further back to allow for proper access. He did think the proposed addition was nice and would like to see a darker used on the exterior of the house, preferably brown or a darker grey with brown tones.

Commissioner Sias agreed with staff stating the house would loom.

Chairman Yarish agreed with staff recommendations except he felt the exterior color would be fine because the site was not visible. The roof is too close to the street and there could be better solutions to access the rear bedroom and still allow light to enter.

M/S, Kroot/Julin, to continue AR-9001/V-9033-Steven Hoertkorn, 9 Summit road, A/P 7-031-43, 1) architectural review of a 1,388 square foot living addition; and 2) an 18' frontyard variance and a 7' east sideyard variance to raise the roof of an existing dwelling within 2' of the front property line and within 1' of the east side property line, on property located within the R-1C zoning district. The application will be continued to the meeting of November 19, 1990 to allow the applicant time to think about the comments of the Commissioners regarding the exterior color and height of the roof and perhaps come up with alternate plans.

Motion unanimously passed.

3. **U-9012 - Tri-Xuan Le, 606 Redhill Avenue, A/P 6-092-24**, use permit for a dry cleaner and laundry agency (no cleaning on-site) on property located within the L-C zoning district.

The applicant and the property owner's son, Roger Pierce, were present.

Assistant Director of Planning Anderson presented the staff report.

Commissioner Kroot stated that the ingress and egress would be quite easy from this site.

Chairman Yarish felt it was hard to see this as a low use generator when in actuality, the building was built for a fast food use.

Commissioner Mihaly thought that 25 trips per day was quite low for a business to operate at a profit. He wondered if the General Plan specifies a specific number of trips that would constitute a low traffic generator.

Commissioner Sias asked what use would be acceptable according to the General Plan? Mr. Anderson stated that an antiques business would constitute a low traffic generator.

Mr. Le stated that the main thrust of his business will be the home delivery, where it will pick-up and deliver to residents. This will be beneficial to senior citizens and handicapped individuals. He his delivery times will be between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Pierce was surprised to find that the General Plan down zoned this property. He said the property was built for a fast food chain and they was subsequently used for a car stereo store

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF OCTOBER 15, 1990**

and then Yoghurt Delight. Because the property has been down zoned, none of the past type enterprises would now be allowed on the site. He stated that the Land Use regulations state that dry cleaners are permitted without a use permit and wanted clarification on that. He stated that 90% of the people that have been interested in leasing the site are interested in using the site for fast food. It seems that the down zoning of this property has really limited the type of business.

Mr. Anderson read the General Plan definition of the permitted uses in this zone.

Commissioner Julin stated that the hours of operation are being designed to capture the commute traffic. The business would not add additional traffic but would add turning movements for an already heavy traffic situation during commute times. Therefore, she concurred with staff that the application should be denied because it would increase the turning movements during peak traffic time.

Commissioner Harle supported staff's recommendation of denial.

Commissioner Kroot thought the use was appropriate for the site and stated that there were going to be no more than 25 trips per day and the cars have good access to the site because of the traffic light. He did not think it would be reasonable to limit the hours to non commute times.

Commissioner Hayes supported the application and did not think the turning movement would be significantly and that the maximum number of cars per day would be 25.

Commissioner Sias support the proposal and asked that there be a review in six months. He further asked that the patrons of the business be encouraged to use it as a pick up and delivery enterprise.

Commissioner Mihaly supported the application but would condition the approval with a review within six months of operation and that there be an emphasis on pick-up and delivery.

Commissioner Harle decided that he would support the application because he stated there are other dry cleaners currently at the HUB and it does not seem to generate a traffic problem.

Chairman Yarish supported the application. He did not feel there are many businesses that could be in this location and by limiting this business could be an infringement of property rights.

Commissioner Hayes stated if there was a change in the color of the awning he would like to see it back to the Commission for a Design Review.

M/S Hayes, Sias to approve U-9012 - Tri-Xuan Le, 606 Redhill Avenue, AP 6-092-04, use permit for a dry cleaner and laundry agency on the basis: 1) The granting of the use permit will not allow a use which generates traffic at a rate greater than forty vehicle trip ends for each 1,000 gross square feet of gross leasable building area and which does not add any additional traffic volume or turning movements on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard during the AM and PM peak commuting periods; and 2) the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use or building applied for will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the Town, and that the granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner; specifically that the use will not be detrimental to the Town or businesses. This approval is conditioned with a one year review by the Planning Commission and that the dry cleaner offer the services of pick up and delivery and that further there is the understanding that the sign review and the design review will come back to the Planning Commission at a future date.

Ayes: Sias, Mihaly, Harle, Kroot, Hayes, Yarish

Noes: Julin

Motion carried. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

4. **PP-9001/PD-9001.AR-9002 - David and Lydia Bell, Fernwood Drive, A/P Nos. 7-131-58 and 7-131-59, preliminary plan, precise plan, and architectural review of a new single family dwelling located within the R-1H zoning district.**

The applicants, and their architect, Dan Thomas, were present.

Assistant Planning Director Anderson presented the staff report.

Dan Thomas stated that the house had been lowered and moved off the ridge and within the required setbacks. They have also provided a turn-around for fire trucks. He presented samples of exterior colors. The house will not be visible from Redwood Road. He presented the

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF OCTOBER 15, 1990**

landscaping plan to the Commission. He indicated that they have met with all the neighbors who had originally objected to the project and they are now generally in favor of the design.

Gay Kagy, 280 Redwood Road, stated she was opposed to the project originally because it was very visible however she feels the owners have made a good faith effort to reduce the size of the house and make it less visible. She therefore, is now in support of the project.

Pat Beckum, 286 Redwood, thought the house was very attractive, and the location was much more desirable than the original location. She would like to see the oak trees remain in front of the house.

Chairman Yarish stated that the owners of 56 Fernwood did not oppose the application but were concerned about preserving the pine tree. Mr. Bell agreed that it was also important to them.

All the Commissioners supported the application.

Chairman Yarish also asked if a road bond could be included as a condition of approval.

M/S Julin/Kroot, to approve PP-9001/PD-9001/AR-9002 - David and Lydia Bell, Fernwood Drive, A/P Nos. 7-131-58 and 7-131-59, preliminary plan, precise plan, and architectural review of a new single family dwelling located within the R-1H zoning district on the basis:

Preliminary Development Plan; 1) The proposed Preliminary Development Plan or phase thereof can be completed within four (4) years of the approval of said plan. Construction of the proposed single family detached residence is expected to begin within six months of the date of approval, with total construction expected to require approximately six months. Therefore, the proposed preliminary development plan can be completed within four (4) years of the approval of the preliminary development plan. 2) That each individual phase of development, as well as the total development can exist as an independent unit. Utility services and improvements required to serve the project site, including water, sewer, telephone, and electricity, are available immediately adjacent to the site, and will be extended onto the property to serve the proposed residence. No roadway improvements or enhancements are required to serve the project site. Vehicular access to the site of the residence from the end of Fernwood Drive will be provided by a driveway to be constructed as part of the project site's overall development. No other improvements are required or proposed to serve the project site. As such, the proposed development is not dependent on the development of other, off-site improvements. Therefore, the total development can exist as an independent unit.

3) That the roadways proposed are suitable and adequate to carry projected traffic, and the proposed development will not generate traffic in such amounts as to overload the street network outside the project area. No roadway improvements have been identified as necessary to support development of the project site. Development of the project site has been anticipated within the context of the 1988 San Anselmo General Plan. The Negative Declaration certified as adequate to address environmental impacts associated with the accommodate additional traffic resulting from planned and anticipated development projected by the General Plan, which includes development of the project site. Therefore, the roadways proposed are suitable and adequate to carry projected traffic, and the proposed development will not generate traffic in such amounts as to overload the street network outside the project area. 4) That the proposed plan will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing in or adjacent to the area or endanger property located in the surrounding area. The project site exhibits several classifications of soil and geologic conditions. The site of the proposed residence, set off of a secondary ridge line which forms the southern boundary of the project site, exhibits the most geologically suitable and stable location of the entire project site based on information contained in a geotechnical investigation conducted of the site in April, 1990. The siting of the proposed residence on the most geologically stable portion of the site reflects consideration of issues of health and safety to both the applicants and to adjacent property owners and improvements. At this writing, staff has received no comments from adjacent property owners regarding perceived effects of the proposed residence's siting with regard to issues of health or safety. In the absence of information to the contrary, there is no information to suggest that the proposed plan will adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing in or adjacent to the area or endanger property located in the surrounding area. 5) That the proposed plan is in conformance with the San Anselmo General Plan. The 1988 General Plan contains a series of policies which address development within the hillside areas of the Town, specifically Land Use Element Policy numbers 2.2, 3.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.5, 9.2, 9.3, and 9.4. In summary, the proposed development of the project site is in conformance with these General Plan policies, and therefore, this finding can be made.

Precise Development Plan; The precise development plan in its entirety is in substantial conformance with the previously approved preliminary development plan. The precise development plan proposed by the applicants represents an identical development plan for the project site, and is therefore consistent with the preliminary development plan in its entirety.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF OCTOBER 15, 1990**

Architectural Review; 1) Conformance to the approved preliminary and precise development plan. The siting and design of the proposed single family detached residence represents an identical development plan and design for the project site as depicted on the preliminary and precise development plans, and is therefore consistent with the preliminary and precise development plans in its entirety. 2) Adequacy of screening. The proposed siting is set within and adjacent to an existing stand of trees which will serve to screen the residence from northerly, easterly, and westerly off-site views. Southerly off-site views of the residence will be screened by two trees proposed for installation by the applicants. Therefore existing on-site vegetation and proposed landscape enhancements will adequately screen the proposed residence from all off-site views. 3) Selection of architectural features that enable the proposed residence to blend with its environment. The overall design and style of the proposed residence exhibits visual qualities of a long, low structure when viewed from southerly off-site vantage points, the elevation of the residence which, as proposed, is the most relatively visible from off-site views. The incorporation of different roof units and cupolas introduce visual variety into the design and serve to diminish the massing of the proposed residence. The applicants have chosen the use of light-chocolate brown stucco, white and forest green trim, and a dark grey-brown composition shingle roof. The visually predominant exterior materials will be the stucco and roof. The colors will cause the residence to recede into the existing trees and proposed landscape enhancements. The proposed use of white and forest green trim will serve to accent the proposed residence's features and will not create visual disharmony with the surrounding natural environment. 4) Is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area. The siting and design of the proposed residence is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area. 5) Provides for protection against noise, odors, and other factors which may make the environment less desirable. Following completion of the construction process, which results in inherent noises associated with the construction process, the proposed residence will not serve as a source of noise, odors, or other factors which could make the environment less desirable, in a manner any different from other, existing residences in the neighborhood. 6) Will not tend to cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy, investment, or orderly development in such area. The project site, and the siting of the proposed residence, will generally not be visible from the immediately surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, the proposed residence will not tend to cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy, investment, or orderly development in such area. 7) Will not create unnecessary traffic hazards due to congestion, distraction of motorists, or other factors and provides for satisfactory access by emergency vehicles and personnel. The development of one single family residence on the project site, will not result in the generation of traffic volumes in excess of the levels anticipated by the General Plan. While the introduction of an additional residence will increase the number of vehicular trips on the roadway network serving the project site, that increase has been identified as necessary to serve the project site. The existing roadway network which serves the project site is adequate to provide for access by emergency vehicles. 8) Will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area. The findings required for the approval of architectural review can be made for the proposed design. Conditions of approval are that adequate protection be taken for the pine tree and that a road bond be established for Fernwood.

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

5. **AR-9003 -/V-9034 - Cyrus Ansari, 15 Oak Springs Drive, A/P 5-254-05**, 1) architectural review of a new single family dwelling; 2) a height variance for the dwelling to be 40' in height as measured from average grade, on property located within the R-1C zoning District.

The applicant and his architect, Bob Hayes were present.

Planner Wight presented the staff report.

Mr. Hayes stated that the architecture proposed characterizes other homes in the area. It is low profile, has a low roof and has access from the street. They wanted to create a quiet house and tried to break up the mass on the downhill slope. With regard to the height variance, he felt it was necessary because of access off the street and the required slope of the driveway and also because of structural reasons. Drainage is a real issue. Staff is proposing 18% grade but he did not think it is a good design.

Mr. Ansari stated that another problem with the driveway is that his house is near a curve on Oak Springs and visibility is also an issue. Also the houses in his area were built approximately 30 years ago and standards have changed since then.

Mrs. Lago, 17 Oak Springs Drive, stated that the current design will loom.

Brian Hickman, 14 Oak Springs Drive, did not think the height would be an issue for him because it will not affect his view because he is up hill from Mr. Ansari. He stated that he would like to see

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF OCTOBER 15, 1990**

something built relatively soon because the site has been in dispair since 1982. He hoped there could be a compromise.

Commissioner Kroot had no problems with the design review, including the siding proposed by the applicant. He would like to see the height reduced and felt the driveway could be sloped down. He did not think the slope could decrease more than 4 feet for safety reasons. He felt the house was designed nicely.

Commissioner Hayes wanted to see the height reduced between 4 and 6 feet.

Commisisoner Sias would like to see the height not exceed 35 feet. He had no argument with the design review and horizontal or vertical siding was acceptable with him.

Commisisoner Mihaly thought the exterior colors were acceptable and had no statement to make on the type of siding. Supported the decrease in height of 4 feet.

Commissioner Harle supported lowering the height by 4 feet, had no dispute on the exterior colors or the siding.

Commissioner Julin did not feel there were special circumstances for the height variance because there is plenty of land to work within the standards. She had no problem with the exterior colors and preferred horizontal siding.

Chairman Yarish would prefer not to see such a steep slope. Colors and materials were acceptable to him and preferred vertical siding. He would accept a two foot height variance. He stated that even though the Town Engineer has a recommendation, he agreed with the architect.

Commissioner Sias requested that the Town Engineer be present at the next meeting to discuss the driveway.

M/S, Sias/Mihaly, to continue the application to the meeting of 11-5-90, to see a design with a height requirement not to exceed 35 feet or testimony of driveway feasibility. The Commission would also like to see a cross section of the building that is the maximum slope of 35 feet.

Motion unanimously passed.

M/S, Sias/Mihaly, to approve the exterior colors and landscaping as follows: Exterior material: redwood T & G Verticle Runs; Exterior color: Olympic Stain "Beachwood" (grey green); Exterior trim: Olympic Stain "coffee" (dark brown); Window Trim: White; Roof: Natural Cedar Shakes; Deck Handrail: 2x6 1/2' center copper pickets @ 6" o.c., 4x4 posts @6"; Lower Deck: Enclose bottom with lattice 1x2 redwood panels (no stain). Frontyard landscaping: a) needlepoint ivy and existing juniper shrubs on both sides of the entry deck; b) Two (2) Japanese Maple trees to the south of the driveway; Rearyard landscaping: a) Two (2) Apple trees to the center rear of the dwelling; b) Two (2) Peach trees to the south rear property line; c) Two (2) cherry trees to the south rear near the dwelling; and d) plant a 24 inch pine tree, ten (10) to the east of the existing pine trees.

Motion unanimously passed. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes of October 1, 1990 were continued to the meeting of November 5, 1990 because of the late hour.

**F. ADJOURNMENT**

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:30 a.m. to the next meeting of November 5, 1990.

BARBARA CHAMBERS