

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was convened at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber by Chair Julin with Commissioners Harle, Mihaly, Sias, and Yarish present and Commissioner Hayes and Kroot absent. Staff present were Ann Chaney, Director of Planning and Lisa Wight, Planner.

B. CONSENT AGENDA:

1. Minutes - June 3, 1991
2. **V-9118 - Mark Piper, 122 Redwood Road, A/P 7-081-50**, 5 foot side yard variance for an as built stairway within 1' of the side property line for property located within the R-1 Zoning District.

M/S Yarish/Harle, to approve consent agenda. Motion unanimously passed.
Audience advised of the ten day appeal period of the approved Variance.

C. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **V/AR-9111 - Frank Ordaz, 95 West Hillside, A/P 6-171-14**, 1) a 10' front yard variance to construct a bedroom and bath addition within 10' of the property line; 2) Architectural review; for property located within the R-1 Zoning District (Above 150' mean sea level). CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 1, 1991
2. **DR-9101 - W. B. Savage, 607 - 615 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-212-28**, design review of 1) an awning; and 2) exterior building color change. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 1, 1991
3. **DR-9107/SR-9103, Sezer Ozkan, Redwood Gas Station, 98 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., A/P 6-191-36**, 1) design review of exterior building changes to an existing service station; and 2) sign review on property located within the C-3 zoning district. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 1, 1991
4. **V-9114, Bell and Renee Glenn, 9 Olive Avenue, A/P 7-085-03**, a 5' rear yard variance and a 3' side yard variance for an addition to a single-family residence in the R-1 zoning district. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 15, 1991

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **V/AR-9109 - Jasper and Sheryl Smith, 66 Oakland Avenue, A/P 5-211-47** 14'6" rearyard variance and a 3' sideyard variance to construct a deck within 0' of the rear property line and within 3' of the side property line on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Architectural review for a structure more than 500 square feet on the downhill side of the property above 150' mean sea level)

The applicants were present.

Ms. Chaney presented the staff report.

Mr. Smith presented photographs of the area, noting the special circumstances are that this is the only outside living area for the family and with small children they require sufficient amount of deck that is away from the pool for safety. He felt that the additional trees they are suggesting will adequately screen the area.

Commissioner Yarish felt that deck would appear quite massive, with a length of 67 feet and up to 12 feet high. He also noted that there was an existing redwood tree on the western portion of the property and he did not want to see it removed or jeopardized. He suggested lopping off a 45 degree corner which would preserve the integrity of the redwood tree and allowing the deck to be approximately 6' to 8' away from the tree. He was unable to support the application in its present form.

Commissioner Harle felt that some of the changes made by the applicants since the previous meeting have reduced the imposing nature of the deck however this was a hillside lot and most hillside lots do not have pools. He felt the applicants were trying to achieve a flat lot on a hillside and did not want this to become the norm. He felt this deck would be imposing upon the neighbor. He would consider the proposal if the deck was stepped down, creating a less visual impact and still achieving the outdoor living space for the applicants.

Commissioner Mihaly was unable to make the findings for special circumstances for the sideyard variance but would compromise with the rear yard. He also stated that he would entertain a split level deck.

Commissioner Sias was also unable to grant the sideyard variance but would consider granting a portion of the rearyard for safe walking distance around the rear of the pool. He was unable to grant the entire rearyard variance and did agree with Commissioner Harle that he did not want pools with large massive decks to become the norm on hillside lots.

Commissioner Yarish added that he would also consider a split level deck.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 1991

Chair Julin stated that this particular lot was not visible from below and noted that the Commission approved a variance at 80 Oakland for a deck which was very visible and massive in the same neighborhood. She did not feel that the deck and pool that currently exists for the applicants is imposing and that the additional decking would be done tastefully. There is no outside play area for the children to play safely and did not feel the addition would be too large. She did agree that the side yard deck could be pulled back to 6' which would eliminate the variance for the sideyard.

Mr. Smith stated that although the sideyard deck would not be viewed by anyone because of the landscaping, he would be willing to pull it back to 6' if that would move the application along. He felt very strong about retaining the rear yard variance because of the safety issues.

M/S Mihaly, Yarish, to continue V/AR-9109 - Jasper and Sheryl Smith, 66 Oakland Avenue, A/P 5-211-47 14'6" rear yard variance and a 3' sideyard variance to construct a deck within 0' of the rear property line and within 3' of the side property line on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Architectural review for a structure more than 500 square feet on the downhill side of the property above 150' mean sea level). This is continued to the meeting of July 1, 1991 to allow the applicants time to consider the comments of the Commission.

Motion unanimously passed.

2. **DR-9108/SR-9104, Mohammad Banaee, 100 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-241-01, Design Review of a Auto Detailing Shop on property located within the C-3 zoning district.**

The applicant was present.

Ms. Chaney presented the staff report.

Chair Julin did not feel she could make a decision on this application without having color renderings of the building. It was her understanding that all Commercial design review proposals should be accompanied with complete color renderings so the Commission would be able to better view the proposal. Therefore she is requesting colored elevations of the building, accurate drawings with color rendering of the proposed signage and a proposed landscaping plan.

Mr. Banaee stated that he was hoping the Commission could make a decision on his illuminated sign tonight because he has been without signage on his building which is hurting his business. He would be happy to comply with the Commission's request for color renderings but was told by Staff that he was only required to present color samples.

Commissioner Harle felt he could approve the illuminated sign tonight with the understanding that any additional signage would have to comply with the maximum allowable signage for the building. He also felt that any of the gray tones would be satisfactory but felt the diagonal lines and tails were unnecessary and the stripes should be continued to the edge. He did not object to the emblems as long as they did not exceed the maximum allowable signage. He concurred with Chair Julin about seeing color renderings prior to making a final decision on the design review.

Commissioner Mihaly had nothing further to add, although he supported the illuminated sign and was ready to vote on that tonight.

Commissioner Sias preferred the warmer gray tones and had no objection to the emblems on the face of the building. He felt that the illuminated sign could be approved tonight and preferred a white sign with black lettering. He noted that the sign has been part of the building for a long time and there has been no objection to it in the past.

Commissioner Yarish concurred with the comments of Commissioner Harle about keeping the lines horizontal. He preferred the warmer gray tones and felt the emblems were fine as long as they did not exceed the allowable square footage. He felt the illuminated sign should be black with white lettering, which would visually reduce the sign at night and be less obtrusive.

Chair Julin stated that she agreed that the lines should be horizontal but would have no objection reviewing the tails. She also felt the warmer grays would be preferable. She felt that the application should be reviewed in total and therefore wanted to wait to make a decision on the illuminated sign. She suggested that the applicant put up a temporary sign.

M/S Sias/Harle, to approve a portion of SR-9104 - Mohammad Banaee, 100 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. This approval is to allow the illuminated signage for the building, to be a white background with black letters. This is based on the drawing submitted for the meeting of June 17, 1991.

Ayes: Harle, Yarish, Mihaly, Sias
No: Julin

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

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 1991

M/S Sias, Harle, to continue DR-9108 and a portion of SR-9104, Mohammad Banaee, 100 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-241-01, Design Review of a Auto Detailing Shop on property located within the C-3 zoning district. This is continued to allow the applicant time to provide complete color renderings of the building and signage on the building as well as adequate square footage of the signage. This is continued to the meeting of July 1, 1991.

Motion unanimously passed.

3. **AR-9112, John and Robin Vance, 131 Tamal Vista Drive, A/P 6-261-09, Architectural Review of a Single Family Residence located within the R-1 Zoning District (within 150 feet mean sea level).**

The applicants were present.

Ms. Chaney presented the staff report, noting that the applicants were proposing a change from their original colors to cedar siding with a composition roof.

Mr. Vance stated that they have spent a long time researching their project, as well as driving around various areas to achieve their goals and not be a detriment to their neighbors.

The Architect for the project stated that there are no extensions past the current building envelope for the second story and there will be no shadowing on the neighbors.

Cathy Gallagher, 128 Tamal Vista stated that she was in support of the project.

The Commission was in support of this proposal. Commissioner Yarish suggested that the applicant provide additional vegetation on the north side but would leave the type of vegetation up to the applicant,

M/S Yarish/Harle, to approve AR-9112, John and Robin Vance, 131 Tamal Vista Drive, A/P 6-261-09, Architectural Review of a Single Family Residence located within the R-1 Zoning District (within 150 feet mean sea level). The reasons for approval are as follows:

1. The design is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area. The proposed addition will not change the architectural integrity of the house. The house will be similar in scale to surrounding homes. 2. Provides for protection against noise, odors, and other factors which may make the environment less desirable. This proposal will not have any major long-term detriment impacts on the environment. Continuation of the proposed use (residential) will be consistent with current activities occurring in this neighborhood. 3. Will not tend to cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy. The house has been designed in such a manner that its potential impact on neighboring properties will be very minor. The property is setback far enough that the house will not severely impact neighboring homes. All of the existing landscaping will be maintained to effectively screen the property. 4. 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 addition will not result in any additional vehicular trips to the property nor will it impact existing circulation patterns in this area. 5. Will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area. The proposed addition will conform with all established codes controlling building in San Anselmo. These standards have been adopted to insure that all new developments will not create any adverse or hazardous conditions during construction and after completion. 6. Conformance to the approved precise development plans. This property is zoned R-1 and a precise development plan is not required. 7. Adequacy of screening. The site presently has a significant number of mature trees and shrubs which will all be maintained. These trees and shrubs effectively screen the property from the neighboring houses in all directions. 8. Selection of architectural features that enable the structure to blend with its environment. The architect will introduce new building products that will upgrade the building's exterior appearance. This includes using cedar shingle siding throughout the house. This approval is based on plans dated 2/6/91.

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

4. **V-9117, Surinder Singh, 28 El Cerrito, A/P 5-242-11, a 1) 20 foot front yard variance to replace an existing single car garage with a two car garage, deck stairs; and trellis; and 2) a variance for lot coverage exceeding 35%; in property located within the R-1 Zoning District.**

The applicant and his Architect, Mr. Khan were present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report. She stated that although she was unable to make the special circumstances for the trellis above the stairs, she did not consider it a detriment.

Mr. Khan stated that the intent of the trellis above the garage was to soften with vegetation and also reduce the street noise for people on the deck. He noted that the planters around the deck are also used as railings. He felt it would be difficult to move the deck back because of the waterproofing issues.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 1991

Commissioner Yarish was concerned about the mass. He wondered if the applicant would be willing to remove the portico wall and overhead deck. Mr. Khan said that was a possibility.

Commissioner Sias wanted to see a redesign to soften the front of the house. He was sympathetic to the need for parking but wanted to avoid the variance if possible. He suggested the removal of the portico, which would allow for tandem parking. He suggested stepping the deck back as well as the railing to allow for vegetation to screen the deck. He felt the trellis over the garages detracts from the project because of the additional height.

Mr. Khan stated that the proposal is to step the deck back over the garage.

Commissioner Yarish shared the concern about the massing. He said the street was narrow in a densely populated neighborhood. He liked the idea of three off-street parking but felt the visual impact should be modified. He suggested eliminating the deck over the portico and the trellis. The building stairs could be built further back from the street and a metal or wrought iron railing should be used in place of the planters.

Commissioner Harle concurred with the comments of his colleagues.

Commissioner Mihaly supported two garages but was not inclined to approve the portico. He supported the idea of softening the railing and setting the deck back. He suggested putting the trellis against the house.

Chair Julin support the three parking spaces with the deck being set back further and a lighter railing in place of the planters. She noted that 2 El Cerrito has a wrought iron railing that might be workable for this applicant. She agreed that the trellis should be against the building and had no comment to make on the stairs.

Commissioner Sias stated that there are two sets of stairs that lead to the same place and suggested eliminating one set. He felt the elimination of one stair case would also allow ample room for tandem parking.

M/S Mihaly/Yarish, to continue V-9117, Surinder Singh, 28 El Cerrito, A/P 5-242-11, a 1) 20 foot front yard variance to replace an existing single car garage with a two car garage, deck stairs; and trellis; and 2) a variance for lot coverage exceeding 35%; in property located within the R-1 Zoning District. This is continued to the meeting of July 15, 1991 to allow the applicant sufficient time to consider the comments made by the Commission.

Motion unanimously passed.

5. **AR-9113/V-9119 Carvel Johnson, 296 Redwood Road, A/P 7-095-36, 1) Architectural Review** for property located within the R-1 zoning district (above 150 feet mean sea level); 2) a 20' front yard variance to construct a carport and storage area within 0' of the front property line.

The applicant was present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Mr. Johnson stated that the storage area at the street level was to be used to store garbage cans and recycling material. He said that he is rebuilding his car deck in kind with the exception of the overhead walls. He presented a model of the proposal for the Commission's review. He stated that he originally proposed this, and was given approval for the project in 1989 but was unable to build because of structural changes in the design.

Commissioner Yarish thought the garbage enclosure was a sensible design and had no objection to leaving it in the proposed location. He also supported the car deck and enclosure as proposed by the applicant.

Commissioner Harle supported the applicant's proposal.

Commissioner Sias was sympathetic to the need for the garbage enclosure but agreed with staff's analysis of safety issues.

Commissioner Mihaly and Chair Julin also concurred with the staff recommendations. The consensus of the Commission was to allow the carport to have partially open walls to allow for safe egress and ingress.

Commissioner Yarish stated that there are seismic considerations for having partially open walls on the car deck.

M/S Mihaly/Sias, to continue **AR-9113/V-9119 Carvel Johnson, 296 Redwood Road, A/P 7-095-36, 1) Architectural Review** for property located within the R-1 zoning district (above 150 feet mean sea level); 2) a 20' front yard variance to construct a carport and storage area within 0' of the front property line. This is continued to the meeting of July 1, 1991 to allow the applicant to work with staff on the best location of the garbage enclosure. With the understanding that if it

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 1991

was in front it could be enclosed and if to the side, it should be open. Also, staff should attempt to put this item on the Consent Agenda.

Ayes: Sias, Mihaly, Julin
Noes: Harle, Yarish

Motion carried. Item continued to the meeting of July 1, 1991.

6. **AR-9114, Dan Hanley 43 Rosemont Avenue, A/P 5-072-23**, Architectural Review for an addition to an existing single family residence located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet mean sea level)

The applicants and their Architect, Mr. Hageman, were present.

Ms. Chaney present the staff report.

Mr. Hageman stated that they would be moving the current retaining wall to the rear of the property there by creating additional parking in the garage. In addition, the current square footage of the house is 963 square feet, not 1,123 square feet as stated in the staff report.

The Commission was in support of the application..

M/S Yarish/Harle to approve **AR-9114, Dan Hanley 43 Rosemont Avenue, A/P 5-072-23**, Architectural Review for an addition to an existing single family residence located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet mean sea level). Approval is based on the following:

Adequacy of screening: The proposed addition is stepped back from the street and does not require screening to minimize visual impacts. Selection of architectural features that enable the structure to blend with its environment: The exterior of the existing house will be remodeled and repainted in conjunction with the proposed addition, for an overall unified effect. functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area: The addition will be visually part of the existing house. Protection against noise, odors, and other factors which may make the environment less desirable: The proposed use, expansion of an existing single-family house, is consistent with current uses in the neighborhood. Will not tend to cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy: An expansion of a single-family residence is consistent and compatible with uses currently in the area. 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 addition is not expected to generate additional vehicle trips. Access will not be impeded. Will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area: The proposed residence addition will conform with all established codes controlling building and grading, which have been adopted to insure that new development does not create any adverse or hazardous conditions during construction and after completion. Approval is based on drawings dated received May 6, 1991.

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

E. GENERAL DISCUSSION

The consensus of the Commission was to have the meeting start time go back to the original 8:00 p.m. It was the understanding that the 7:00 p.m. start time was in affect only to catch up on the back log of work. The planning staff has now indicated that the work is now manageable. In addition, the consensus of the Commission was that the 7:00 p.m. start time created a hardship on both the Commissioners and applicants.

Commissioner Mihaly suggested that on future Architectural Reviews that would not create view shed issues could be part of the consent agenda. He stated that that although staff would have to do the same analysis, and the applicant would have to provide the same information, the Commission would be able to have the option of discussing the project or approving it on Consent.

The rest of the Commissioners agreed with Commissioner Mihaly.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 1991

Ms. Chaney stated that the owner of 729 Sir Francis Drake forgot to apply for exterior color change when he applied for his variance. He proposes to paint the exterior white and staff wonders if the Commission felt it could be handled Administratively or if it would have to come back to the Commission for review. The preference the Commission was to either leave the building wood, with a transparent or translucent stain or secondly paint it an off-white, but the white that was suggested by the applicant would be too bright. The Commission felt that staff could handle this matter without further review of the Commission.

F. REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL

16 Ivy Lane will be heard at the Town Council meeting on June 25, 1991. Also, the owner of 96 Broadmoor appealed the Planning Commission decision of denial.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The regular Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m. to the next regular meeting of July 1, 1991.

BARBARA CHAMBERS