

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 1992**

1

The San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Kroot. Commissioner's in attendance were Sias, Julin, Hayes and Harle with Mihaly arriving at 8:15 p.m. Staff present was Planning Director Ann Chaney, Planning Consultant Delvin Washington and Planner Lisa Wight.

Director Chaney polled the Commission as to whether or not a special Planning Commission meeting should be set to view the site of 663 Oak Avenue prior to the June 15th Public Hearing.

M/S Sias/Julin to continue this regular Planning Commission meeting to the meeting of June 8, 1992, to meet on the site of 663 Oak Avenue at 7:00 p.m. for the purpose of a site visit prior to the meeting on June 15, 1992. Commission Hayes stated he would not be able to attend. Motion unanimously passed.

B. CONSENT

1. Minutes - May 18, 1992

2. DR-9207/V-9214 - Terry O'Neil for the Velesco's, 115 Woodside Drive, A/P 5-272-08, Design Review to replace an existing deck and retaining wall; and 2) a 20' rear yard and 4'6" side yard variance to relocate the retaining wall within 0' of the rear property line and 3'6" of the side property, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet mean sea level).

3. DR-9209 - Rob E. Guest and Joan Englund-Guest, 122 Jordan, A/P 6-144-46, Design Review to construct an addition to an existing single family residence for property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet mean sea level).

4. PP-9/AR-7 Rob Yeakey, 80 South Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-50, request for extension of time to begin construction of a single family dwelling on property located within the R-1H Zoning District.

Commissioner Sias asked that the minutes be removed from the Consent Agenda and placed at the end of the public hearing items for discussion.

M/S Julin/Harle to approve Items 2, 3 and 4 of the Consent Agenda with wording as written in the staff reports as follows:

2. DR-9207/V-9214 - Terry O'Neil for the Velesco's, 115 Woodside Drive, A/P 5-272-08, Design Review to replace an existing deck and retaining wall; and 2) a 20' rear yard and 4'6" side yard variance to relocate the retaining wall within 0' of the rear property line and 3'6" of the side property, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet mean sea level).

Design Review:

1. Is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area; As viewed from surrounding properties, the existing decks blend well with the existing dwelling. The new deck on the west side will only be visible from one or two properties above on Oak Springs Drive. **2. Provides for protection against noise, odors, and other factors which may make the environment less desirable;** The decks will not impact noise, odors, nor other factors which may make the environment less desirable. **3. 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 decks will actually be an improvement to the property. The white motor trailer with the blue tarp, parked along the south side of the dwelling is much more visible from surrounding properties than the existing dwelling and decks. In keeping with the desire for hillside structures to have a low visual profile, if the trailer is intended to remain at this location, staff requests that the applicant consider planting some trees or bushes that could reach a height of 10' on the south side of the trailer. **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;** and The decks will not create traffic hazards nor affect satisfactory access by emergency vehicles and personnel. **5. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use 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 the proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the Town.** The decks will not be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the Town.

Variance:

1. Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the controlling zoning

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 1992

2

ordinance or regulation deprives the 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; and Due to the topography, the retaining walls, designed by a civil engineer, are necessary to provide stabilization of the hillside. **2. The granting of the 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.** The retaining walls will provide better stabilization to the hillside and will serve to protect properties below. Conditions of approval are that the project be built according to the approved plans dated received March 16, 1992.

3. **DR-9209 - Rob E. Guest and Joan Englund-Guest, 122 Jordan, A/P 6-144-46,** Design Review to construct an addition to an existing single family residence for property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet mean sea level).

1. Is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area; This proposed dwelling will utilize the same exterior materials that exist on the current house such as a wood exterior. **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 detrimental impacts on the environment. Continuation of this current use (single-family residence) will be consistent with the activities occurring in this neighborhood. A condition of approval has been included limiting the construction work hours and days in order to minimize impacts on the neighborhood. **3. 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 proposed addition of an existing dwelling will not cause the depreciation of property values in the surrounding area. The improvements to the current structure should cause the appreciation of this and neighboring properties. **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;** No additional vehicular trips should result from this proposed addition. **5. Will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area.** The proposed dwelling will conform with all established codes controlling building and grading associated with the construction of a new single family residence. These standards have been adopted to insure that all new development will not create any adverse or hazardous conditions during construction and after completion. Special drainage conditions and plants have been included as mitigations for this project. **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.** All of the existing mature trees on this site will be maintained and an extensive landscape plan has been included. The proposed location of the house will not be highly visible unless seen from the end of Ivy Drive. In addition the neighboring properties have an extensive amount of mature trees. A substantial amount of new vegetation will be planted in conjunction with this project. **8. Selection of architectural features that enable the structure to blend with its environment.** The addition has been designed in such a manner so as to be consistent with the architectural character of the existing house. **Conditions of approval:** **1. That the request for design review be granted to construct a new single family residence, in accordance with the plans date stamped received by the Town of San Anselmo on April 17, 1992. 2. The exterior of the house shall conform with the existing color and material palette approved by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Sias noted that the roof color should not be green.**

4. **PP-9/AR-7 Rob Yeakey, 80 South Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-50,** request for extension of time to begin construction of a single family dwelling on property located within the R-1H Zoning District.

That approval of a Precise Development Plan and Design Review for 80 South Oak be granted a one year extension of time, to April 15, 1993 to start construction of a single family dwelling. This approval is based on the fact that the design meets current codes and design standards.

Motion unanimously passed for Items 2, 3 and 4 of the Consent Agenda. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS - CONTINUED

1. **V- 9210 - Dean and Diana Randle, 13-A Smith Lane, A/P 6-251-20,** a 10' street sideyard variance, a 2' east sideyard variance, and a 2' rearyard variance to construct a second story living addition within 2' of the street side property line, within 6' of the east side property line, and within 18' of the rear property line, with a 2' roof overhang; and 2) a 2' street sideyard variance to construct a new enlarged covered front porch within 10' of the street side property line; and 3) a parking variance to allow substandard parking to remain, on property located

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 1992**

3

within the R-1 Zoning District. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 15, 1992

2. **V-9208 - John Oldfather and Holly Ford, 158 Pine Street, A/P 7-251-31**, 1) a 4'8" side yard variance; and 2) a 1' front yard variance to construct a second floor addition; and 3) a two car parking variance to locate parking within the front and side yards, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 15, 1992

3. **Water Well Ordinance - Town of San Anselmo** - A General Plan Amendment and Ordinance Code Amendment to allow private domestic water systems and the adoption of a well ordinance relative to their construction, reconstruction, maintenance, removal and monitoring. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 6, 1992

4. **V-9213 - Harry Kraft, 214 The Alameda, A/P 5-054-07**, a 20' front yard and 8' side yard variance to allow a 7'3" existing fence and trellis structure to remain within 0' of the front and side property line, on property located in the R-1 Zoning District. AFTER-THE-FACT. - CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 15, 1992

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **V-9206/DR-9205 - William Johnson, 100 Chipman Place, A/P 7-271-21**, a reconsideration of a design review and variance request in order to construct a new 4,607.5 square foot single family residence on an existing parcel. This square footage is "adjusted" per Town Ordinance to consider portions of the garage and second unit. A dwelling was formerly located on this property but was destroyed by fire.

The applicant was present.

Mr. Washington presented the staff report.

Commissioner Harle was concerned as to whether or not vacancy means voluntary or involuntary. Because of the fire on the site, the vacancy could be considered involuntary because of fire safety and if that is the case, he did not think the applicant should be penalized.

Director Chaney suggested the Commission vote of the design review of the proposed new dwelling with the condition that an occupancy permit not be granted until the second unit issue is resolved; either by the ruling of the Town Attorney that the second unit can stay or whether or not it should be abated, with the cooking facilities removed and just used as an accessory structure.

Mr. Johnson stated that he was and has always been under the impression by the planning staff that this was a registered, legal, second unit. He contacted First Interstate Bank who held the loan after the fire and prior to his purchase of the property. He was told that the property was occupied temporarily by someone as caretaker of the property. He stated that he did not know the difference between vacant and abandoned and therefore could not respond to that. He did not think parking was a problem. He owns the area in the turn-around fronting 100 Chipman Place and there is room for at least one car there. It is on the deed of record that he can use that area as long as it does not prohibit ingress and egress of 90 Chipman Place. Mr. Johnson stated he was not against applying for a Use Permit for the second unit but was not sure how that would change or jeopardize his right to the existing unit.

Commissioner Sias was in support of the application with the conditions in the staff report and that amended by the Planning Director.

Commissioner Harle supported the project, with staff's amendment and excluding Conditions 11 and 12 which eludes to the second unit.

Commissioner Mihaly concurred with Harle and added that there has been a good deal of case law on the books regarding involuntary disabandonment of a use and would suggest staff contact the Town Attorney to have his people research it. He personally felt that he would use the date of the applicant's application of November 1991 as the starting date for the six months of occupancy of the unit.

Commissioner Julin supported the application with the conditions and amendments as have been noted.

Commissioner Hayes agreed that the abandonment of the second unit might not be considered voluntary because of the fire and in principal he was sympathetic in allowing the use to remain as it was although the proposed house does seem larger than the one that burned.

Chairman Kroot had nothing further to add.

Director Chaney suggested a modification to Condition 6 to include Section 10.3-607(c) non-

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 1992

4

conforming use of buildings. This will allow for clarity on how much it can be brought up to code without jeopardizing the non-conformance.

Director Chaney suggested amending conditions 11 and 12 with refer to the second unit as follows: If the existing accessory building at 100 Chipman Place is determined by the Planning Director and Town Attorney, to be a legal, nonconforming second unit, then it may be used as such. However, no occupancy permit may be issued for the new residence unless and until this determination is made. Should it be determined that the accessory building does not constitute a legal, nonconforming second unit, the applicant must do one of the following prior to occupancy permit issuance: A. Demolish the accessory building; B. Remove the kitchen and convert the building to a use such as a guest quarters; or C. File for and obtain a Use Permit to allow a second unit in the building. Such a permit is subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission via a public hearing.

M/S Harle/Sias to approve V-9206/DR-9205 - William Johnson, 100 Chipman Place, A/P 7-271-21, a reconsideration of a design review and variance request in order to construct a new 4,607.5 square foot single family residence on an existing parcel. This square footage is "adjusted" per Town Ordinance to consider portions of the garage and second unit. A dwelling was formerly located on this property but was destroyed by fire. Approval is based on the following:

Design Review:

1. Is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area. This proposed dwelling will utilize exterior materials that are consistent with those used on existing homes in the neighborhood. The house exterior will have a natural wood finish with colors that will not contrast with neighboring structures. **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 detrimental impacts on the environment. conducting the proposed use (single-family residence) 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 construction of a new dwelling will not cause the depreciation of property values in the surrounding area. The activity of a single family residence is consistent and compatible with activities currently occurring in this area. In addition, this house should not be highly visible from surrounding areas due to the existing topography and vegetation. **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 additional vehicular trips generated by this new dwelling unit will not have a significant impact on this neighborhood. The location of the house will not obscure visibility on Chipman Place not will it inhibit the smooth flow of traffic to and from the neighboring properties. The installation of an on site garage should further alleviate parking problems that may be occurring in the turnaround 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 dwelling will conform with all established codes controlling building and grading associated with the construction of a new single family residence. These standards have been adopted to insure that all new development 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-C and a precise development plan is not required. **7. Adequacy of Screening.** The parcel is virtually hidden from the street and the proposed location of the house will not be visible. The mature trees that are throughout the property will be maintained with the exception of two trees. **8. Selection of architectural features that enable the structure to blend with its environment.** The proposed use of natural wood products will blend with neighboring homes constructed in the area. The proposed location also appears to have the least potential impact on the topography of this property in that a pad already exists from the original house.

Variance:

1. Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinances or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under an identical zoning classification, and the granting of a 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; and The front access to this parcel is extremely narrow and steep and the existing walkway is not wide enough to accommodate a vehicle. This is an unusual characteristic unique to this parcel of land. Based on this reason staff can make the necessary findings to recommend support of the variance. **2. 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.** The reconstruction of a single family residence on this property will not have any detrimental impacts on any of the immediate surrounding properties. This is a single family residence which is consistent with the adopted zoning guidelines for this district. **Conditions of approval are as**

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 1992**

5

follows: 1. That the request for design review be granted to construct a new single family residence, in accordance with the plans date stamped received by the Town of San Anselmo Planning Department on May 5, 1992. 2. The applicant shall conform with all other procedures for plan review required by the Town of San Anselmo. 3. The owner shall install a sprinkler system as per the satisfaction of the Ross Valley Fire Department Chief. 4. That no trees be removed from the site, other than the two trees shown on plans dated August 8, 1991. 5. The applicant shall establish a cash surety, in an amount determined by the Director of Public Works for any necessary public or private road maintenance that might result from the construction of this house. 6. The existing accessory building on the property next to the main home site shall be inspected and brought up to code as per Section 10.3607(c) Non-Conforming use of buildings of the San Anselmo Building Code Standards. 7. The house when measured at an elevation of 79.41 feet shall not exceed a height of 35 feet when measured to the top of the spark arrestor on the chimney. 8. The shed located at the northwest corner of the parcel shall be removed prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for the new residence. 9. The Eucalyptus trees located on the north side of the property, adjacent to 155 Oak Avenue, shall be safety pruned prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for the new residence. 10. Access to the accessory building next to the main home site shall be provided from the garage area across the subject property via a pathway so as not to have a direct impact on any of the neighboring properties. The location of the pathway and materials used to construct it shall be shown on plans submitted at the time of Plan Check and will be reviewed by staff for conformance with this condition. This condition shall not apply if the accessory building is removed. 11. Should it be determined that the accessory building does not constitute a legal, nonconforming second unit, the applicant must do one of the following prior to occupancy permit issuance: a) Demolish the accessory building; b) Remove the kitchen and convert the building to a use such as a guest quarters; or c) File for and obtain a Use Permit to allow a second unit in the building. Such a permit is subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission via a public hearing.

The Planning Commission directs staff to further investigate the status of the second unit and to withhold the granting of an occupancy permit until this matter has been resolved.

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

2. **DR-9208 - Robert and Vicki Gerstenkorn, 241 Oak Springs, A/P 5-293-16, Design Review to construct an addition, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet mean sea level).**

The applicants were present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

There was a lengthy discussion on the intent and definition of the ridge zone and ridge line. Commissioner Harle stated that the ridge lines and zones on the General Plan Map were drawn to indicate the general location and not the exact location. He said that in 1976 during the General Plan discussions, the intent was to identify lines, not to define them. He therefore was not sure if a topo map would provide the answers necessary to determine if this property was in a ridge zone.

Commissioner Julin felt that this was a small addition with a low visual profile and that in this instance the important factor was how the addition will be viewed from various locations around Town.

Mr. Gerstenkorn stated that the height of the house will not measure higher than 25 feet at any point. He has thoroughly researched the different ways to add onto his house for additional space and felt that this was the best proposal. He stated that the owners of 187 Oak Springs were allowed to build a second story addition last year. The addition was 1,200 square feet and about 25 feet in height. He was under the impression that because this house was approved there would be no problems with his addition. With regard to Policy 2.5 of the General Plan Open Space Element, stating that the Camino de Herrera ridgeline extends from elevation 400 feet at the end of Camino de Herrera northward to the upper end of Woodside Drive at elevation 500. He stated that he can stand on his deck and could view the top of Woodside and Camino de Herrera. He stated that the houses across the street from him are higher, approximately 3'9" higher at some points, measured from the slab of his garage and measuring directly across the street. He stated that when he purchased the house the previous owner mentioned that the house was on a knoll or berm and at some point was leveled to create solid ground. He felt that it would be very difficult for staff to determine the ridge line using "Exhibit A" because the size is so small. He stated that his lot is approximately 60' wide with only a drop of perhaps 10' in width. With regard to the ridgeline running through his garage as stated in the staff report, he stated that area is very flat and his immediate neighbor's garage to the west is 6 1/2' above his house at the fence line. He presented photographs of the fall of the street on Oak Springs. He stated that although his house was visible from 9 Carlson with some skyline in the background, it

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 1992**

6

should also be mentioned that there were other locations within town that the house could not be viewed. He was reluctant to have a topo done of his house and surrounding houses because he felt that the Town should have the appropriate maps that determine the ridge line. The next door neighbor's house is approximately 18' high but because of the elevation his house with the addition would be equal to his neighbors. With regard to his addition, he would rather not tear off the entire roof or set the addition further down. He explained that he did not feel it would be feasible to lower the addition because of the structural complications. He said that he proposes Anderson windows that would be tinted vinyl gray which will reduce the glare. With regard to staff's recommendation that the addition could take place in a portion of the garage. He stated that he did not think this would be aesthetically pleasing or make sense. He also stated that the garage slab was already 1' below the finished floor of the house and would have to rework the entire sewer system. The proposed addition will be set back 64' from the street and will appear teared because of the existing carport. Their intent is to keep the lines of the addition soft.

Commissioner Kroot suggested that if as Mr. Gerstenkorn states the house is about 4' below the house across the street and thus 4' below the ridge line. And if the new upper floor is lowered about 2'6" by removing the existing roof and not building over it. And if necessary, the proposed gable roof can be flattened then it should be possible to build this new addition within the 18' ridge height limit.

Mr. Gerstenkorn stated there were a few errors in his plan and did not think he would be able to comply with Chairman Kroot's suggestion.

Commissioner Harle was in sympathy with the applicant and agreed that this project was compatible with other houses in the neighborhood but, there is a question about what height is appropriate based on the ridge. If the height is greater than 18', determined from the ridge line, then it is against the General Plan and cannot be approved. A determination of the ridge will alter the situation and may be worth while to the applicant to have a survey done. With regard to 187 Oak Springs, he would be interested in knowing more about this project.

Commissioner Mihaly would not be able to act on this project without additional information. He wants to have the issue of the definition of ridge top resolved because it will determine the height of the house. Is the ridge described as a straight line or is it a meander? How should the meander be defined? What is the definition of ridge top? Is it a line or a space? Would it be measured differently if it passes through the lot and not the house?

Commissioner Julin felt Commissioner Mihaly's questions would take considerable staff time and she should that the intent was to just interpret the concepts. She felt that the important issue with this design review was to determine how much of a visual profile the addition would be. Her feeling was that the house was a little tall for this area.

Commissioner Hayes felt that the issue of the ridge top, line and area needs to be clarified but did not want to see these applicants held hostage. He would not be able to approve an application that was against the General Plan and felt that he could not approve a height that exceeded 18 feet. He was hopeful there were ways to reduce the height of the existing addition and still allow the applicants the additional room they need.

Commissioner Sias wanted to make it clear that he could not approve a height that exceeded 18' above the ridge line. He suggested a measurement from the property across the street since that house was higher.

Commissioner Mihaly suggested measuring the highest point of the house across the street and measure the distance to the applicant's house.

Chairman Kroot noted that the applicant has to prove where the ridge top is in relationship to his property and it would be up to a licensed surveyor to do that. He said if the house did not exceed 18' he could approve the project. The applicant could seek a variance to exceed the height and he thought he could make the findings because of the minimal impact but he was not sure his colleagues felt the same.

Mr. Gerstenkorn stated that they are currently the lowest house on his end of Oak Springs. To decrease the height of the addition would be difficult because they have a beam and plank ceiling and would have to rip the current roof off to lower the addition, and the roof would be flat. He did not think that was aesthetically pleasing and did not follow the lines of the house. He wondered if the Commission would consider a 1 foot variance. Commissioner's Sias and Hayes did not think they could make the findings. Commissioner Harle could not comment without looking at the proposal and would then have to see compelling reasons as to why it had to be a variance. Chairman Kroot stated that under the circumstances he might be able to support a variance of 1 foot or so.

M/S Mihaly, Sias, to continue DR-9208 - Robert and Vicki Gerstenkorn, 241 Oak Springs, A/P 5-293-16, Design Review to construct an addition, on property located within the R-1 Zoning

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 1992**

7

District (above 150 feet mean sea level). Continuance is to allow the applicant time to have a survey prepared or to redesign the project and for staff to review the approved project at 187 Oak Springs. This is continued to the meeting of July 6, 1992.

3. **Marin Countywide Plan - Town of San Anselmo**, will involve general discussion of the Countywide Plan with possible recommendations being forwarded to the Town Council

Because of the late hour the consensus was to continue this discussion. Director Chaney was hoping for input of the Commission prior to June 25th.

M/S Julin/Sias to continue discussions on Marin Countywide Plan - Town of San Anselmo, to the special meeting on June 15, 1992, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, after the site visit to 663 Oak Avenue. All Ayes.

4. Minutes of May 18, 1992

Commissioner Hayes noted that he and Commissioner Mihaly were not present at the May 18th meeting and the minutes should reflect that. Commissioner Sias wanted minutes amended under General Discussion to delete "...rather than have the Council review the major changes."

M/S Sias/Julin, to approve minutes as amended. Motion carried with Commissioner's Hayes and Mihaly to abstain.

H. ADJOURN

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m. to the special meeting of June 8, 1992 which will convene at the site of 663 Oak Avenue for the purpose of viewing the site prior to the June 15, 1992 Public Hearing where testimony will be heard.

BARBARA CHAMBERS
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES II