

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 17, 1993**

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber by Chairman Mihaly. Staff present: Planning Director Ann Chaney and Associate Planner Lisa Wight.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioners present: Harle, Hayes, Julin, Kroot, Israel, Mihaly
Commissioners absent: Sias

B. CONSENT

1. Minutes - May 3, 1993

The minutes were taken off of Consent for amendments.

- 2. Z-9301/PS-9302/ER/DR-9309/U-9303 - Bill and Sharon Asbell, directly to the south of 45 Cedar St, A/P 7-222-58, 1) a request to rezone a parcel from PPD (Preliminary Planned Development)-multi unit to SPD (Specific Plan Development) multi unit; 2) a tentative parcel map to subdivide an existing 12,000 square foot parcel into two 6,000 square foot parcels; and 3) a use permit and design review application to construct one unit on each of the new parcels. (the total number of new units on this parcel will be two), on property located within the PPD Zoning District.**

Due to comments to be made by a neighbor and by Commissioner Israel, Chairman Mihaly removed this item from the consent agenda.

C. APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

- 1. V-9244 - Lenore Mathews, 72 Foothill, A/P 7-033-12, a front yard variance to raise the existing house 3' in height to be located 2' from the front property line; 2) a 7'6" side yard variance along the south side property line; 3) a 4'6" side yard variance on the north side property line to construct a new garage and garden storage house, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.**

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS - CONTINUED

- 1. PS-9301/LLR-9301/ER (Environmental Review, Parcel Split, and Lot Line Relocation, - Andrea Sandvig and Stuart Jacobson, 500 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-191-06 and 07, 1) environmental review; 2) a parcel split to legalize the 1946 creation of two separate parcels, one which is currently developed; and 3) a lot line relocation for an approximately 5 acre piece of property located within the R-1-H Zoning District. No development is proposed as part of this request. **CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 7, 1993****
- 2. V-9315 - Laurent Recollon - 36 Canyon Road, A/P 7-062-09, a variance to construct an 8'6" retaining wall along Canyon Road beyond the front property line (within the right-of-way) in order to help stabilize the slope supporting the house; and 2) a retaining wall within 4' of the east side property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' mean sea level). **CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 7, 1993****
- 3. PS-9201 - Tony Richards for Viking Leon, Between Forest Avenue and Vista Lane, south of Lansdale Station Park, A/P Nos. 7-021-07, 7-021-23, and 7-021-24, 1) environmental review; 2) parcel split to legalize the 1954 creation of three separate building sites, each of which is currently undeveloped. **CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 21, 1993****
- 4. V-9240/DR-9218 - Tony Richards for Viking Leon, 5 Vista Lane, A/P 7-021-24, 1) design review of a single family dwelling; 2) a 17' frontyard variance to construct a dwelling within 3' of the front property line; 3) a 3' rear yard variance to construct bay windows within 17' of the rear property line; 4) a 20' frontyard variance for driveway retaining walls to be within 0' of the front property line; and 5) a 13' frontyard variance to construct an uncovered deck within 1' of the front property line. **CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 21, 1993****

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 17, 1993**

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Minutes - May 3, 1993

M/S Israel, Julin, to approve minutes with the following ammendments. Page 5, Commissioner Israel to change wording to "...screening would help soften the view for the neighbor.; Page 5, Commissioner Harle to add "....therefore, the liability is placed on the owner...". Motion unanimously passed.

- 2. Z-9301/PS-9302/ER/DR-9309/U-9303 - Bill and Sharon Asbell, directly to the south of 45 Cedar St, A/P 7-222-58, 1) a request to rezone a parcel from PPD (Preliminary Planned Development)-multi unit to SPD (Specific Plan Development) multi unit; 2) a tentative parcel map to subdivide an existing 12,000 square foot parcel into two 6,000 square foot parcels; and 3) a use permit and design review application to construct one unit on each of the new parcels. (the total number of new units on this parcel will be two), on property located within the PPD Zoning District.**

Ms. Chaney presented a brief staff report, noting the conditions presented in the past staff report as amended by the Planning Commission at the last meeting.

Bill Purdy, resident of the neighborhood, felt strongly that there should be a stop sign at the corner of Tunstead and Cedar due to the speed of the cars on Cedar. He also would like to see a red zone near the intersection of Cedar.

Commissioner Kroot noted that the stop sign is one of the recommended conditions. Ms. Chaney noted that the ultimate decision on the stop sign will actually be up to the Traffic Safety Committee. The Town Council will consider this zoning application on May 25, 1993, and they may also make that a recommended condition. Ms. Chaney assured the neighborhood that she would advise Sandy White when the Traffic Safety Committee meets on this issue.

Sandy White, 196 Tunstead, stated that she has always wondered about the jangled vibes about the neighborhood and was horrified about the development across the street. She had P G & E come out and do an EMF reading and found that her bedrooms has 6.9 (normal is 2). Most houses get a 0 reading. The quietest place is 1.6. Tunstead Avenue has 0 readings; San Anselmo Avenue is similar; walk from Tunstead to Tamalpais on Cedar and the meter goes up to the red zone for the whole length of the street. The "red" zone claims it is dangerous. There is a high tension line that affects 4 houses. She noted some medical ailments of herself and possibly her son. She stated that the 4 houses closest to her handle all the distribution lines to Fairfax. The P.U.C. told her that P G & E installed them and P G & E said the Town decides where they are installed. For some reason right under the lines the reading is 0. She stated that it is safer for her son to play in the intersection, rather than in his own backyard. She wanted the Commission to take quick action to have the pole moved across the street so that it is not near her property. She said that it means cooperation between everyone to absorb the cost. She wanted to see it done before the houses are built and new property owners are concerned about their "views" of wires.

Commissioner Harle questioned whether it is appropriate to discuss Ms. White's concerns at this meeting - it was not agendized. Chairman Mihaly agreed that it is a serious issue and since it has been brought to the Commission's attention, he felt that the Commission should decide what, if anything, is going to be done about it. In the meantime, Chairman Mihaly wanted staff to give direction. Ms. Chaney advised that the first course of action should be to contact P G & E. Also, it might be handled by the County Environmental Health.

Commissioner Mihaly suggested that Ms. White contact Ms. Chaney directly by telephone, noting that he appreciates her concerns.

Mr. Asbell said he is willing to work with the conditions previously made, but with regard to the power pole, he questioned their responsibility of moving the pole.

The public hearing was then closed.

Commissioner Israel stated that it seemed as though the applicant is interested in moving away from the lot split and going with a condominium map. Mr. Asbell said he was interested in going with the lot split and CC&Rs. Ms. Chaney said it may not be CC&Rs, but they would need to record some type of document stating the conditions.

Commissioner Kroot said P G & E could make changes. He stated that they are approachable, but it may be expensive. Ms. White said she is aware of that, but she needs help absorbing that cost.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 17, 1993**

M/S Kroot, Israel, to approve Z-9301/PS-9302/ER/DR-9309/U-9303 - Bill and Sharon Asbell, directly to the south of 45 Cedar St, A/P 7-222-58, 1) a request to rezone a parcel from PPD (Preliminary Planned Development)-multi unit to SPD (Specific Plan Development) multi unit; 2) a tentative parcel map to subdivide an existing 12,000 square foot parcel into two 6,000 square foot parcels; and 3) a use permit and design review application to construct one unit on each of the new parcels (the total number of new units on this parcel will be two), on property located within the PPD Zoning District. Approval is based on the following:

Specific Planned Development

1. The Planned development is consistent with the preliminary planned development; The plan as presented is in conformance with the standards that were set when this property was rezoned from R-2 to PPD Medium Density Residential. That rezoning limited the number of residential units on the property to two. *2. The lot or lots is/are of sufficient size and otherwise suitable for planned development;* The lot split proposed for this development will be of an appropriate size to accommodate a development of this type. The two units will share a common wall which will allow for larger setbacks on the exterior side property lines, reducing the projects impacts on the adjacent neighboring properties. *3. The lot or lots can best be developed or further developed by a specific integrated plan approved by the Town in advance of development or further development;* A development plan has been presented in conjunction with this rezoning request that will establish an appropriate land use and structure for the property. *4. Planned development or the lot or lots would promote the purposes set forth in Section 10-3.704(1);* Due to the unusual and difficult physical features on this property a Specific Planned Development will best facilitate the parcels development. The activity allows a degree of flexibility that insures the best suitable project for the property. *5. The planned development is consistent with the Town's General Plan, with specific references to the applicable sections of the General Plan.* This project will not violate the established density for this district and the review process has been conducted in the appropriate manner.

Use Permit

1. The established, 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 to the general welfare of the Town. These two new residential units will not cause any detrimental impacts on the surrounding properties. Nor will the development of the property detract from the established residences in the area. The proposed use is compatible with the neighboring land uses and the property's development will not dramatically or negatively alter the character of the neighborhood.

Design Review

1. Is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area; The applicant proposes to use exterior materials that are commonly used in San Anselmo. The house will be similar in size, scale, and height to the neighboring single family residential area. *2. Provides for protection against noise, odors, and other factors which may make the environment less desirable;* The activity will not generate any additional noise levels than are currently experienced in 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 development of the property will certainly not depreciate neighboring properties but should cause the appreciation of neighboring homes. *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 additional vehicular trips generated by this activity will not increase the overall volume of traffic in the neighborhood.* The maximum total daily vehicular trips generated by this project is 20 which will have only a minor impact on existing traffic levels on Cedar Street. *5. Will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area.* This structure will be built in conformance with all applicable standards adopted by the Town of San Anselmo. The project as designed is a safe and appropriate development for this parcel. *6. Conformance to the approved precise development plan;* The plan is consistent with the Specific Plan approved in the rezoning. *7. Adequacy of screening;* Because of the location of the garages the amount of vegetation located in front of the property will be quite limited. The applicant is proposing to plant a substantial amount of shrubs and some additional trees in the side and front yard. *8. Selection of architectural features and colors that enable the structure to blend with its environment and which results in a low visual profile.* The proposed exterior materials will be consistent with those used throughout the Town of San Anselmo. **Conditions of approval are:** **1. That if this development, which has received discretionary approval, has not begun within one year from the date of the final action, the permit shall become null and void. However, this discretionary action may be reviewed by the Planning Director for a maximum period of one year provided the applicant places such request in writing to the Director showing good cause prior to the expiration of the discretionary action.** **2. The applicants shall develop the project in accordance with the plans date stamped received February 26, 1993.** **3. The applicants must submit a soils investigation for the specific project and a \$1000 deposit to be charged for peer review.** **4. The applicants must abide by all recommendations of the soils report and the peer review.** **5. The applicants must remove the existing valley gutters and install the standard curb, gutter and driveway**

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 17, 1993**

approach. 6. The applicants must install a sidewalk four feet in width across the property frontage. 7. The applicants must repave the road if any damage occurs from construction. A video tape of the road way is required prior to the issuance of a building permit. 8. The applicants must connect all down spouts, surface, and subsurface drains under the sidewalk and daylight to face of curb. 9. The applicants shall use double paned windows on the front elevation (east elevation) of all the living areas to mitigate street noise. 10. No existing mature trees as shown on plans approved by the Planning Commission and on file with the Planning Department shall be removed without the approval of the Public Works Director. Such condition shall be recorded as part of the CC&R. 11. CC&R's shall be prepared by the applicant and recorded subject to review by the Planning Director which addresses future maintenance of the structure and landscaping. 12. Exterior colors are to be identified.

Ms. Chaney noted that the Town Council will hear this on May 25, 1993.

Commissioner Julin suggested the EMF issue come up specifically in the staff report. This is a huge burden for one person to bear. Ms. Chaney assured the audience that it will be a specific issue. Mr. Asbell questioned whether it could be kept separate from his project. Chairman Mihaly said it is part of the testimony.

1. **NU-9302/DR-9120 - Th.E. Posthuma, 379 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-61,**
1) a use permit to establish a second unit; and 2) an amendment to an existing design review approval to allow the construction of a new detached structure to accommodate the second unit, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.

Ms. Chaney stated that the item has been continued on the recommendation of the applicant to the meeting of June 7, 1993.

2. **V-9318 - Fred and Holly Stuart, 299 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-15,** 1) a variance to exceed the maximum floor area with a 2 bedroom addition on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.

The applicants and their designer Fran Halperin, were present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Ms. Halperin stated that the house was originally designed to include additional bedrooms. She stated that their engineer has advised them that this current plan will improve the structural integrity of the house because the addition is located underneath the footprint of the existing house. She also stated the addition would not be highly visible.

Fred Stuart asked the Commission to approve this project and stated that there are two easements for access to the adjoining property which are for landscaping and access.

Vance Barnet, 303 Oak Avenue, stated that he does not object to the addition.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Harle stated that if the addition was de minimus, he would be able to support the project.

Commissioner Israel agreed with Commissioner Harle. If easements were included within this property, the owner would have a larger lot size to which we could apply the maximum dwelling size calculations.

Commissioner Julin stated that she could support the project.

Commissioner Hayes stated that a unique set of circumstances are created because of the landscape easements off-site that is not easily accessible and must be retained in landscape.

Commissioner Kroot stated he supported this application because of the easements and the small size and concealed location of the addition.

Chairman Mihaly stated that the existing language on the 5,000 square foot maximum is rigid. However, the findings dealing with size may be applied in this case because of the presence of easements used by this owner.

M/S Hayes, Kroot, to approve V-9318 - Fred and Holly Stuart, 299 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-15, 1) a variance to exceed the maximum floor area with a 2 bedroom addition on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. Approval is based on the following: 1. *Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or*

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 17, 1993**

surroundings, the strict application of the controlling zoning 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. This past year, the Planning Commission and Town Council have reviewed two variance applications to exceed the maximum dwelling size. In one instance, the variance was approved due to the location of the property and the existing surroundings, which provided screening. In the second instance, the variance was denied due to its incompatibility with the neighborhood and the possible adverse visual impact to surrounding properties. There have been recent discussions regarding whether or not the maximum dwelling size regulation should be changed to a guideline. Such a guideline would likely be used during the design review process to assure there wasn't excessive bulk and adverse visual impacts associated with an addition, and that there would be compatibility with the neighborhood. The logic of changing this regulation to a guideline is that the issue is bulk and visibility within the neighborhood. In fact, it was surprising to staff to find that many of the homes in this neighborhood are quite small: ranging between 1,205 square feet and 6,629 square feet. Due to the lot sizes, topography and mature vegetation, it really isn't visibly clear how small or large the homes are in this area. This particular dwelling does not loom and is compatible with the neighborhood. There is no additional bulk associated with the addition, and the addition is not even visible from surrounding properties. The neighboring property at No. 295 Oak Avenue views the existing second story family room, but should not see the proposed addition below. And yet, because the variance process is required, we must make the special circumstance finding in order to grant the variance. The special circumstances for this project are: 1) the topography of the site in the building envelope, which necessitated the use of poles and bracing on the rear of the dwelling to support the second story; 2) the location of the lot, tucked between two Oak Avenue street frontages; 3) the surrounding vegetation and hillside properties, which provide natural screening; and 4) the effective size of the lot plus attendant easements together complies with the spirit of the ordinance and that it would meet applicable size requirements if these easements were included, and 5) the small size of the square footage exceedance in combination with the above considerations renders the exceedance de minimus in nature. 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 additions are within the existing building footprint and are heavily screened from surrounding properties. The granting of the variance will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood, and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood. **Approve The variance to exceed the maximum dwelling size, subject to the conditions that: 1. The approval is based on the plans received by the Town of San Anselmo on April 7, 1993; and Should this development, which has received discretionary approval from the Planning Commission, not begin (with secured building permits) within one year from date of the final Planning Commission action, the permit shall become null and void. However, this discretionary action may be renewed by the Planning Director for a maximum period of one year provided the applicant places such request showing a good cause in writing to the Director prior to the expiration of the discretionary action.**

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

3. **Town of San Anselmo - Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment** to Article 4 Development Standards, Table 4A-Development Standards Table and Section 10-3.710-Design Review Procedures which could permit administrative design review to occur on R-1 and R-1-C zoned properties above 150' mean sea level elevation depending upon the proposed structures size and visibility. The amendment would also exempt "in-kind" replacement of pre-existing development from design review provided there is no material change in visual effect.

Ms. Chaney presented the staff report.

Ms. Chaney said she spoke with an individual today who was unable to attend tonight's meeting and that person asked that she remind the Planning Commission that even a very small building could have some significant visual impacts. Commissioner Kroot asked if that person was aware that the Planning Commission originally recommended 800 square feet, and Ms. Chaney said they were.

Pat Burton, 40 Alta Vista, said she supports the work the staff is doing in presenting this information to the Planning Commission. She noted that there needs to be a balance between the needs of the residents of the homes in the hills and the Town in general. Some of the older hillside homes are very large, but not all those rooms are usable and there is a need to expand.

Ms. Chaney noted this would only be a recommendation to the Town Council.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 17, 1993**

Commissioner Hayes said he is uncomfortable with everything going to the staff, rather than the Commission. He prefers holding an open public hearing on matters so that people have the feeling that they can be involved.

Chairman Mihaly suggested changing the language to read "2. All new dwellings or additions which may be subject to admin design review and scratch out the rest to Table 4A . . ."

Commissioner Kroot suggested using the Alternate 2 for 800 square feet because it seems that all the 500 square feet Design Review applications seem to be put on the consent agenda anyway.

Pat Burton stated that she would want to add on below and it would not be visible but would be greater than 800 square feet.

Commissioner Kroot, stated that at a certain point staff is not going to want to administratively approve an addition much more than 800 square feet.

Commissioner Israel noted that some 500 square foot additions could be more obnoxious than some 800 square foot additions, but would allow staff to make that decision.

Chairman Mihaly will go with Alternate No. 1 with 1,200 square feet as the maximum; going with Alternative No. 1 instead of Alternative No. 2 because No. 1 is halfway between what we have now. He would be willing to go to 800 square feet in return for design review everywhere, not just the hillsides. Flatlands can be hurt just as badly as the hillsides.

Commissioner Kroot stated that he liked Mill Valley's idea of allowing 1,500 square feet of house floor area or 50% of the existing house whichever is less, before design review is required.

Chairman Mihaly stated that he realizes that there cannot universally be a design review throughout town that quickly, but would like it to be a goal.

Commissioner Harle did not want a design review requirement in the flatland. He wanted some creativity within the Town.

Commissioner Hayes agreed with Commissioner Harle. He stated that it would be a major political move and the decision belongs with the Council.

Commissioner Israel wondered why design review is limited to the hillsides. Many hillside homes are much more protected and create less of an impact than houses in flats. The addition on Broadmoor Avenue is one example.

Commissioner Kroot stated that this could open the possibility of having someone flatten a lot and build a monster. In a way he agreed with Commissioner Israel because in the hills homes are sometimes less invisible because of the trees.

Commissioner Harle felt the Commission was getting too picky; to impose the taste of 5 to 7 people as though it represented community consensus. He felt the tendency is towards uniformity and he did not think uniformity is desirable.

Commissioner Julin said the flats are important - it is gathering the blocks together. She felt the Barnes addition on Pine Street destroyed the block. She said that maybe the identification of special neighborhoods to keep in tact would be a half way point.

Commissioner Israel asked what the intent of design review was in the hillsides. He did not feel that a hillside lot has more visual impact than a corner house on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. How can the Town ordinance view everything above 150' as important and everything below is not.

Chairman Mihaly said that we do not want too many standards, but there should be some. He would like to make a motion so that we can get a recommendation to the Town Council on this one and then find out if there's a consensus on the maximum for the administrative design review over 800 square feet.

M/S Mihaly, Julin, Alternate No. 1 with it reading " . . . anything less than 1,200 sq ft if not materially visible. . ."; or 800 if not significantly visible"

Commissioner Israel stated that he liked Commissioner Kroot's idea of 50% increase because that would denote a significant change.

Ms. Chaney noted that one approach might be for every building permit that comes into the department to be reviewed by staff; those that have the potential to change a neighborhood

yo

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 17, 1993**

could be looked at from a design review standpoint. All building permits are plan checked anyway.

M/S Mihaly, Julin, Alternatives No. 1 and 3 with the 2nd paragraph of the footnote 6 and 7 rewritten " . . . so that it is clear that administrative design review approval may be granted 1) for any structure less than 1,200 square feet where the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that it is not materially visible off-site; 2) any addition having less than 800 square feet which is absent having significant visual impact.

Ayes: Harle Hayes Israel, Kroot, Mihaly

Commissioner Israel supported Harle's argument about homogeneity and we don't want that; but he disagrees that the design review results in that. Commissioners Israel and Harle discussed the beauty of San Anselmo due to its different neighborhoods.

Ms. Burton noted the cost of wood is increasing and design review of the flatlands is important because the new materials are cheap.

Ms. Chaney questioned whether they want the design review issue on flatlands agendized. If so, she will hold off sending the rest of the information on to the Town Council.

There was consensus to pass this information on to the Council and agendize the other to a short meeting where we can spend time talking.

F. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Ms. Chaney presented the exterior samples that have been proposed for 35 Pasadena and noted the colors are similar - still light. Stuart Hill, architect, said his clients want a light house; don't care for beige or grey. Their feeling is that the house is not visible from the road and a large oak will remain due to changes from the original plan.

Ms. Chaney said that from certain angles the house can be viewed through the trees. The house is currently beige. The neighboring green house is lower and will see it. This property is also cut in half by the 150' mean sea level line, and is close to Elkhorn and Miwok. Those houses are very natural looking and blend in better with the environment. Mr. Hill noted the house above is white. Ms. Chaney added that the design review ordinance gives the Town the opportunity to review color and should the neighboring "white" house come in for an addition, design review may require a color change.

Commissioner Israel said he has not seen the property, but believes that the architecture should speak for itself; that color is not the only concern, i.e., a house in the trees shouldn't be painted green to look like a large tree. However, he would need to look at the property.

Ms. Chaney didn't notice it because she thought she would be receiving a darker color sample and didn't think it would be a major discussion item, but now that she sees the new color is also very light, she feels they should see the property first and agendize it for a future meeting.

Commissioner Julin feels the new color is even lighter than that originally proposed, but is satisfied with what is proposed.

Commissioner Hayes feels the color is too light, but would like to visit the site.

Commissioner Kroot feels the color is too light, particularly since there is a neighbor below who expressed concern about screening.

Commissioner Harle is not concerned about the color, but to be consistent, the Commission should visit the site before approving such a light color.

Ms. Chaney agreed to place this matter on the next agenda.

G. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION

There was none.

H. REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL

There was no discussion.

I. ADJOURN

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:08 p.m. to the next meeting of June 7, 1993.