

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 1999**

Chair Zwick called the San Anselmo Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber:

Commissioners present: Chair Zwick, Commissioners Harle, Dowd, House and Israel

Commissioners absent: Cronk and Wittenkeller

Staff present: Senior Planner Wight, Associate Planner Griffin and Consultant Chaney

**OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION**

No one spoke during this time.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Minutes – December 21, 1998 - CONTINUED

**PUBLIC HEARING**

1. Master Plan Amendment – San Francisco Theological Seminary, 2 Kensington Road, - Proposed revisions to the Master Plan, on property located within the SPD Zoning District (Staff person: Chaney)

Chair Zwick excused himself due to a conflict of interest and turned the gavel over to Commissioner Harle.

Consultant Chaney presented the staff report as she had recently worked on this project as Planning Director.

In response to Commissioner House's inquiry about the acquisition of off-site properties, Ms. Chaney said if purchased as a single family residence and used as a single family residence, the use would not be considered a "change." However, the issue was raised about people being displaced.

Commissioner Israel wondered how the 70 percent of catering would be measured, i.e., by profits, numbers of events, etc. Ms. Chaney noted the Negative Declaration states the catering company has to come in every six months to show the 70 percent/30 percent has been met. The intent is the percentage should be determined by number of events rather than number of people or amount of food or drink.

Commissioner Israel stated that there needs to be a clear understanding of how to measure the percentage of meals used by the Seminary versus the outside catering. Ms. Chaney referred him to the schedule of campus events and noted that the difference is on-campus versus off-campus events.

Regarding the schedule of campus events versus outside events, Commissioner Israel said it looks like the outside events appear to be larger than the inside events. Ms. Chaney said it would be a judgement call by the Planning Director. If food service is being provided to the Town of San Anselmo or the Chamber of Commerce, it is serving a community service, but it is on campus. Commissioner Israel's understanding is that outside means serving an outside use off campus.

Commissioner House inquired about the water system not meeting Town standards, and wondered if there were changes that would affect that.

Commissioner Israel questioned whether the Town's control over the catering was better served with the planned document or the use permit. If the use becomes problematic it seems that it would be easier to revoke a use permit than to amend the master plan. Ms. Chaney responded that the plan is a better document to put the use in because it is a harder document, i.e., if they deviate from the conditions, then they are violating the plan itself and this was the recommendation of the Town Attorney.

Commissioner Harle questioned serving Alexander Hall by Kensington Court. Does this mean they need to use the stairs? Ms. Chaney confirmed there is an elevator, but it is still not as convenient.

In response to Commissioner Dowd, Ms. Chaney said that any change in use would require approval. The Seminary wanted to purchase a single family residence and last year the property owner said he would sell it to them. This required approval from the Town Council as does any acquisition of land outside the current Seminary lands.

Lucky Phelps, 101 Sunnyside Drive, Chair of the Advisory Committee, noted that this Committee of 9 were appointed to review the changes to the Master Plan and recommend specifics to the Planning Commission and Town Council. The meetings were attended by many neighbors. The intent of the Seminary has been to revert the buildings to their original uses when possible, identify the heart of the campus, and

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 1999**

provide an affordable plan in harmony with the existing neighborhood and facilities. They have received current and estimated future enrollment. New studies provided earlier this year showed that the buildings on the hill could be renovated, but not completely restored due to finances. The committee voted approval of the amendments on October 29, 1998. Committee Members are: Roberta Robinson, Hellie Robertson, neighbor, Rebecca Herrero, Chamber and graduate of Seminary, and Chuck Swenson, Historical Commission. She also introduced Geraldine Blackstone, Landscaper.

The meeting was open for public comment.

John Colteaux, 55 Kensington Road, said he appealed the Planning Director's decision to permit the catering service and at the same time Ms. Walker applied for a use permit to the Planning Commission, which was denied. Following that, the use was incorporated into the Master Plan. The Master Plan presentation is not adequate under the SPD statute because it is not clear. It is good practice to put this Plan into a complete document without corrections; similar to the way it was presented in 1990. Regarding the catering service, you cannot approve a commercial use in that zone either with a use permit or the master plan. The SPD is an overlay over the zoning district and it specifically forbids a commercial catering business. One of their customers is the Seminary and other customers are served elsewhere. Deliveries are through Kensington and out on both Austin and Kensington. Regardless of the percentage, the use is prohibited by the statute. If there is any ambiguity in the Code, then the strictest one will apply. The use affects his property value because he has to disclose the commercial catering use across the street. This is spot zoning. Since the deliveries have been rerouted to Kensington Court, the noise and annoyance has been decreased. However, there are still large trucks and garbage pick up (including recycling, which can be noisy).

Mr. Colteaux went on to say that the enforcement of the 30/70 percentage use will not be done because it would necessitate going through their books. The impact of different types of events has to be addressed because the impacts are different. In addition, other caterers come in for various parties and he wondered how they would fit in to the percentage. They also bring in additional vehicles. In 1989 the Branson School students were told they could not park at their school or around their school. The result of that is that Bolinas, Waverly and beyond on both sides during the school year, are occupied by cars. Anyone using Baryd Hall parks along Austin. When the Lloyd Center was put in, in 1970, the neighborhood was promised that cars would park on Austin and around Kensington, but that can't happen anymore because of the Branson cars. There is a parking lot near Kensington Court, which is not used. It usually accommodates delivery vehicles only there.

Mr. Colteaux further stated that the Seminary either has to build more parking or use the parking available in the lot. The Ross Town Hall authorities don't feel any obligation to do anything about it the Branson parking. Regarding page 7 and the expanded uses: the apartment house on Belle Avenue was purchased by the Seminary and they proposed to evict the tenants and create student housing. The Town Council put in language to protect that from happening so that the Seminary would have to approach the Council to change a use. The language needs to be stronger because if still used as residential, then there is no change in use according to staff.

Don McCullough, President of the Seminary, thanked those persons including staff involved in the committee meetings. He noted the Seminary has been in San Anselmo for over 100 years and the Town grew up around the Seminary. In general, the relationship has been good and he felt that as a member of the Town, the Seminary wants a good relationship with the community. The Seminary is an important meeting place for the community. In the last 30 years, theological education has gone through declining enrollment, serious financial difficulty, a budget deficit, the buildings on the hill have been closed, 3 of the major houses have been closed, and there were discussions a few years ago to sell the property and move to Berkeley. The Seminary began a process of renewal and the Seminary is entering a new chapter: the financial situation has turned around and the Board is committed to a multi-million dollar project. Their goal is not to create a thousand-student university. At their strength, they will have 150-200 students, which is less than they have had in the past.

Mr. McCullough went on to say that they do not want a decaying rot in the middle of the Town, so in going forward, they must attract students. Most seminaries have food service for 3 meals per day, which they do not. The "70 percent" is 4 lunches per week with occasional other uses. This is much less than years ago in Alexander Hall. Dominican College and Marin Community College District both have outside food service contracts. However, because the Seminary has so few students, we cannot have a full time caterer. It works for Ann Walker to have outside catering permitted. It is true that there are occasional outside groups that use the Seminary. For example the San Anselmo Chamber recently had their lunch at Alexander Hall. Their mission is educational, but they want to be available for lunch meetings. They have modified truck deliveries and had garbage pick ups delayed to later in the day and they have done everything they can to maintain the ambience of the Town.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 1999**

Roberta Robinson, San Anselmo resident for 33 years and former manager of the San Anselmo Bank of America, said that part of the Seminary's function includes services for other religions; it is ecumenical. The students of the Seminary bank, shop, and dine in town.

Hellie Robertson, neighbor of the Seminary for 27 years, noted that the neighbors have been very instrumental in working with the Seminary over the years and came together as a neighborhood committee. Her only disappointment in the set up of the Advisory Committee was that it was no longer a neighborhood committee made up of people most affected, but made up of community members. She has tried to keep the neighbors informed and everyone has been delighted about the renovation of the buildings on the hill and that the 2 nice brown shingles will remain. She acknowledged the parking problem with Branson School. The remaining thorn in the neighbor's side is allowing the commercial caterer in the neighborhood. In spite of the Committee's recommendation, she doesn't feel that the neighborhood was really represented.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Israel acknowledged both the Seminary and the Advisory Committee for their work on the Master Plan. He was sensitive to the changes in theological study and the difficulty in maintaining a viable program, which necessitates flexibility. Additionally, the students do add to the quality of San Anselmo and represent support to our businesses and community at large. Regarding the catering use, he asked staff to get clarification from the Town Attorney on the legal issues of the use and whether the SPD overlay zone permits this use. That being said, if the catering use is permitted to serve off-site uses, which he understand the Seminary needs, he wants to be sure there is clear protection for both the Seminary and Ann Walker Catering and the neighbors. He doesn't want to see the Seminary brought back for minor disputes of perception of intent. It should be crystal clear what constitutes on and off campus uses. He supports the Seminary's position of allowing other entities there for events as an integral part of a community facility, but it needs to be taken into account in the equation so that if Ann Walker Catering is having so many events and there are others, there should be clarification. Regarding garbage and recycling, this can be traumatizing in every neighborhood and he would like the Town's support in having those hours changed. The neighbors' concerns are valid issues, but the garbage issue is not wholly germane to this.

Commissioner Harle supports Mr. Colteaux's recommendation that this come back with the recommended staff changes in a final form for everyone's protection. He agrees that page 7 should have a better definition of change of use. His opinion is that if the Seminary takes over a single family residential use and keeps it a single family residential use, but houses Seminary people, there is no problem. He does have a problem with multi-family use changes where apartments are changed to student housing. With regard to the Baryd Hall parking problem, that is not a Seminary problem, but a Town problem. If it means residential parking permits, then so be it. The Town should not be supporting Ross student parking to protect the Ross neighborhoods and that has nothing to do with the Seminary.

Commissioner House supports most of what Commissioner Israel said. She supports the Seminary in town. Should the Seminary acquire housing, she favors it being used by Seminary people because it can reduce traffic and, therefore, does not feel it necessary to get Town Council approval for use changes.

Commissioner Dowd agreed with Commissioner Israel and had nothing further to add.

Commissioner Harle agreed as well, and wants the legal issue clarified regarding the catering use and the document cleaned up. Most importantly is to define the Ann Walker external catering use. He said the 70/30 business is too difficult to define and police. What he is really interested in is how much catering traffic is added by the external use and there should be a definition of that in clear terms. If the Seminary decides to eat twice as much, then the Ann Walker Catering can do twice as much off-site catering. It should be defined in terms of traffic generation.

Ms. Chaney explained the changes were emphasized to see the difference between 1990 and today and noted that she was going to prepare a complete, clean copy once adopted.

Commissioner Israel stated that he wants the mitigations inserted into the document now so that we don't say the plan is dependent on something not incorporated into the plan.

It was decided that the new information would remain underlined, but all will be in one document, e.g., page 10 to insert mitigation measures with only text. It will not be necessary to reprint the large maps. Ms. Chaney stated that she will also provide a clean copy without underlines. She noted that if her presence is necessary, her availability is limited to 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays.

M/S Dowd, Israel, to continue this application to February 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion passed unanimously.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 1999**

2. DR-9623/V-9857 - Marc Mendelsohn, 42 Greenfield Avenue, A/P 6-251-10, Design Review Amendment and Variance to exceed previously approved signage. The request is to allow a total of four (4) signs (2 allowed), and to exceed the maximum signage area (150 square footage allowed), on property located within the C-3 Zoning District. (Staff person: Griffin)

Associate Planner Griffin presented the staff report.

In response to comments from the Commission, Mr. Griffin confirmed that the signage already exceeds the maximum permitted due to a former staff error, and that neon open signs are not disallowed.

Mark Mendelsohn, applicant, read a prepared letter. He said the neon window signs are critical for their business survival. Their location is not highly visible from the heavily traveled Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and the building improvements were intended to attract business from drive-by traffic. He did not expect their business to decline when the two neon signs were removed. When they reinstalled the two signs, the drive-by business increased. Much of his work is completed in the Ross Valley and he is a member of the Chamber of Commerce.

Commissioner Dowd confirmed that the signs read: Kitchen and Bath Design and Supply.

Mr. Mendelsohn said the triangles are part of their logo, but the signage does not come near 150 square feet. There are dozens of neon signs and the Costco "open" signs in other businesses in town.

Roberta Robinson, Sequoia neighborhood, said the colors of the neon signs are green and pink and those colors are nice to drive by and are not obtrusive.

Rebecca Herrero, 130 Greenfield, therapist and President of the Chamber, said it is hard to have a business thrive on Greenfield Avenue and it has been wonderful to see the new businesses upgrade Greenfield. She felt that Mr. Mendelsohn's upgrades have helped her business as well. She supports his effort.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Israel said the Chamber comments are reflective of the attitude of the Commission, which is why the Commission allowed the formula area for signage. The Commission saw a business that was going to make a significant effort to improve that area and at that time he voted in favor of this application. However, he felt the signage was at the maximum. During downtown revitalization meetings, it was agreed that business signage is important, but he is passionate about when a business says in order to be viable they need more visible signage. He is concerned about the cumulative effect. He doesn't want that level of sign war to go down Greenfield Avenue. If we say neon is okay and exceed the threshold, we open Pandora's Box. The applicant's success is based on his reputation and good marketing.

Commissioner Harle said the Town has been against neon signs in general and if one person has a neon sign it makes him more noticeable and everything else recedes. It is a tangible detriment to the neighboring businesses. He is surprised that this type of business would be so subject to drive by traffic.

Commissioner House inquired about the use of neon, to which Mr. Griffin said it is not outright prohibited. Ms. House suggested the existing signage is huge and she does not support additional signage and the findings cannot be made.

Commissioner Dowd said it is a great addition to Greenfield Avenue, but he is not sure where the architecture ends and the signage begins. Perhaps the shapes can be considered architectural and not signage so that the neon signs could fall within the square footage guidelines. The sign says Design and Construction and it is only in the neon signs that there is a mention of kitchen and bath, so he wouldn't know what the business was. Therefore, the wording may want to be changed to include kitchen and bath.

Commissioner Israel noted that signs do not include just wording, but the shape as well. If the triangles were white they would be ineffective in drawing attention to the sign. The blue triangle is part of the logo.

Chair Zwick said the design is attractive, but feels that neon signs are not appropriate for San Anselmo. Although the Sign Ordinance does not specifically prohibit neon, it does steer you away from it to a more natural look.

Commissioner House said that if the Bomark Construction were changed to Bomark Bath and Kitchen, it might attract the walk in traffic.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 1999**

Commissioner Israel said Commissioner Dowd's idea is a good one, but he cannot support additional signage.

M/S House, Israel, to deny the sign review application. Motion passed unanimously.

The audience was advised of the ten day appeal period.

3. V-9858/DR-9849-Edward Heavey, 405 Sequoia Drive, A/P 6-117-08, Setback variances for: 1) the third required parking space to be located within 0' of the north side property line and substandard in length at 17' (Code setback: 12' and space length: 19'); and 2) the dwelling to be located within 15' of the rear property line; and 3) Design Review of a new single family dwelling on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' msl). (Staff person: Wight)

Senior Planner Wight presented the staff report, noting that late mail has been received from the property owner of 15 Alto, who was opposed to the project because of the proposed damage to the roadway and the structure being too large.

Ralph Key, architect representing the applicant, stated that the current proposal is 1755 square feet; the mass, bulk, height and roof pitch has been reduced. Also, the house has been reduced in both length and width. The parking deck has been eliminated, which has caused the parking space to be substandard by 3'.

Gil Iwanaga, 409 Sequoia Drive, said the public safety issue has still not been mitigated by placing a mirror on the road. This is a dangerous spot in the area of the project driveway. He stated that here is literally no off street parking in the area and felt the project must be scaled back more, even though it has been somewhat reduced.

Richard Lucas, 506 Sequoia Drive, stated that this is a better design and a smaller house. His house is 1,400 square feet, and other neighbors have similar size houses. He is concerned about the maintenance of the private road, which the neighbors paid to have repaved. He stated it was his impression that the Council felt a cottage should be on the site. If approved, he wondered what the Construction Management Plan would be.

Peter Brekhus, Attorney representing the applicant, said the plans would be reviewed by the Public Works Department and there has been no evidence of a safety issue. There are various degrees of on street and off street parking and this house should not be held to a higher standard than other homes. With regard to the Town Council stating that this should be a cottage, this property should be able to enjoy the same privileges as other properties and it has been demonstrated that this house is in keeping with the size of other houses in the immediate neighborhood. With regard to roadway safety, there is no proof that the construction vehicles would cause damage to the roadway but suggests a letter be issued by the Department of Public Works indicating that the roadway be reviewed prior to the Certificate of Occupancy. The project has been redesigned and compares favorably with other homes in the neighborhood and Staff supports the project. This site is a classic case of a variance situation and Variance findings 1 and 2 support the variance. He did not think anyone in the vicinity would be negatively affected by the size of the proposed house. This house, after it is built, probably will not look any differently than the house next door but people focus on the house because it is a virgin lot.

The hearing was closed to public testimony.

In response to the question of "cottage", Ms. Wight said the Town Council minutes note that the Council felt the house was too big and they could not make the findings, but the word "cottage" is not included in the minutes. Also, a street bond is commonly required by the Building Department and the condition referring to it in the Staff Report is a standard condition.

Chair Zwick read the motion from the Council as to why the project was denied.

Commissioner Harle said he supported the original proposal and supports this one even more. The rear yard variance is really functionally a side yard. This house has been reduced in size and mass, and there are other houses that are larger, although perhaps were built prior to the current regulations. He could support the proposal.

Commissioner Dowd stated that there are grounds for the variance findings. The Town Council was probably concerned about the size but he is in support of staff report.

Commissioner House stated she was in support of the project. The slope is very steep, the view would only be blocked by those people driving down the hill.

Commissioner Israel stated that this is a classic example of a variance and has no problem with the variance findings. The reduction in size does help. He would have liked the architecture softened but does not want to impose it on the project. There are many houses built in the hillsides that are heavily impacted by lack of parking. The parking

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 1999**

requirements would not change, no matter what the size of the house. The concern about the blind intersection is valid but given this constraint, the driveway is in the best location. It might be better to state the road be video taped by the applicant, and prior to certificate of occupancy, the road should be reviewed. There needs to be a Construction Management Plan that is reviewed and approved by staff.

Chair Zwick approved the project in the past and can approve the project now. Acknowledging that the Town cannot require the applicant to pay his share of the road bond, which took place before he purchased the property, he supports the applicant paying the road bond that the previous owner did not pay, which would help the neighborhood.

M/s House/Harle, and unanimously passed (5-0), to approve the project based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report; and with the addition of the Construction Management Plan.

The audience was advised of the ten-day appeal period.

4. DR-9851 - Andronico's Market, 631 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-101-05, Design Review of proposed parking lot and landscape plan, which includes a fountain, and 'Welcome to San Anselmo' sign, on property located within the C-3 Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight)

Senior Planner Wight presented the staff report.

Dan Goltz, Architect representing the applicant, stated the concept was to originally connect the parking lots through the PGE lot. The other alternative would be to go through Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, but the Police Chief was opposed to it. There is also MTBE on the lot, which has to be removed. A one way system is a good system and will provide the maximum number of cars. He was the designer of Creek Park and they want to mirror the parking lot after Creek Park. They wanted to use the same trees. The trees inside the parking lot are evergreen elms, which are the same as the trees in the current parking lot. There are faults with the ingress and egress but there might be a way to get left hand turns into the parking lot. The flow of traffic inside the parking lot is counter clockwise because it is the natural flow.

Commissioner Dowd wondered why the last application for Jiffy Lube had ingress off of Sir Francis Drake but this does not. Mr. Sutti, Architect representing Andronicos, stated that the Police Chief did not want people taking a short cut across the parking lot from Sir Francis Drake to Center Boulevard.

In response to Commissioner Dowd, Mr. Goltz explained the lighting proposal. He stated that they will excavate the site and will slope the site for appropriate drainage.

Paul Leffingwell, Landscape Architect representing the applicant, explained the landscaping proposal. They tried to relate the trees to those in Creek Park. There is no longer a quarantine for the elm trees. He said that the Village Green Zalkova will have an unobstructed view. The elm trees are semi evergreen and cast a light shade and will also provide winter light. The Little Gem Magnolia will only get to a maximum of 20'.

Bill Andronico, applicant, stated that in many of his stores, there can be a heavy pedestrian walkway and he does not feel it will be an unsafe situation. The parking lot configuration, given the situation, is the only alternative. The people who use the lot will become accustomed to it.

Commissioner Israel said that Andronicos is very important to San Anselmo but it has not been his vision that a parking lot should be in this location. This is the most visible location in Marin County. If this site will be used for parking, he wants to make sure it is enhanced. Circulation is very bad, but not unmanageable, but he does not want the median shortened. It is problematic to get from hub. He does not think the wrought iron fence in lot 2 serves a different purpose from lot 1 and the vines have not taken over in lot 1. It also does not create a rhythm or an urban edge. He would rather see a wall that provides real screening and ties into the entry sign. He would like to have something more than trees to screen the street and the lighting should enhance the corner. He would like to see traditional street lamps that also provide lighting in the lot. He was concerned about the welcome sign size. The trellis concept in Creek Park stops the eye and he would like to see something that comes out and embraces the corner. The parking lot does not support the location at this point; the fountain needs to be more integrated also. He would like the applicant to consider additional trees in the lot.

Commissioner House stated she would like to see the same fixtures as used downtown. She is not in favor of a fountain at the corner, unless it is very large. She would like to see something large there, that is a piece of artwork or something else that is large. She was also concerned that the welcome sign did not really indicate that the downtown is a few blocks away.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 1999**

Commissioner Harle stated that he liked the idea of the design and liked the choice of plants because of how it ties into Creek Park. He wondered if the three parking spaces at the toe of the lot could be sacrificed to provide an arbor, benches or another structure.

Commissioner Dowd liked the idea of giving up the three parking stalls. He would like some of the old styles incorporated with the new. He would like to minimize the visual impacts of the cars and he liked the idea of a stucco fencing. He would like to see something taller by the fountain. The Pavilion across the street should be balanced with what would be constructed. He asked staff to provide the Commission with a map that indicates ingress and egress of the site for the next meeting.

Chair Zwick said that there is a real need for a vertical element in the corner of the lot. He concurred that the sign might be rethought because San Anselmo's downtown area is not in this location. He felt that the traffic flow in the parking lot would be difficult and there should be more analysis done. Perhaps there should be fewer parking spaces.

Commissioner Israel said that moving the cart storage area closer to the market would be helpful.

Mr. Goltz said that they want to plant trumpet vines, which would grow over the walls. They do not want solid retaining walls because it would have to be a minimum of 42" tall. The element on the corner should not be a monumental element. A tower is all wrong, but the sign is very important. They want to indicate that it is the beginning to San Anselmo. A lot of artwork there would be cost prohibitive and would not fit the concept presented. The parking layout has been carefully laid out and there is no other way to design it.

Chair Zwick would like to see an alternative parking circulation because if the cars go in to the right, traffic could be backed up if a car is waiting to pull into a parking space, and other cars could be waiting on Center Boulevard.

Mr. Goltz was opposed to the proposed modifications by the Commission but the Commission felt it was in the best interest of the applicant to continue the item to allow the applicant time to consider alternatives.

M/s Israel/House, and unanimously passed (7-0), to continue the project to 2/2/99.

**CONTINUED ITEMS**

1. DR-9842/PDP-9805 – Chris Albrick, 370 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-05, (Old Lot A) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight) **CONTINUED TO 1/19/99**
2. DR-9843/PDP-9806 – Chris Albrick, 376 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-06, (Old Lot B) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight) **CONTINUED TO 1/19/99**
3. DR-9844/PDP-9807 – Chris Albrick, 398 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-07, (Old Lot C) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight) **CONTINUED TO 1/19/99**
4. DR-9845/PDP-9808 – Chris Albrick, 392 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-01, (Old Lot 1) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight) **CONTINUED TO 1/19/99**
5. DR-9846/PDP-9809 – Chris Albrick, 394 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-02, (Old Lot 2) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight) **CONTINUED TO 1/19/99**
6. DR-9847/PDP-9810 – Chris Albrick, 396 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-03, (Old Lot 3) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight) **CONTINUED TO 1/19/99**
7. PDP-9505/Parcel Split-9503/V-9549/DR-9525 - Carlos Castro, 444 Redwood Road, A/P 7-191-10, 1) Land Division, Precise Development Plan, Density Determination, and Design Review to split an existing property currently developed with a single family residence in order to construct a new house; 2) a Variance to construct a retaining wall a total of 60' long along the uphill side of Redwood Road (within 0' of the property line) in order to widen Redwood Road to 15' of paving for fire safety reasons; and 4) remove one heritage tree (30" bay) on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' mean sea level) (Staff person: Griffin) **CONTINUED TO 2/16/99**
8. ER/DR-9848/U-9810 - Safeway Store, 838 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-061-23, review of traffic study and use permit/design review amendment to the Redhill Shopping Center to expand the existing 27,492 square foot Safeway Store to 37,699 square feet, a fenced trash enclosure and new retaining walls in the rear for the loading area, and additional parking spaces in both the front and east side of the store on

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 1999**

property located within the SPD Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight) **CONTINUED TO 2/1/99**

9. V-9861/DR-9850 – Jeff & Diane Ramsey, 14 Spruce Avenue, A/P 7-024-05, Design Review and Variance to build a new 2,014 square foot, three-story house and a 423 square foot attached garage. Variances are requested as follows: 1) To build the house and garage within 11' from the front property line (20' required) this request also includes the allowance of all parking spaces within the front setback area, 2) to allow a 36'-5" building height (35' allowed), and 3) build an elevated driveway within 0' of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff person: Griffin) **CONTINUED TO 1/19/99**

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

1. Discussion of Planning Commission Meeting on February 16<sup>th</sup> in lieu of February 15<sup>th</sup>

The consensus of the Commission was that there would be a quorum for the meeting of February 16<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner House indicated that she would not be available.

2. Election of Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair for 1999

Continue to next meeting

Commissioner House asked staff to research the use of Greenfield Motors.

**REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT TO SPECIAL MEETING ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1999**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 a.m. to the next meeting.

**BARBARA CHAMBERS  
SR ASA**