

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES FO SEPTEMBER 5, 2000**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**Commissioners Present:** Vice-Chair House, Commissioners Zwick, Jochum and Couture

**Commissioner(s) Absent:** Chair Cronk, Commissioner Wittenkeller

**Staff Present:** Senior Planner Wight and Planning Technician Chambers

**OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION**

No one spoke during this time.

**CONTINUED ITEMS**

1. **DR-0028 – Frank Gobar, 120 Ross Valley, A/P 6-212-26, Design Review** to add a 2,262 square foot two-story addition to an existing 1,197 square single story house, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (above 150 msl) (Staff: Feagans) **CONTINUED TO 9/18/00**
2. **U-0005/V-0018/DR-0022 – Henry Foulk, 30 Carlson Court, A/P 5-062-72 – Design Review and Use Permit request, and side yard setback variance** to construct a two-car garage with a second unit above. The structure is proposed to be within 4' of the rear property line (20' required) and 6' of the side property line (8' required) in the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff: Feagans) **CONTINUED TO 10/2/00**
3. **DR-0022/U-0006 – Alaris Group, 1509 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-153-03, Use permit** to install three wireless panel antennas to be mounted and concealed within a false chimney with a maximum width of 2'-6" and maximum height of 28'-11" above grade. The equipment will be housed inside the main building. The project site is within the R-2 Zoning District. (Staff: Feagans) **CONTINUED 9/18/00**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. **Minutes – August 21, 2000**
2. **U-0007/DR-0026 - Jeremy Norman, 343 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-252-16, design review** of a 528 square foot addition and exterior alterations, and a use permit for change of occupancy, on property located within the C-2 Zoning District.(Staff: Wight)
3. **V-0025 – Jeff and Laurie Johnson, 15 Vine Avenue, A/P 7-273-19, front yard and side yard setback** to construct two trellis structures and a stucco wall: one trellis will be 11'-6" high x 10' wide and located as close as 6' to the front property line on the east side of the front elevation of the house. The second trellis will be on the west side of the house and will be within 4' of the side property line (8' required) and will be 5'-6" wide x 9' high (7' post on top of the planter wall) and will be 7' from front property line (20' setback required) and 7' high x 4'-6" wide stucco wall that will be 7' from the front property line and 1' from the side property line on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.(Staff: Feagans)
4. **V –0026/DR-0030 - Jill and Chris Cincebeaux, 33 Broadmoor, A/P 5-142-16, front yard setback variance and design review** to enclose a 143 square foot second story deck area above the existing garage to create a new bedroom and office area within 15' of the front property line (20' required) and 5'-4" of the side property line (8' required), on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff: Feagans)

Commissioner Jochum asked to pull 343 San Anselmo Avenue from the Consent Agenda.

M/s Jochum/Zwick, and unanimously passed (4-0), to approve the Consent Agenda Items 1,3 and 4.

Vice-Chair House advised all parties of interest of the ten day appeal period.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

- 1A. **U-0007/DR-0026 - Jeremy Norman, 343 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-252-16, design review** of a 528 square foot addition and exterior alterations, and a use permit for change of occupancy, on property located within the C-2 Zoning District. (Staff: Wight)

(Taken from Consent Agenda.)

Commissioner Jochum hat a question who the manufacturer and type of windows that are being proposed.

Jeremy Norman, applicant, responded that he has not decided yet but would be open for comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Jochum stated that he would not like to see divisions internal to the glass.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2000**

M/s Jochum/Couture, and unanimously passed (4-0) to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report and amended to state that true divided lights are preferable, simulated divided lights are acceptable, but any kind of removable or snap in grid is not acceptable and that if simulated divided lights are used, a spacer bar would be desirable.

Vice Chair House advised all parties of interest of the ten-day appeal period.

1. **DR-0020 TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO-CORPORATION YARD, 500 San Francisco Boulevard, A/P 177-204-01, Review of the siding color for the Corporation Yard facility, on property located within the PF (Public Facilities) Zoning District. (Staff: Feagans)**

Ron Kappe, architect, explained the different color selection for the building and roof. He noted that there is a limited selection with the standard colors. He stated that the Custom Panel Industries which has the profile that is similar to board and batten that they have selected will do a custom color at 75 cents up charge per foot, which means approximately, \$5,500 more for the siding and \$7,500 more for the roof. Other manufacturers either could not do custom colors or could and would charge anywhere from \$5,00, up to \$25,000. The selection is rather limited.

Mr. Angerman stated that custom colors do pose a problem during construction. Whether it IS fasteners or trim, then a new batch must be custom made. The Town has received one response from Jerry Draper who could not be present. He preferred a darker color because he felt it would blend in with the surroundings better.

Commissioner Zwick said he liked the original scheme. After hearing the public comment, and the suggestion to go to a darker color, if that could accomplished, he would go with the Scheme 1 Alternate but it would cost too much money. Therefore, if the Town had the additional \$13,000, he would go with Scheme 1 Alternate a little bit better than the original scheme but he could still go with the original approved color scheme.

Commissioner Couture stated that he liked Scheme one for the original color; he likes Alternative 1 slightly better because of the olive tone but it is not the additional cost to the Town.

Commissioner Jochum agreed to stay with color scheme 1, noting that it would be fool hardy for the town to get into custom colors.

Vice-Chair House concurred with the comments of her colleagues.

M/s Jochum/Zwick, and unanimously passed (4-0), to approve color scheme 1 based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report.

M/s Zwick/Jochum, and unanimously passed (4-0), to amend the motion to add: that they go with color scheme 1 or a color that is as close as possible to color scheme 1.

Vice-Chair House advised all parties of interest of the ten day appeal period.

2. **ER-0002/V-0019/DR-0021 – Ned MacDonald, 14 and 20 Greenfield Avenue, A/P 6-251-07 and 08, environmental review, demolition of an existing building at 14 Greenfield Avenue, construction of a new office building, with potential to be used for retail, install new site utilities, install landscaping, install paving as required for parking, construct new sidewalk/curb. 330 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, (Tam Building), A/P 6-251-04 and 06: construct raised parking deck and ramp. Application includes a proposal to transfer title of the two public easements, one on Greenfield Avenue, and one on Smith Lane. The existing Tam Building is 9,500 square feet and the building floor area of the new building will be 18,430 square feet, necessitating a total of 62 on-site parking spaces. Planning applications include design review, and parking variance for some of those spaces to be in tandem and some to be substandard in size, and to have a total of 59 spaces, on property located within the C-3 (General Commercial) Zoning District. (Staff: Wight)**

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Mr. Murch explained the changes made since the last meeting. They also did changes the ADA parking spaces from 5' to 8'. They had to move the trash container, which increased the available on-site parking. They are proposing to surround the trash area with a stucco wall and add trellising. They met with Public Works Director regarding the storm drain. They have also been informed by the Public Works Director that there are Measure G funds set aside for paving of Greenfield Avenue. This could take place as late as 2002. Because of the timing of the Town project it may be premature for them to discuss landscaping. They did however change the type of tree as suggested by Commissioner Wittenkeller.

Ned MacDonald, owner, wanted to discuss the beautician plan for Greenfield that Commissioner Wittenkeller proposed at the last meeting. Staff wrote adequately in the resolution that an in-lieu fee shall be paid to the Town for the off-site landscape improvement beautician however, it was left somewhat open-ended because it did not have a dollar amount. . He proposes that he contribute an amount of money now for the San Anselmo beautician fund in the amount of \$5,000, and if, and when, a fund for the Greenfield beautician fund takes place, he would also contribute. He, however does not feel landscape is necessary on Greenfield because it would obscure the signage of his future tenants and landscape is not in keeping with the Tamalpais building.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2000**

Vice-Chair House asked why they want to limit parking on the building at night. Mr. MacDonald responded that putting control arms allows them to open and control the parking. It could be left up and the parking used for a variety of functions. However, some of the neighbors may not like the parking lot being used at night because of the noise.

Lisa Joban, 46 Lincoln Park, stated that she wants the Town to coordinate the sewer project with the development of the building. She talked with Mr. Murch and he indicated that besides the drainage program, there would be another Town project that would repave the whole front of Greenfield. She wondered if that could be coordinated with parking in the front of Greenfield. If so, it may eliminate the need for the parking deck. Marin County has also designed Bank Street as a bicycle land also goes through that area and what would the increased traffic do to the residents. She is opposed to using the parking deck at night and supports the idea of the traffic arm to prohibit parking during off-hours. She wants to close off the Greenfield access to Lincoln Park.

Roger Bettini, 18 Bank, stated that Greenfield Avenue should be accessed from Greenfield, not Lincoln Park. The project could be modified by getting rid of the second floor parking deck. The neighborhood is being sacrificed for this project.

Johndi, 13 Smith Lane, stated he is still is concerned about the safety hazards on Smith Lane. The two level parking deck would be a detriment to his second floor bedroom due to noise and pollution. He is also concerned that people would still park on Smith Lane and make it difficult for him to access his house.

Bob Capurro, 15 Lincoln Park, spoke on behalf of Mr. Larson of 17 Lincoln Park and read a letter about his concerns. The street is only 12' to 14' wide and safety must also be considered. If there were a vehicle parked on the street, it would be difficult to get around. One residence on Smith Lane has the front door right on the street. The street width is only 8' to 10' near the wall. The tenants of the Tamalpais building park on Lincoln Park and not always in their designated parking spaces. The neighbors have had concerns about traffic safety prior to this proposed development. If this street were impacted by any more cars, the safety of the children would be exacerbated. There must be a better solution. The Town Council spent time in this neighborhood and allowed two to three additional parking spaces. It helps but it has not solved the problem.

Tony Barbara, 19 Bank Street, stated that about 1 1/2 years ago the neighbors had a meeting with the former Police Chief and based on that meeting two stop signs were added. Cars do not stop at the stop sign even those signs have been placed there. He agrees that using Greenfield for access would be better than Smith Lane.

In response to Commissioner Couture, Ms. Wight explained that staff is unable to come up with a specific dollar amount for the applicant to pay the Town for in-lieu fees because the Town has not adopted a plan yet for that area of town.

Commissioner Zwick stated that at the last meeting he asked for a solution from the applicant so people would not be permitted to park half on and half off Smith Lane; one solution was to see ballards or another device. Now it seems like it is being encouraged because of the delivery vehicles that would be using Smith Lane.

Mr. Murch responded that the cars that are creating a problem are in the area of the planter box. It becomes a problem if three cars are parking there. They are still willing to cooperate with placing a sign or with a ballard. The reserved area might be used for service vehicles because they may not be able to get access any other way. The area reserved for vehicles is clearly off the right-of-way and is 10' x 12' feet, which is clearly larger than a typically parking space.

In response to Commissioner Zwick's question about the stop sign, Ms. Wight stated that she wrote a note to the Traffic Safety Committee to consider the Commission's concern about the stop sign and have not heard back yet.

Commissioner Zwick stated that this parking plan becomes the nexus of the project. It is quite possible that a different parking design could be done, as well as access to and from Greenfield but it would cost more square footage from the developer. He is still looking for that spirit of cooperation. If the neighborhood would be impacted he wants to know where the loading zone is and wants to know that the location is acceptable with the Town. He also wants to know about the additional landscaping proposed and the ballards, none of which he has information on. Also, the parking deck has also not been moved. He is uncomfortable leaving the \$5,000 to Greenfield and downtown. He felt that if one building takes the lead along Greenfield, more development would follow. The doors to the enlarged recycling and trash enclosure along Smith Lane could be done in several ways, but he does not know what it would look like. The Commission is encouraging this project. He is not asking for the ramp to be off of Greenfield but he is encouraging the developer to propose a nice design. Also, he has not heard the dollar amount of exchange from the public land to the developer.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2000**

Commissioner Couture said that the building is wonderful and the changes in lighting would be good. He understands that the dollar amount should be clarified but he is not sure \$5,000 is adequate. He disagrees with the location of the parking deck because it is a big disadvantage to the residents on Smith Lane, particularly 13 Smith Lane. A solution to this would be to make the parking deck smaller, lose some parking spaces and decrease the floor area. If the parking deck wasn't there, it would provide access from Greenfield. Smith Lane is not a street, as stated by the residents, and it is a fairly valid comment. He really thinks the parking and access issues need to be dealt with regard to the concerns of the neighborhood.

Mr. Murch stated that they had access from Greenfield on the three-story project that was previously submitted but that was not approved by the Commission. They did not study it this time because of the loss of square footage of the building.

Mr. MacDonald added that former Commissioners said that if access was on Greenfield it would make Greenfield ugly and encouraged access onto Smith Lane. It was more an urban design consideration, rather than a loss of square footage.

Commissioner Jochum stated that setting the building back would be a horrible idea. Putting another 24 foot in and out lane would also be detrimental, at least to the streetscape of Greenfield. Therefore, he felt the best access would be with access from Smith Lane. The internalization of the parking is quite a bit more successful now as shown. He is surprised in not seeing any more clear delineation of the edge of Smith Lane. They need to show that this is clearly the best solution as far as access to the building, access by the neighbors and minimizing the potential for safety hazards. The delivery location should be clearly delineated as well. What is not documented is Smith Lane and how the edges are being dealt with. Don't see how a small delivery truck will be able to access the site. He can accept the location of the parking deck. As far as privacy for 13 Smith Lane, the back of the Tam building has windows facing in that direction. That is more of a privacy problem than the parking deck would be. He does not think the parking deck poses a privacy issues. There are trees to screen it and moving the parking one or two parking lengths would not make that much of an impact. Clearly, he does not want to see it against the Tam building. He does not see the benefit of the control arms. It would be an asset to the Town if it was used at night but it would be an open invitation for kids if it were not being used. Making an s-turn coming down the ramp and out of the parking lot would be fairly tight. He was also worried that once they get to the final exit they would exit quickly and it might be a traffic safety problem for people coming down Smith Lane. It might be better to have a straight exit and then turn onto Smith Lane.

Vice-Chair House asked about where the figure of limiting this project to no more than 64% retail came from? Ms. Wight responded that the information came from the traffic study and if the amount of retail were reduced, it would generate less traffic. Mr. MacDonald stated that he had no objection to reducing the amount of retail.

Vice-Chair House said that generally speaking she does not like to see loading zones in front of buildings because they are not very attractive. However, in this particular case where they are trying to keep traffic off of Smith Lane, what are the thoughts about using two spaces for a loading zone and in the rear of the building where there is a current proposal for the loading space, stripe that area or place ballards there so the space cannot be used. She is in favor of in-lieu fees and would be comfortable with having the Public Works Director coming up with that amount. She is also in favor of using the parking at all times and not having the traffic control arms. She wanted more information about the door for the trash enclosure. With regard to the color of the building, she would rather wait and not make a decision now so the applicant could place big color swatches up on the building, and vote on that at a later date.

Ms. Wight want to make sure there was clear direction to the applicant. Regarding in lieu fee for Greenfield improvements, she stated that it is up to the applicant to come up with a plan to give to the Town Engineer before the Engineer can come up with a dollar amount. It is generous of the applicant to offer specific amounts now but it is difficult to say if this is an accurate amount if there is no specific plan for Greenfield in place. Staff was concerned about traffic on Smith Lane and that is why a traffic study was done prior to the project being heard. The previous application was heard by different Commissioners and the consensus at that time was to keep access off Greenfield so the building could be close to the street. She can talk with the Traffic Safety Committee about the triangular area for delivery vehicles if that is something the Commission would wish to pursue. Also loading on Greenfield would be a Traffic Safety Committee determination. Is the Commission comfortable with the location of the trash enclosure or should it be moved? . Also, what is the consensus on the parking deck? It appears that parking spaces 20 and 21 seem awkward and maybe the deck can be pulled back by deleting those two parking spaces. It also sounds like the applicant is agreeable to reducing some of the retail space so that can be included in the condition.

Mr. Murch explained that the doors to the trash enclosure have wooden door and a trellis over it. He noted that it is on the elevations. He also stated that the traffic consultant concurred with the use of the s-turn.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2000**

Commissioner Jochum stated that he would like to see the s-turn at Smith Lane rather than on the driveway and he has no problem with the deck as is. He would not like to see a loading space on Greenfield and would not want to see the parking spaces lost. He was unclear about the garbage trash location. He was not sure how to come up with an in-lieu fee but would not like to see this project be responsible for having to come up with a design, he would rather have a streetscape design for all of Greenfield.

Commissioner Zwick stated that he doesn't want to see the possibility of retail precluded on the ground floor. If the Town is trying to offer the applicant something that is in the right-of-way to benefit the project then we should look at the landscaping, and loading areas and listen to the concerns of the residents to improve the traffic along Smith Lane. He liked staff's idea of eliminating the two parking spaces on the deck. He was sorry that he missed the fact that the wood doors are on the plan. He does not find the s-turn on the way out a problem but he think the project architect explained why that needed to happen. With regard to the streetscape design, he would not want to be the developer and have this fee hanging over him and he wouldn't want to be the Town stating that some day they will do something because now is when the nexus occurs. He is not suggesting they design all of Greenfield but want then to take a look at doing the best they can in front of the project.

Commissioner Couture stated that he wants to be able to allow retain on the ground floor and he is okay with s-turn. The parking deck should be pushed over and the loading area should be clearly defined. He feels the burden should be placed on the Town to come up with a design and then come to the owner for an amount.

Vice-Chair House stated that she liked the reduction of two parking spaces and that she was neutral about s-turn. She would like the applicant to come up with a plan for landscaping of Greenfield and have the Town review it for the dollar amount. Once reviewed by the Town the applicant could give the money to the Town to be held until such a time that it is needed. She wants input from the Traffic Safety Committee about the loading zone. She can support the trash enclosure and door. She wants the building color removed from the resolution because she wants to see a sample on the wall first.

Consensus by the Commission to only allow retail on the first floor, if at all.

M/s Zwick/Jochum, and unanimously passed (4-0), to continue to the meeting of 10/2/00.

3. **ER-0003/PS-0001/V/PDP-0001/DR-0029 - Tommy Kennedy, Between 41 and 43 Tomahawk Drive, A/P 177-250-31, environmental review (Negative Declaration), parcel split (with a street frontage exception as access will be over an easement), precise development plan, and design review of a single family dwelling, on property located within the R-1 (above 150 msl) zoning district. (Staff: Wight)**

Ms. Wight presented the Staff Report.

Fred Divine, architect representing the applicant, said they were under the impression that the project was approved in 1995. The driveway design was prepared by Irv Schwartz in 1995, which included the Fire Department turnaround. They took the driveway as a given based on the 1995 Planning Commission minutes. He had the landscape architect modify the planting along the driveway to help screen the retaining walls. They have a modified plan that includes trees in response to the concerns of the downhill neighbor along the driveway. They cannot change the way the driveway is accessed. The house has been sited within the building envelope and it is the most logical place for the house because of the driveway and the Fire Department turnaround. The site is very visible now on Broadmoor and Indian Rock because there is no vegetation at this point. They wanted a Victorian type house and they used a design idea that has been successful in Marin, which was to step down to the first floor, with is 15' below the parking area. The house is approximately 3,600 square feet. The upper floor is not stepped back and has a 6:12 roof pitch. There are modulated areas on the downslope side. They wanted to have 4' retaining walls with 3' rails to create an outdoor space. He presented a photographs, including what the location of the house would be look like to the down hill neighbor. They will put in 36" box trees that could be planted and the photographs indicate the screening of the trees at planting date. They took several phonographs of homes in the neighborhood and many of them may not necessarily belong on a hillside lot. They are within the height limits of the Town.

Tommy Kennedy, applicant, said he tried his best to meet with the neighbors and wanted to design a house that would be nice and a landscape architect which would provide a plan that would help screen the house.

Pauline Grazianne, Real Estate Broker, representing the owner of 41 Tomahawk, said she received information from the Title Company that does not indicate easement. In the CC&Rs of Quarry Mountain, no removal of dirt etc. The property of 41 and 43 Tomahawk would be severely impacted. They are also concerned about drainage. She would like to have the driveway area market to be able to indicate the impact on the buyer.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2000**

Gary Hanson, 27 and 37 Indian Rock Road, stated that there have been various references to lot splits in the negative declaration. He has researched this with the County of Marin and the only lot split of record is a split off from a larger parcel, which was designated as parcel 31 (this parcel). And the other one was 1/31/66. This lot has never been re-split and he does not understand why it should be split again. It is in fact connected to 41 and 43 Tomahawk because they share the easement. He was also concerned that it was a parcel "defacto" from the Quarry Mountain subdivision. There is no public record of the split of lot 31. The parcel has been, for some reason, left out of the Quarry Mountain subdivision. Prior to tonight it has never been approved as a legal building site, and yet it has been designated by the Town as an R-1H parcel. This seems illogical to zone a parcel if it is not a legal building site. Everyone that bought in the Quarry subdivision bought with the understanding that this lot could not be developed. He wants the zoning receded since it is not a legal building site and then, and only then, determines if it is a legal building site.

Mary White, 2 Indian Rock Court, can see the story poles from the back of her house. She is concerned about drainage and erosion of the hillside. She is also concerned about protection of the hillside during construction. The old Quarry Mountain subdivision was done tastefully but this house seems too tall and is sitting on top of the ridge.

Margie Knots, 19 Indian rock Court, said that there is a gully that leads into a 10-inch drainage ditch and she wants to know the impact to her with this construction. She wants to know what, if any impact, there would be to the downhill neighbors.

Peter Ritter, 40 Indian Rock Court, presented pictures of the story poles. He was told this was not a buildable lot when he built his house. The house is enormous, and can be seen from his living room. The site is a deer habitat. The surrounding homes have been respectful of the habitat because of the open space. The 440-foot long driveway should be an indication that the project is not feasible. A very long retaining wall would have a major, negative impact on the neighborhood as well as the environment. This house would be the most prominent house on the hill.

Melissa Burris, 57 Indian Rock Road, said the proposed driveway would be directly in back of her property. If it is determined that the lot is legal, she would like to have more story poles in place to indicate the driveway location. The new buyers should also have input on the driveway.

Annie Fox, 11 Indian Rock Road, is astonished that there is a misunderstanding that this was an approved lot. It clearly was not approved. Perhaps, the outcome would be different if the applicant did not think the project was approved. She disagrees that this house fits in with other houses in the neighborhood.

David Israel, 47 Indian Rock Road, stated that there were General Plan impacts that were put into place that makes this fit into the R-1 H Zoning. Regarding the site issues, he wanted to see how narrow the driveway width could be made and he would like to see the surface was made permeable. He wanted to know the maximum height of the rear wall, and if it includes the terrace wall. The Quarry Mountain subdivision had a real sensitivity on how the houses sit on the sites. There is some real strong language in the CC&Rs. regarding this. This should be a house that is broken up into different components. On parcels that are highly visible, size takes on a different definition. The house will be very big and the understory is quite large. He would like the Commission to keep a close eye on the glass area because the lighting at night can be like a beacon.

Mr. Fox, 11 Indian Rock Road, said that if the lot were made legal, he would like to see alternatives so the house could be stepped down more. He has major concerns regarding the drainage.

Fani Hanson, 27 and 37 Indian Rock Road, presented photographs of the site and what the building would look like. She agreed that they should look at the CCR's for Quarry Mountain. If this is a buildable lot, she strongly advises them to step the house down the hill and place it where it would be hidden behind the plantings.

Tony Brohman, tenant of 27 Indian Rock Road, said that this house does not sit within the contours of the hillside. He would want the profile reduced.

Ms. Wight stated for the record that in 1996 the project was heard but was continued and a decision was never made.

Commissioner Jochum asked if the building conforms to the height requirements? Ms. Wight responded that they are now at the maximum height allowed by Code.

Commissioner Couture asked if CC&R's apply to this lot? Ms. Wight responded that they do not because this was not part of that subdivision but they could be used as a guideline and Staff will provide that information for the next meeting.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2000**

Commissioner Zwick asked the applicant, Mr. Kennedy about his understanding of the legality of the lot. Mr. Kennedy responded that he thought the driveway was already approved. The previous owner, Jack Hunt, said it was his understanding that the lot was approved by the Town.

Ms. Wight explained that the 1995 Staff Report indicated that this was a legal lot of record. However, this was in error. After further research, Staff required more information that would indicate this was a legal lot of record.

After a review of the previous minutes, Commissioner Zwick stated that the minutes indicated that the meeting was continued because the Commission did not have enough information.

Commissioner Jochum said that he would like to review 22319 of the General Plan. In looking at the findings for denial, he could not deny and that seems to be cut and dry. He would like staff to give him more information on. He agrees that the Commission should look at the Quarry Mountain CC&R's and they should form some guidelines around this lot. This is a very highly visible lot. This house is clearly more looming than the applicant's photographs represent. The house is clearly not appropriate for the site. He agrees that this is a flat land house on a steep lot. It does nothing to fit into the topography to provide the lowest visual profile. He would like to see a better definition on the retaining wall that is required for the yard. If they wanted outdoor space, rather than creating retaining walls for the space, they should have purchased a flat lot. The height of the house should be reduced as well.

Commissioner Zwick said if this does go forward, he cannot figure out where the other houses are, wants an aerial photographs; wants to know where this driveway is in proximity to the neighbors. Have lots of questions on the geotechnical information. There are slides on this site and on the adjacent site. Wants drainage as thoroughly researched as was on 90 Camino de Herrera. What does the Fire Department want for a maximum slope? This is a 21 percent slope. Would like a photomontage. Can go with a max height and FAR under maximum conditions. This house has an understory that is huge and should be viewed on the overall calculations of the building. The house is too tall. There is an easement over the two lots. Perhaps the legal description could tell the history of the lot and what it would be used for. Would be interested if the 'tail' is used in the calculation of the R-1 H lot. Want to see the Quarry Mountain CC&R's. If the lot is so steep and the driveway cannot be moved, this indicates how tight the site is.

Commissioner Couture said he would like information on the General Plan. If it is a legal lot, this is a very difficult lot. The extent of cut and fill, the length of the driveway and cut and fill of the driveway are all concerns. The impact on the downhill on 41 Indian Rock. There are privacy issues to be dealt with on the downhill neighbor on Indian rock. The house design is not a low visual profile. He agrees that the houses around this are not low houses but they are not sitting on a prominent knoll. The houses on Tomahawk are on the ridge and are low visual profile. He wondered if the driveway would require railings. The hedges need to be broken up along the driveway. The proposed outdoor space is excessive on such a steep lot. He would like to have more information on the proposed drainage issues, the sheet flow issues from the driveway, site drainage, and drainage from the roof, etc. A photomontage would be important. He wants a clear visual representation on what this would look like. He would also like to see a color rendering, or a model would also help. Story poles should be placed for the driveway location; perhaps add tape across them.

Vice Chair House stated that she would like the Town Attorney to comment on the legal lot issue. It is unfortunate that the neighbors could not afford to purchase the parcel and keep it as open space. This is a very visible site and can be seen from everywhere. Therefore, it must be the best house. Drainage will be a very big issue. Lighting and landscaping will also be a big issue.

M/s Jochum/Zwick, and unanimously approved (4-0), to continue the project to the meeting to October 2, 2000 to get the following information:

- General Plan Policy language
- CC&R's on Quarry Mountain
- Overall drainage plan
- Aerial of site
- Where does sewer go?
- Maximum slope allowed for fire trucks
- What about reduction of roadway width required from Fire District
- Story poles for driveway
- Section of building and how it sits on the site
- Comments from the Town Attorney for required findings for approval and denial
- Provide the definition of a ridge
- Views from different station points of the photomontage
- Documentation on how the calculation was done on acreage
- Provide information on the easement

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2000**

Commissioner Zwick asked for a copy of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance

**REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL**

None at this time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

**BARBARA CHAMBERS**