

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2000**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Commissioners present: Chair Cronk, Commissioners House, Jochum, Wittenkeller, Zwick

Commissioners absent: Commissioner Couture

**OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION**

No one spoke during this time.

**CONTINUED ITEMS**

1. **Minutes – June 5, 2000**
2. **ER-0001/DR-0014/U-0003/V-0013 - Svend Hansen, 7 and 9 Mariposa Avenue, and 131 and 151 San Anselmo Avenue**, A/P 7-301-07, Environmental Review and Design Review of: a) a new commercial/residential, two-story building (1,980 square feet commercial and 4:2-bedroom apartments) facing Mariposa Avenue; and b) construction of a new commercial/residential two-story building (1,038 square feet commercial and 1:2-bedroom apartment) facing San Anselmo Avenue. No change to existing commercial/residential two-story building (2,180 square feet commercial and 2:2-bedroom apartment) facing San Anselmo Avenue. Removal of a 600 square foot commercial building facing Mariposa Avenue. Use Permit: for 5 new and 2 existing residential apartment units. Parking variance: for two spaces to be substandard in width at 8' (Code: 9') and two spaces to be in tandem, and one space, on property located within the C-2 Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight) **CONTINUED TO JULY 17, 2000.**
3. **DR-0020 - TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO-CORPORATION YARD, 500 San Francisco Boulevard**, A/P 177-204-01, Design Review request to reconstruct and rebuild the San Anselmo Corporation Yard facility. The existing barn building is 7,227 square feet. The two new buildings proposed are 4,200 square feet for the shop and storage facility; 1,200 square feet for the administrative building, for a total of 5,400 square feet. There will be no change in use from the existing facilities, on property located within the PF (Public Facilities) Zoning District. (Staff person: Feagans) **CONTINUED TO JULY 17, 2000.**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. **U-9808 - Esquin Imports, Inc. 15 Ross Avenue**, A/P 007-284-12, Amendment to existing use permit to permit delivery by full size delivery truck to no more than two times per month on property located within the C-3 zoning district (staff person: Feagans)

A member of the audience asked to take the application off consent and open it for discussion.

M/s House/Jochum, and unanimously passed (5-0), to remove the item from Consent and place it on the Public Hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

- 1A. **U-9808 - Esquin Imports, Inc. 15 Ross Avenue**, A/P 007-284-12, Amendment to existing use permit to permit delivery by full size delivery truck to no more than two times per month on property located within the C-3 zoning district (staff person: Feagans)

Taken from Consent.

Ms. Feagans presented the Staff report.

Don Oliver, applicant, stated the public warehouse lost its lease and the minimum time to get a licensee for a new place is approximately 90 days. Therefore they can only deliver from their San Anselmo location until they get a new warehouse. He noted that they only sell to licensed premises.

Karl Baeck, 36 Ross Avenue, was happy to hear that they do not intend to use it permanently however, that area of town has turned into an industrial area. The business will need a forklift to unload their merchandise and it will block traffic. Ross Avenue is very heavily traveled and the loading and off loading of merchandise will prohibit traffic to go by. Traffic then goes onto Woodland Avenue. He recommends the change in use permit to be denied.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2000**

Gerry Frank, 24 Ross Avenue, concurs that this area is congested with trucks for the Ongaro plumbing business. If the wine use is going to park in front of Ongaro's, then the Ongaro trucks will have to go somewhere else. The entire street is very congested. His driveway is used by many vehicles that want to take a short cut from Ross Avenue and Woodland Avenue. He is concerned that there will be more deliveries than the applicant has suggested.

Ada Fitzsimmons, 22 Woodland Avenue, cannot understand how a 16 wheeler can be allowed on Woodland. Traffic is a serious problem. This is a residential neighborhood and the commercial use should not be permitted. She is also offended with the amount of pollution.

Mr. Oliver responded that to his knowledge there has only been one large delivery in the past to his business. He lives in San Anselmo and his employees live in San Anselmo. They also care about the quality of life here.

Commissioner Zwick asked about the Ongaro's trucks. Ms. Feagans responded that the zoning for Ongaro's permits this type of business because it is commercially zoned.

Commissioner Zwick stated that he would support the application based on the staff report as a temporary use and he could also support it as a permanent use. They are not selling alcohol to people in town.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said he would approve the use on a temporary basis but does not want it on a permanent basis. He does not approve of 18-wheelers on town streets. He also requests staff to look at the prohibition of the large vehicles in town.

Commissioner House had no further comments although she understands the neighbors are concerned about the large vehicles.

Commissioner Jochum supports the staff report.

Chair Cronk is supportive of this use on only a temporary basis as described in the staff report.

M/s House/Jochum, and unanimously passed (5-0), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the Staff report.

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

1. **V-0007/DR-0008 – John Paletta, 90 Camino de Herrera, A/P 5-071-55, Design Review of a 3 story, 2,896 square foot single family dwelling; and a setback variance for the garage to be within 0' of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' msl). (Staff person: Wight)**

Ms. Wight presented the Staff report.

Steven Lachey, applicant, did not have more to add from what was presented by Staff at this time.

Alberta Hare, 56 Rosemont, said there was a slide that went from Rosemont to Hillcrest in 1982 and that has not been mentioned. Also, there are several big trees by the fence on the easement and any disturbance would damage the roots. She had questions about the location of the retaining wall and drainage ditch in relation to the easement.

Edwin Shires, 56 Rosemont, said that there is a power pole close to, if not on the easement. In addition there is a 12" water main in the easement.

Karen Moskowitz, 95 Rosemont, explained that in February 1983 there was a mudslide that ended up on Rosemont. There was another slide in 1998 that affected her. She has concerns about the development because of the instability of the hillside.

Ruth Hicks, 111 Camino de Herrera, stated that there road is not town maintained and they had the road resurfaced several years ago. Because of that, when the slide occurred in 1998, the residents were sued. Therefore, as a neighborhood, they will probably not improve the roads again because of the lawsuit.

Rick Sheviakov, 30 Oakwood Court, stated that visually he is greatly impressed with the changes however he wants confirmation on the accuracy of the story poles. If it is accurate, he can live with it. Regarding safety and drainage, there have been major slides in the area. Hillcrest to Rosemont and the top of Oak Springs to Woodside. If no company is willing to issue a bond, the Town will be liable. He is still concerned about the construction impact. This is a 25-house impact, whereas the 405 Sequoia development only affected about ten houses. Therefore, he does not think the

SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2000

construction management plan for 405 Sequoia would be a good comparison. He wanted assurance of at least a 12' clearance. The plan for street closures seems somewhat unrealistic.

Gerald Hymanson, 100 Camino de Herrera, stated the design has been improved. He was still concerned about the cypress tree otherwise the proposal is fine.

Gary Gross, 4 Herrera Court, said there is a piece of land next to 4 Herrera Court and neighbors put in a road about 10' above his property. Who has responsibility for that area? The changes to the project are an improvement. He wants to see the street widened to 12 feet.

Steven Lachey responded to the audience's questions and concerns as follows:

- Easement and trees – he sees the concern but will make it work for both parties. The exact location of the property still needs to be surveyed. To determine the easement they have to have the survey.
- The slides on the Moskowitz's property – this is off to the south and not next to this property and would have no impact.
- Additional road pavement – he cannot address this; if the road is damaged during construction, he will repave it.
- The height of the garage – the story poles are accurate.
- Insurance – the question about Insurance has been covered in the Staff report.
- Construction management plan – was submitted to the Town and will be revised and more detailed during the building permit process.
- Road closures for the 25 Oakwood project – did notify neighbor's 48 hours ahead of time. The port-o-potty truck was only there for 5 minutes to unload and pick up.
- Bond for Oakwood repaving – there is a bond given to the Town for repaving the front of 25 Oakwood but will not be used until the entire road is paved.
- Protection of the cypress tree - they have moved the project away from the cypress tree and the tree would not be compromised.

In response to Chair Cronk, Mr. Lachey stated that they can get a bond (liability insurance) during construction and then it is up to the homeowner to get their own insurance.

In response to a question by Commissioner Zwick, Mr. Lachey stated that MMWD has a water pipe that goes through the easement of 56 Rosemont.

Ms. Wight stated that when the Hillcrest/Rosemont slide occurred in 1983 a butress wall was installed but the Town was not sued. She noted that the Construction Management Plan for 405 Sequoia worked well in the neighborhood. That CMP will be fine-tuned for this project. The Oak Springs slide is not close to this property and went down to Rancho.

Commissioner Wittenkeller thanked all the residents for their presence at the hearing and their comments. He also thanked staff for a very thorough report. In his opinion, the applicant was responsive to the public and the Commission and he can vote for this project with certain conditions. His primary concern is drainage. The other concern was visual but the applicant has gone a long way to mitigate the visual. The drainage plan that has been prepared did not have a civil engineer's wet stamp. He would require that during the building permit stage. Also, he wants a landscape plan that reflects the intent for erosion control and visual screening; with drought tolerant landscaping, and prepared by a professional. This plan can be reviewed by staff.

Commissioner House said she is leaning in favor of this project but she would want the details on the easement. If there are trees affected in the easement, she would need to know what mitigation measures are needed. She also wanted to know what the plan was for various utilities.

Commissioner Jochum stated that he does not understand why they are siting the building in its current location on the lot, noting that it is odd at best. The parcel is quite large and there are other locations that would be better suited for the structure. The benefit of a larger lot allows you to isolate the building. Having said that, he is not opposed to the project because the neighborhood is not opposed to it. He does not think we could ask for a more detailed construction management plan at this point. Regarding the drainage, in a situation like this, he has gotten a watershed study where it takes into consideration all the water that comes across the site. That is something that should be done, especially considering the ground in this area. Taking the master suite off the garage is a good move and the applicant has been responsive since the last meeting. He would not be in favor of a dispersion pipe. In summary, he is generally in favor of the project

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2000**

Commissioner Zwick stated that he has read the geotechnical reports and this is a site that is somewhat more dangerous to construct. He noted that the town is built out and these sites are the only sites left. He wanted to understand the drainage of the hillside. He is interested in that because maybe the other side of the site is less dangerous; but maybe it is not. There is conflict in his mind about this. A closed drainage system is going to be a lot more efficient and will help the downhill neighbors. The engineers state that they would not recommend watering flowers on the site. Based on this statement, he questions the safety of the site. He wanted the applicant to take a look at the uphill drainage and place the slide areas on a plan. He wanted them to mark the trees in the easement because if they are heritage trees, it would be an issue for the Commission. Looking at the small map, the easement and the MMWD easement overlap. That should be looked into to make sure there is a solution to this. The closed pipe system is the only viable solution in his mind. With regard to the uphill portion of the house, he would like to see a drawing on how the stem wall would be placed. The applicant has done a great deal to respond to the massing level and if this is the best location, he has no problem. He would also like to see the details of the windows at a larger scale.

Chair Cronk said she was in general agreement with all the Commissioners. She would like to see a Landscape plan, have more information on details of the easement and impact it may have. Wants a watershed study and a drainage plan signed by an engineer.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said he was not sure a watershed study is necessary because the road is above the site.

Commissioner Zwick responded that the geotechnical study stated it would cross the road and it appears they are building in the swale.

Commissioner Jochum added that if no water is coming on site from up hill the study would be very brief and probably no more than 1.5 pages in length.

M/s Zwick/Jochum, and unanimously passed (5-0), to continue the application to the meeting of July 17, 2000.

2. **BLOCKBUSTER, 820 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-061-13, Traffic Study – Review and comment on the Blockbuster Traffic Study prepared for the 4,400 square foot store. The Planning Commission will be reviewing the adequacy of the document; on property located within the C-3 Zoning District. (Staff person: Feagans)**

Ms. Feagans presented the Staff report.

Ron Foster, Traffic Engineer for Wilber Smith Associates and representing Blockbuster, explained the different access and exit areas. He explained that the addendum to the traffic report looks at a very heavy traffic load. They have an additional four spaces that they did not realize were theirs and the additional three that they have found based on moving the dumpster, for a total of 59 spaces.

Commissioner Jochum asked who owned the land behind the Thrift Shop, noting that there are five parallel parking spaces. Ms. Feagans stated that she did not count that in her parking count and was unsure of the ownership.

Dalene Whitlock, Traffic Engineer with W-Trans and representing the Town for the peer review, stated that there were some questions about the rates used in the traffic study for this site. The traffic generation rate was quite conservative. The Commission may want to consider closing the medium and not permitting the left hand turn but there are problem with that during peak traffic. They could also consider placing a medium that does not allow people to turn left, although it would be almost impossible to turn left during peak traffic time on Sir Francis Drake anyway. Regarding the peak time in Novato, there was a small amount of time that parking was an issue. This store in San Anselmo is smaller than the Novato store and would have more than two thirds the amount of parking – as well as having employees park off site.

In response to Commissioner Zwick, Ms. Whitlock stated the size of the store does have some impact on the amount of traffic as well as using the Novato site as an example. If this store was the same size as Novato, parking might not be adequate.

In response to Chair Cronk, Ms. Whitlock stated that the analysis was done based on the new trips (vehicles specifically going to the Blockbuster site) on Sir Francis Drake. She felt that the majority of people are pass by traffic. Even as new traffic, it did not have any impact.

Larry DeSpain, Blockbuster Video, felt they have fairly addressed the concerns. Blockbuster can accept the conditions by staff. With respect to Condition Number 4, he has been in contact with Geoff Koblick, the property owner a few buildings away, and he

SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2000

is more than happy to lease a minimum of three spaces to the Blockbuster employees. With respect to Condition 5 regarding a six-month review – it is risky but they have enough faith that this site will work. They did that in Tiburon and did pass their review. He did meet with the owner of the Thai restaurant and she wanted to remain neutral but did want the building cleaned up, the parking spaces better stripped and have better lighting at night in the parking lot. There is sufficient parking on the site and it has adequate access. If the site is as bad as their adversaries' state, they should not be opposed to them going in because the site would not work. He wants to let the marketplace decide if Blockbuster can be part of the community.

George Bianchini, Broadway Video, feels the traffic study is inaccurate. The six-month review is not legal and cannot hold and this should be verified by the Town Attorney. This store will be one of their larger volume stores. Blockbuster will take in the bulk of the business of the video stores in the neighborhood. He wanted the Commission to impose Ordinance 1012 and put it to full design and use permit.

The property owner of 820 Sir Francis Drake asked the Town what the appropriate uses for the building were. They spoke with Blockbuster and were told by the Town that the use was acceptable. They want to make tenant improvements to the building but cannot do that until a decision is made. All the parking spaces are for the mutual benefit of the restaurant as well as for Blockbuster.

Rick LaFrankie, Silverscreen Video, said the traffic counts were taken from January and February and took advantage of the slowest time of the year. He would argue the comparison to the Novato store – there are more people living in a one-mile radius in SA than in Novato. He noted that the Santa Rosa store is smaller than the Novato store but the volume is larger. Re the six-month review – that would not stand up in court. What is the impact on the Red Hill shopping center? Clearly, cars will use Bella Vista. His store is 3,900 square feet and they have up to six employees at peak time so he does not think three employees is realistic. The property does not have the amount of parking they need for this use.

Robert Caporro, 15 Lincoln Park, said that Blockbuster is the largest in the world and their interest in this area is not just to serve the community but because of the traffic flow. We need to support our own local business people. His main concern is safety for cars getting in and out of the site.

Hardy Fox, 825 Sir Francis Drake, is certain people would use his driveway.

John Bain, 149 San Francisco Boulevard, was struck by a truck in front of the proposed site by an individual who was trying to get into the parking lot. This was not at peak time. Therefore, he does not want to add additional traffic. The expansion of Safeway will also add additional traffic.

Mr. DeSpain said that there was criticism about using Tiburon because they had just opened. They then used the other six stores, Novato has been open for six years. There is a correlation between size; the store has 11,000 tapes; this store will have about 6,500 tapes. The trade area for the Novato store encompasses the whole of Novato, and they don't expect to draw from San Rafael. They expect to draw from 26,000 people.

Mr. Foster explained that they counted the peak traffic generation between 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. in Novato.

In response to Chair Cronk, Ms. Feagans stated that she would talk to the Town Attorney with respect to the six-month review and the new ordinance as to whether or not this application is subject to the ordinance, because it came in prior to the ordinance. In addition, many people had the impression that this project was going to be conditioned so it might be a good idea to continue the application.

Commissioner Jochum has questions about how the parking is laid out. He felt there is a better solution to parking that could get more cars in. Along with design review, he would like to see the applicant take a closer look at parking. He questioned why the parking was angled by the Thrift store because parking is lost by doing that.

Commissioner House said she is more comfortable with the number of parking spaces but is still concerned about the eastbound traffic as people leave the store. She is not comfortable that people would still use the left turn and/or go through the shopping center. She wants the curb cuts to be wider going into the parking lot. All the Blockbuster employees should be parking off site, not just three. She is interested in a six-month review if it is legal.

Commissioner Zwick said if the traffic study is approved by the Commission he would like to see design review, although he is not sure it is ready to be approved.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2000**

Commissioner Wittenkeller said there have been two professionals that have looked at traffic and staff concurs that parking is adequate. He wishes he could approve the project and not threaten the livelihood of local individuals. However, the whole country is founded on the competitive spirit and it feels that we are reaching that borderline. He concurs with the staff report.

Commissioner House stated if the parking is re-stripped, greater parking could be provided.

Commissioner Jochum stated that going into the parking lot with only the width of a single lane turn in, is a slow moving turn and should be carefully done.

M/s House/Wittenkeller, to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report; and with the addition of improved curb cuts of ingress and egress into the parking.

Discussion by the Commission.

Commissioner Zwick said he would not like to vote for the traffic study. He does not believe in traffic studies because they are based on an imprecise science. Common sense tells him that getting in and out of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard would only be made worse by this use. The consultant's recommendation doesn't always work as predicted. Since they don't live in the community or fight Sir Francis Drake Boulevard traffic on their way home, they won't have to live with the results if they are wrong in this instance. A traffic study was done on Miller Avenue in Mill Valley for whole Foods. It was studied very carefully and traffic was horrible when the use went in. Common sense argues that this is a site with more problems than most. Every issue raised by the traffic consultants is addressed, but in each case they just barely find a solution that they can live with. Considered cumulatively there are just too many marginal decisions added together. He feels that Blockbuster capitalizes the use in a different way than the local storeowner; by newspaper, radio, etc and can bring in a lot of traffic. Access in and out of the site is very difficult which also makes this a marginal parking lot.

Chair Cronk stated this is a legitimate business owner and where do we draw the line? What do we tell the owner of the business for the reasons of denial?

Commissioner Zwick responded that there must be some nexus for safety. The Town parking requirements are not adequate as stated by staff. If the use is not for the public good, we do not have to approve it.

Commissioner Jochum said that he has never had a problem with parking when he went to Silverscreen or Broadway Video, although he admitted that he does not go there during peak times. His biggest problem is ingress and egress to the site. He does not really feel that we know what the overall traffic pattern is.

Motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: Wittenkeller/Jochum/House  
Noes: Zwick/Cronk

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

**3. PDP-0001/DR-0011 – John Hynes, 3 The Alameda Knolls, A/P 5-320-04 – design review of a single family dwelling and amendment to the building envelope, on property located within the R-1H Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight)**

Ms. Wight presented the Staff report.

Commissioner Wittenkeller stated that this will be a decent looking house but looking at it from below it would appear large. He would like assurance that there is landscaping.

Commissioner Zwick stated that he would like to see true divided windows in the house.

Margaret Thorpe, representing the applicant's architect, stated there is a lot of detail. She understands the reservations about the stem wall but with the landscaping proposed, it would be screened pretty rapidly.

Commissioner House said it is clear that the house would be visible from everywhere. She took into consideration the landscaping but realized that it would be visible in any event. Therefore, she could vote for it if the house was attractive and this is an attractive house. The shingle style house is just fine and similar to the house below.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said he would require a landscape plan that was done by a professional, registered landscape architect, particularly below the residence. He does

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2000**

not want to hide the building. He noted that Pittosporum box would freeze. He would be happy to review the landscaping with staff.

Commissioner Jochum did not have any trouble with the architecture's work. Even though this house can be viewed from across the valley, the house would be attractive. There are many houses that he currently sees, most of which are not very attractive. There will be a lot of concrete below the shingle and landscaping would be required. Looking at the story poles, he is confident enough with the architect's work to be able to approve his work.

M/s House/Zwick, and unanimously passed (5-0), to approve the application based on the following conditions:

Findings for approval for the Precise Development Plan

- Finding 1: The building envelope extension is diminimus
- Findings 2: The building envelope extension is diminimus.
- Findings 3: There will be no impact.
- Findings 4: There will be no impact.
- Findings 5: There will be no impact.
- Findings 6: This will be handled by a landscape plan prepared by a landscape architect and reviewed and approved by staff.
- Findings 7: This will be handled by a landscape plan prepared by a landscape architect and reviewed and approved by staff.
- Findings 8,9,10, 11, 12, and 13: There will be no impact.

Findings for approval for Design Review:

- Finding 1: This dwelling design is similar to others on this street.
- Finding 2: This dwelling will be an improvement to the neighborhood.
- Finding 3: This dwelling will be an improvement to the neighborhood.
- Finding 4: There will be no impact.
- Finding 5: There will be no impact.

Conditions of approval are:

1. The approval is based on the plans date stamped received by the Town of March 8, 2000, and the material board date stamped received by the Town on February 18, 2000.
2. The exterior materials shall be as follows:
  - Siding: Natural Cedar shingle  
Stone Veneer
  - Roof: Medium Grey Composition Shingle
  - Windows: Dark Green Wood Clad
  - Garage: Sectional doors
3. Should construction not begin within one year from the date of this approval, the approval shall be considered null and void. A one-time-only, one-year extension can be requested in writing to the Planning Director prior to the expiration date.
4. A landscape plan prepared by a registered landscape architect shall be subject to staff approval.
5. The windows shall have true divided lights.

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

4. **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 the number of on-site parking spaces to be substandard by up to 5, on property located within the C-3 (General Commercial) Zoning District. (Staff: Wight)**

M/s House/Jochum, and unanimously passed (5-0), to continue the application to the meeting of 7/17/00.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2000**

**5. V-0020/DR-0022/U-0006 – Alaris Group, 1509 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-153-03, Use permit to install six wireless panel antennas to be mounted and concealed within a false chimney with a maximum width of 5'-8" and maximum height of 28'-11" above grade. A sign variance is requested to construct two monument signs, one, 111 square foot in size, and the other sign will be 65 square feet in size. The signs will conceal the antenna equipment. The project site is within the R-2 Zoning District. (Staff: Feagans)**

M/s House/Cronk, and unanimously passed (5-0), to continue the application to the meeting of July 17, 2000.

**6. DR-0023/V-0021 - John Skinner, 190 Melville Avenue, A/P7-115-04, Design Review and Variance to rebuild an existing carport into a 494 square foot garage and add a 212 square foot covered porch area to the new garage. Setback variance request to build the new structure within 7' of street side property line on one side and within 3' of the street side property line on the other side and to replace and extend an existing retaining wall adjacent to Melville Avenue to approximately 5 feet in height (Code: 12' street side setback required for garage structure, 4' height maximum for retaining wall) on property located within the R-1 zoning district. (Staff: Feagans)**  
There being no comments for or against the project, the Commission was able to take it as a consent item.

Taken out of order.

There being no input for or against the project, the Commission took the item as a consent item.

M/s Zwick/House, and unanimously passed (5-0), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report.

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

**7. SR-0001 – Rick Barnham, Market Rate Insight, 275 Greenfield Avenue, A/P 6-211-19 and 20, sign review of a proposed 25 square foot freestanding sign on property located within the C-3 zoning district. (Staff person: Wight)**

Taken out of order.

Ms. Wight presented the Staff report.

Roland Mayes, architect representing the applicant, stated that this facility does not have any public contact. The sign is simply to advise people who are in the building. The previous tenant had three marquee, internally illuminated signs. The sign will go from 40" to about 70" in height. It is on the very western corner, facing traffic on Miracle Mile. The sign is made of tile, and the letters are laser cut into the tile; the colored tiles are also laser cut. The background is a matte; the sign is externally lit.

Commissioner Wittenkeller stated that he is happy to see a solid use in the building but noticed there was heavy pruning done to the landscaping. He asked if there was any proposal to provide additional landscape? Mr. Mayes responded that the pruning of the juniper was on the request of the town. Some of it did not survive and it has been replaced.

M/s House/Wittenkeller, and unanimously passed, (5-0), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in Section 10-9.408 b of SAMC.

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

**8. DR-9943 Amendment – Kurt and Elsa Leswing, 330-332 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-254-05, design review amendment to change the approved awning color from dark green to red, on property located within the C-2 zoning district. (Staff person: Wight)**

Taken out of order.

Ms. Wight presented the Staff report.

Kurt Leswing, applicant, stated they originally proposed red but green was approved. They feel that the red is much more exciting and would tie in with the theme of the restaurant.

Commissioner Zwick stated that red is a hard color and the canvas will fade to pink in a relatively short period of time. The green canvas will stay green longer.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2000**

M/s Zwick/Cronk, and unanimously passed (5-0), to move the findings in the staff report.

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

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

None at this time.

**REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL**

None at this time.

**ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, July 17, 2000**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 p.m.

**BARBARA CHAMBERS**