

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MUNITES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

**CALL TO ORDERR:**

**Commissioners present:** Chair House, Commissioners Couture,  
Jochum, Zwick

**Commissioner absent:** Wittenkeller

**Staff present:** Planning Director Feagans, Senior Planner  
Wight

**OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION**

Eric Rosenquest, 18 Lincoln Park, commented that the traffic study done for the Greenfield project that will be heard on the agenda tonight did not take into consideration the impact to traffic on Greenfield.

**JOINT WORKSHOP BETWEEN TOWN COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

Commissioner Jochum asked for the reasoning behind the Council decision to overturn the appeal of 113 Madrone Avenue.

Councilmember Kroot felt the applicant's plan was good because they were trying to keep the original roofline. He had no problem with higher gables; in fact he has a problem with gables that are less than 6 feet because of aesthetic reasons. The real problem was the large addition next door. The real question for the Town is how can enlargement takes place in the flatlands without upsetting the balance of the neighborhood?

Councilmember Kilkus commented that he felt it was more important to communicate with neighborhood when an applicant wants to make changes.

Councilmember Chignell asked the Commission if they would like to take a look at the Second Unit Ordinance with regard to the number of second units in each neighborhood, as well as the illegal units. Also, there are still vacancies on the Commission but the Council has declined to appoint anyone at this time. The Council is looking for high quality applicants that would add a prospective to the Commission. Another concern of the Council is that there is no enforcement on approved projects and he would like the Commission to discuss this.

Councilmember Kroot noted that a lot of second units have been abandoned but are still in the books.

Commissioner Zwick stated that there is not much protection for the design of the buildings in the downtown area and no guidelines on how to spruce up the streetscape.

Commissioner Jochum said he would like to see design guidelines in place for the downtown area.

With regard to design guidelines for the downtown area, Councilmember Kroot suggested that applicants visit the historical Commission and get a look at the historical photographs. The Council would have to pass an ordinance to protect the historical buildings and there could be some tax implications associated with historical districts.

Chair House stated that there are still a lot of current planning applications and she was not sure when the Commission, or Staff, would be able to take on extra work. She explained that the Commission will be starting their meetings at 7:00, instead of 7:30 p.m. and could perhaps use the first hour or so to talk about second unit. She would also like to see design review guidelines for the flatlands.

Councilmember Kilkus asked the Commission how they let people know what is expected. Commissioner Zwick responded that the Commission tries to give the applicant guidance but allow for diversity, but does not want to be the design police for the applicant because tastes differ. Councilmember Kroot agreed that both the Commission and Council have to be very careful about putting your design or style on a project.

Mayor Breen suggested getting the word out about the general guidelines to new citizens by way of the Welcome to San Anselmo brochure.

Commissioner Zwick stated that information could also be attached to the Resale Inspection when a property is sold.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

Councilmember Chignell stated that design guidelines might not reflect what the public wants in the flatland.

Mayor Breen commented that it appears that the only appeals that have come before the Council lately are those that are community issues.

Chair House asked if there should there be time limits on building projects. The consensus on this was that it is not necessary because there are time limits set within the Building Code.

Ms. Feagans noted that there are 38 planning applications still pending. Because decisions are not made on many of the items during the first hearing, she wondered if staff should hold back on those applications that do not appear to have satisfied all issues prior to being heard at the Commission. That might mean a quicker action by the Commission.

The consensus of the Commission was to have more complete applications. In addition there is a checklist that is attached to the planning application of what is required for submittal and they would like to require the applicant to provide an aerials for the larger projects.

Chair Breen asked about what the Commission's policy was on accepting drawings. Did they have to be prepared by an architect?

The consensus of the Commission was that they did not require architectural drawings but did feel it was important to have adequate drawings to be able to evaluate a project.

Town Administrator Pollard stated that many concerns come up about whether or not drainage should be discussed at such depth with the Commission rather than leaving that up to the engineers.

Commissioner Zwick responded that he does not want to approve a project that cannot be drained property because the Town could be sued.

Chair House added that neighbors would be very upset if a project was approved and their drainage issues had not been addressed.

Councilmember Kroot said the Commission was getting too specific about drainage requirements when he was on the Commission. He cautioned this Commission to be aware but be careful about requirements. He suggested the applicant have their engineer present during the meeting as well as the Town Engineer.

Commissioner Couture asked what protocol was about having a Commissioner present at the Council meeting for planning appeals.

Councilmember Chignell stated that the Chair of the Commission could come if the Commission feels strongly about their decision. Mayor Breen added that the minutes of the meeting have all been read by the Council so they get a feel for why an action was taken. Councilmember Kroot said that it is also helpful to get a letter from the Commissioner, such as the one received from Commissioner Zwick about Blockbuster.

Consensus by Council and Commission was that once a month during General Discussion period, the Commission would take some time to discuss second units and downtown design guidelines.

**CONTINUED ITEMS**

1. **V-0030/DR-0033 – Bruce and Kelly Krill, 1640 San Anselmo Avenue, AP 5-191-23, setback variance to construct a 1,086 square foot first story addition within 6' of the northwest side property line (Code setback: 8')(this will necessitate removal of an existing shed, mudroom, and bathroom); design review and setback variance to construct a 649 square foot second story addition within 6' of the northwest side property line (Code setback: 8'); and setback variances to construct a 420 square foot garage within 6' of the northwest side property line and within 12.5' of the rear property line (Code setbacks: 8' side; 20' rear), on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff: Wight) CONTINUED TO 11/6/00**
2. **ER-0003/PS-0001/V/PDP-001/dDR-0029 – Tommy Kennedy, Between 41 and 43 Tomohawk Drive, A/P 177-250-31, environmental review (Negative Declaration), parcel split (with a street frontage exception as access will be**

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

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) CONTINUED TO 11/6/00

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Minutes – September 18<sup>th</sup> and October 2, 2000

M/s Zwick/Jochum to approve Consent Agenda.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

1. 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), AP 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.

Steve Murch, architect representing the applicant, stated that they have made further changes after hearing from the public and access will now be from Greenfield and exiting on to Smith Lane.

Chair House asked how the garage door would function for visitors to the building. Mr. Murch responded that now the access is through the building, they would require security. Access during the day would be remote and then after hours would be through card key system.

Commissioner Zwick stated that the small strip that is owned by the Town still lack definition. Mr. Murch stated that because it does not belong to them, they were unable to make a decision of what to do about it. They have analyzed the turning radius from the adjacent building and felt that leaving the area alone is the best way to deal with it.

With regard to the No Left Hand Turn, Ms. Wight suggested the Commission make a recommendation to the Traffic Safety Committee about the desire to require a no left hand turn at Smith Lane and Bank prior to the certificate of occupancy.

Robert Capurro, 15 Lincoln Park, stated that with the change made tonight they are half way there. The Town Council is aware of the traffic problems and some of the Traffic Safety Committee is aware of the issues - safety is his concern. He questioned the need for a security gate to the building, particularly in San Anselmo. He would suggest not only a no left turn but also a raised implement so it would not be used as a short cut.

Steve Newman, 2 Lincoln Park, is concerned about parking on Smith Lane. He asked if Greenfield could be opened up to two lanes so people would not divert to Smith Lane.

Mohamad Aljundi, 13 Smith Lane, asked why the public easement is given to the applicant from the Town. The two easements that have been given to the applicant have allowed him to develop a large building. He is opposed to the delivery zone in front of his building. Also the garbage containers are going to be placed too close to his home. He felt that the fundamentals of this project have not been discussed with the public.

Peter Abher, 59 Lincoln Avenue, stated that traffic at 4:00 p.m. is primarily cars that do not want to go through the HUB so they shortcut through Lincoln. Vehicles should prohibit driving through Lincoln between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. and even in the morning at certain hours.

Eddie Howars, 61 Lincoln Park, traffic on Lincoln, Bank and Greenfield has gotten progressively worse and someone should be hired to review how bad the parking is.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

Ron Foster, 21 Lincoln Park, stated that traffic can only get worse, and he is concerned about traffic and safety of the residents in the neighborhood.

Roger Bettini, 18 Bank Street, stated that they contend with commute traffic, traffic for the cleaners, the bar and the dance studio. He would like to have a traffic study done on Lincoln Park. The garbage company and taco store would bring additional traffic. Does the traffic engineer know about it being a bicycle designated pathway as well?

Eric Rosenquest, 18 Lincoln Park, questioned how some of the findings were made on the Environmental Checklist. He also wanted the lighting to the building to be secured at night.

Eric Swensen, 31 Lincoln Park, stated that making Greenfield two ways might be a great solution. It would eliminate the problems for Lincoln Park and would preserve the integrity of Lincoln Park.

Ed Cunningham 21 Lincoln Park, was concerned about current and future parking and traffic. Cars are backed up now on Lincoln Park. Added to this is the traffic light at Sir Francis Drake and Bank that also backs up traffic. People do use Lincoln as a way of getting to Sir Francis Drake. He would like to request a study of the area. He also likes the idea of having two lanes on Greenfield Avenue in front of the building.

Dean Larson, 17 Lincoln Park, is concerned about the traffic problems because of the development that will take place in the Lincoln Park area.

Tony Barberra, 19 Bank Street, want the Commission to consider the traffic and safety issues.

Commissioner Zwick said the project is worthwhile in many ways. The applicant has worked very hard and has listened to the public. He understands also about the public input. He can support the project with a few comments. He would like the area across from 13 Smith Lane either stripped, marked with ballards or something that marks the area for loading. He commended them for putting the landscaping in the street on Greenfield. Putting the access on Greenfield is also a big plus. He is opposed to locking the parking garage at night. It is only fair to give back to the public. He really believes in the left turn sign. Adding a little curb or planter on Smith Lane to restrict people would be a plus.

Commissioner Jochum said he voted approval at the last meeting and the applicant was smart in making the change to Greenfield. He agrees with stripping the triangle for deliveries only as suggested by Commissioner Zwick. Regarding the left turn only sign and making Greenfield two ways, both sound like a good idea. No left on Greenfield may be a better one. Rather than a requirement, he would rather make it a recommendation to the Traffic Safety Committee to look at all the traffic safety issues in the neighborhood to see what would solve the problems. Making Greenfield a two-way to the building would be a good solution but it should be reviewed by the Traffic Safety Committee. He would love to see parking available at night but he does not know if they can mandate public use of private property.

Commissioner Couture did not think the Commission should require the applicant to make the parking available to public parking. All the occupants of the building could use the building but guests would not use it, nor would they see it because it is recessed from the building. He is quite happy to see the traffic taken off Smith Lane on the narrowest portion and moving it into the wider section. The requirement for a no left turn should have strong language. Regarding two-way traffic on Greenfield, he not sure how that would work because of oncoming traffic from Sir Francis Drake. Regarding the delivery service area, it looks very unfinished; stripping would not look much better and people would probably still park there. He would favor a defined service area. The impact has been held to about a minimum of impact as possible.

Commissioner Zwick suggested that they use some of that area as a planter area and then strip with a yellow zone large enough for one vehicle.

Commissioner Jochum said he is now recommending that the Traffic Safety Committee take a close look at the situation. The traffic safety problems in the Lincoln Park area are far and above what other neighborhoods have experienced.

Chair House said the applicant has made numerous changes based on the Commission and neighborhood concerns. The garage door is a clever idea but she is concerned that they would not know it could be used. She is in favor of having the public use the lot in the evenings and on the weekend. She would like the staff to research as to whether or not it

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

could be used. She wants to know if lighting should be turned off at night or kept on. She wants the Traffic Safety Committee to look at traffic safety in general.

In response to Chair House's question about lighting, Ms. Wight stated that the police want it lit but it could be limited and downcast.

Commissioner Zwick directed the question to the applicant about night parking for the public. Mr. Macdonald responded that the majority of the neighbors would not like it. However, perhaps some would. He has been a tenant in the building and people use the alley as a short cut and it is unsafe if people would use the building as a shortcut. At night he would want it closed. He would however, consider it for special events.

Commissioner Zwick said he would like it to be used on special events. He suggested that the area enclosed with one way traffic be closed all the time but the area that is used for two way ingress and egress be used for the public. Mr. MacDonald responded that he would be happy to work with the public but he cannot be more direct.

Commissioners' Couture and Jochum said that they did not support the requirement to have public parking on private property.

M/s House/Zwick, and unanimously passed (4-0), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the resolution provided in the staff report, and amended as follows: staff to work with the applicant to modify the triangular area and stripe it appropriately; and landscape it to define the edge and define the loading area. Recommend strongly to the Traffic Safety Committee for no left turn sign at the corner and the Traffic Safety Committee review parking in general to make the neighborhood a very livable area.

Chair House advised all parties of interest of the ten day appeal period to the Town Council.

2. **U-0005/V-0018/DR-0022 – Chris Wong, 30 Carlson Court, A/P 5-062-72 – Design Review and Use Permit request, parking and rear 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) in the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff: Feagans)**

Ms. Feagans presented the staff report, noting that they have a 10-foot setback, not 4-foot setback, as stated in the public notice.

There being no opposition for or against the project, the Commission was able to approve the project as a consent item.

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.

Chair House advised all parties of interest of the ten day appeal period to the Town Council.

3. **V-0029/DR-0032 – Bob and Maureen Sena, 137 Humboldt, A/P 7-033-21, setback variances: to construct a lattice screen up to 8' above grade on a landing within 6' of the north side property line (Code setback: 8' if higher than 6'); a gate up to 8' above grade within 7' of the front property line (Code setback: 20' if higher than 6')(Foothill Road is the shortest street frontage, so it is considered the front property line); and to construct a fence up to 8'9" within 0" of the south side property line; design review amendment to change the exterior colors; design review amendment to the landscape plan: terraced retaining walls uncovered decks, stairs, screens, trellises, fences and gates, and plantings; and review of a conceptual proposal for a future design review amendment to the dwelling: living area additions: a 70 square foot terrace level in-fill of an enclosed, but unimproved, floor; a 145 square foot mid-level addition to replace an existing uncovered deck, and a 145 square foot upper level addition to replace an existing uncovered deck; on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' msl). (Staff: Wight)**

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Bob Sena, applicant, said he was hoping the Commission could look at the conceptual view so they could move ahead with a formal proposal. He only wants to know if he could enclose the decks.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

Chair House advised the applicant to contact staff after the meeting because the Commission cannot discuss an issue that is not formally before them.

With regard to the stone walls, Mr. Sena said that because the cost is too high, they are now proposing that half of the walls (the four walls that are curved) be wood and the other half of the walls be left in stone, which should reduce the price. They will be able to construct the walls within two weeks. They are requesting approval of hardi-plank and want to paint in a wood tone to protect it. The Zoning Ordinance states it should have a low visual profile and this is certainly a low profile.

Commissioner Zwick said the reason the previous Commission asked for the material and color they did was because it is a big house. He would like to leave the wood and color with the original approval. Otherwise he could support the proposal.

Commissioner Jochum said he does not like hardi-plank and would rather it did not happen because it is one of the cheapest products around. He wanted to hear what the other Commissioners had to say.

Commissioner Couture said that the lighting on their plan calls for scones and up lights and a hanging lantern. Ms. Wight responded that all lighting has to be hooded, down lights with low voltage. He was not opposed to the applicant's proposing a change after a six-year approval. He would like to see a natural color and he has no problem with what is being proposed, especially if it is next to a yellow and blue house. He can support the application with down lights.

Commissioner Zwick said it is the planters that are difficult to detail. It is attractive in terms of maintenance but a lot of the boards have swelled up. Hardi-plank has a longer life span.

Ms. Sena said they are proposing a different siding because they cannot stain the existing exterior with the exact color because it would have to be stained every two years. The scaffolding alone would cost too much.

M/s Zwick/Couture, and unanimously passed (4-0), to approve the material change to the walls as shown on the plans date stamped received by the San Anselmo Planning Department on October 16, 2000; approval of the removal of the two cedar trees on the south side; denial of the siding change, and approval of the color of the existing siding to be a natural color to preserve the wood, which will be subject to administrative approval by Planning staff; all exterior lighting will be low level light, low wattage light fixtures, which cast downward direction.

Chair House advised all parties of interest of the ten day appeal period to the Town Council.

Ms. Fritz, 139 Humboldt addressed the Commission and asked why there was no discussion about the cypress tree. Chair House said it was discussed in the Staff Report and the Commission had no problem with staff recommendation and no one from the audience addressed any concern.

M/s House/Zwick, and unanimously passed, to re-open 139 Humboldt application to strictly address the cypress tree.

Susan Fritz, 139 Humboldt wanted to know if the two cypress trees could stay for three years, if not five years.

Bob Sena, applicant, said the trees are flammable and close to his house and he simply does not think the neighbor can change the design and character of their property.

M/s Zwick/Couture, and unanimously passed (4-0), to have the property owners do what they want with the cypress trees on their own property.

4. DR-0031 – B.J. Acker and J. L. Hitta, 49 Canyon Road, A/P 7-064-17, design review of a 75 square foot uncovered deck on the top floor of the east side of the dwelling, and the addition of a California-framed roof over the existing dormer on the north side of the existing roof, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' msl). (Staff: Wight)

Ms. Wight presented the Staff Report.

B. J. Acker, c0-applicant, was asking for a change to the dormer so it looked nicer. The proposed deck on the side was for aesthetic purposes. She was quite surprised about

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

the neighbor's letter in opposition. They built a little bridge over the creek and planted some trees. She noted that the east side deck is over an existing deck.

Nellie Dolensik, 37 Canyon Road, said her complaints are from previous work but the fact remains that this is not a simple addition, it is an accumulative affect. She has lost privacy and there has been increased noise from the decks. The required finding #2 stated protection against noise. This property is the only one that all the land on the other side of the creek has been placed with structures. The unfinished fencing means they have to look at a huge play structure and dogs barking. The noise amplifies and adding another deck would make it unbearable. The neighbors have the benefit of staff coming into their homes but staff has not seen the impact from inside her house. She would like to add large windows at some time in the future because her light is limited but the noise impact would increase the noise. A realtor has stated that her house has been impacted and the value has been reduced. She noted that trees were removed without permits, which was verified by the building inspector.

John Wallace, 25 Canyon Road, said the neighbor on the east side of his lot protested the windows that would face his house when the house was being built. They now have no view of the east side. The canyon is a redwood grove and peaceful. If they were to develop their lot the same as 49 Canyon, it would be from the street front to the open space. The only outdoor space on his deck has been disturbed by the barking dogs and noise coming from the children who are playing in the play structure. To add another deck would create more noise. He has no problems with the dormer but has problems with any further impact on the tranquility in the canyon. The problem is cumulative. They have decks on three sides of their home now.

Chair House stated that the Marin Humane Society gives classes on how to train dogs so they don't bark. She agreed that the canyon is like a sound container and therefore magnifies everything. There are also a lot of feelings about people noise. She recommends the neighbors talk to each other. If that does not work out there is a County mediation service that can work with the neighbors.

Commissioner Zwick said he is sympathetic to the owner of 37 Canyon in that she feels the way she does. However, he has no problem with the proposal. He likes the idea of having the fence and approving the variance for the neighbor to add landscaping to the fence.

Commissioner Jochum said he does not have much to add. The deck would provide slightly more privacy for the neighbor. When they are inside the 3-½ foot deck would shield the bedrooms. Regarding the noise, if they were noisy on the front deck they would be noisy on this deck.

Commissioner Couture said that visually the deck will be a screen but it could be a noise impact on the deck. The additional deck will not increase the noise but noise is out of the commission's control. The dormer is fine. He would not support a variance for the fence and it should be taken down to 6'.

M/s Zwick/Jochum and unanimously passed (3-0), to move the staff report except for the fence, which needs a variance.

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

Commissioner Zwick asked to recuse himself for the rest of the meeting but conveyed support for the application.

5. **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 foot single story house, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' msl). (Staff: Feagans).**

M/s House/Jochum, and unanimously passed, to continue the application to the meeting of November 6, 2000, due to the application having insufficient information.

6. **DR-0035 – Laura Merrill, 285 Redwood Road, A/P 7-097-06, Design Review to construct a new 3,613 square foot house and 500 square foot garage in the R-1H Zoning District. (Staff: Feagans)**

Ms. Feagans presented the staff report.

Laura Merrill, applicant, said the size is almost 700 square feet smaller than what is allowed. They tried to go under the maximum size because of the concerns of the

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

neighbors. Therefore they designed it with the minimum of what they could live with. She is not sure why the height is an issue, she thinks she is under it and the house is stepped into the hillside. They have a very aggressive tree replacement as well as an arborist report to protect existing trees. The staff report indicates it is not visible from Redwood Road but may be from across the valley. Because they are planting 65 trees, that could screen the house from across the valley. They want the windows on the north elevation because of the view and they also have no southern exposure. Glare and reflection should not be a problem. Some of the windows are actually wrapping around and not on a flat surface. There is also a roof overhang and a railing that breaks up the large expanse of windows. The bottom level would be screened by trees. They have submitted a drainage plan. The footprint is 2,820 square feet, which is only 9 percent of permeable surface. Therefore drainage can be handled sufficiently. They would contribute \$2,900 to the town. They have already agreed to widen Redwood Road to 15 feet.

Chair House said she would like the applicant to meet with the neighbors, particularly with respect to drainage, She would like to see the neighbor's concerns mitigated, which would shorten the review process by the Commission.

Jonathan Braun, 479 Scenic Avenue, said the visual impact is a very key issue. This is a really massive elevation from the north. He will be looking down and into the development. 49 trees will be removed and the house is 64 feet wide. A 120-foot long retaining wall is proposed and other retaining walls that are over 10 feet in height that from a distance would create a massive set of walls. There are inconsistencies on the plan; the site plan has a note #2 that all runoff would go to a city drain off but drainage plan states it would be a dispersal plan. There are also some retaining walls that are not shown. The height of the retaining wall to the peak is 44 feet, which is based on average grade. He proposes to limit that by rethinking the large retaining wall below the house, which also impinges on a number of oak trees. The construction, compaction and water concentration would limit the life of the tree. He would like to incorporate a dark pigment, which would have made it recede. There should be a deed restriction that the trees outside of the building envelope cannot be windowed. There should also be a requirement that the foundation shall be verified by a surveyor prior to the pour. One of the retaining walls comes very close to a mature 24-inch oak and it could have an impact on the tree. The parcel is on a ridgeline. The elevation of the ridgeline of the house is higher than the ridge. Ceiling heights are nine feet and 13 feet on the upper story and they can be reduced.

Kathy Sanders, 310 Redwood Road, stated that Objective 9 of the General Plan must be regulated by the Planning Commission. Wants them to also follow 9.7. There are a series of concrete retaining walls, which have an adverse impact from Redwood Road and the contours of the parcel would be disturbed. She advocates the removal of the lower retaining wall. Policy 9.3 and 9.4 should be adhered as well. There are several trees that are being removed for this project.

Peter Fowler, 419 Redwood Road, said that the north elevation could possibly benefit from changes in its visual mass. He would like to be convinced that it is not possible to retain more trees on the site. Many trees have already been lost due to the oak tree disease.

Kay Kagy, Redwood Road, said her main concern is the drainage. She would like to coordinate the road widening with the Dwyers at 289 Redwood Road; particularly the blind curve at the high cliff area. It could be cost effective and less disruptive. The plan calls for perforated pipes downslope onto the ground; the closed pipe system is called for on the architectural plans. The geological engineer was the peer review for the drainage plan. He suggested a closed system at Redwood Road. She would be in favor of this but it poses another problem. A condition of approval for Mr. Dwyer's application to be connected down to Allyn Avenue and then into the creek. That pipe has not yet been connected. That should be in place prior to a building permit for this application. The neighbors down hill would feel a great deal of relief.

Lowell Dwyer, 289 Redwood, is in favor of the project. He is well aware of the drainage problems with Ms. Kagy and will take care of it as soon as possible. The replacement trees would go a long way of taking care of the tree removal. The house is being built into the hillside and he is in favor of the house.

Kevin Williams, architect representing the applicant, said the site is extremely steep, which forces the house to be on multiple levels. They want to have some outdoor space, that is the reason for decks, as well as terraces, which has created the long retaining wall. Hillside houses seem to be inefficient in their outdoor space. The attempt and design of the house is to push it into the hillside and limit the cut and fill and step the house down the hill. Feel this is an appropriate amount of stepping down the hillside and it is well



**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

below the 30' height limit. The drawings seem to show the house in the best way. Other renderings could better represent the forms of the house. The glass is mostly on the north side and limited on the other sides.

Commissioner Couture wanted to know why they placed the house where it is. Mr. Williams responded that they tried to come off the road with a minimum of downhill slope. The upper floors are the garage and entrance level and then it goes downhill to the living areas. If the house were stepped down the hill more, any driveway with a steeper slope would be a major problem and the Town does not allow more than a 25 percent slope. Regarding the optimum spot that would not result in tree removal, the site is just solid trees, although they tried to minimize the large oak removal.

In response to a question by the Commission, Mr. Williams stated that the windows would be metal clad, wood windows. The architectural drawings were done prior to the drainage plan and that is why the discrepancy. Therefore, civil engineer has more current information. Also, the retaining wall is concrete.

Commissioner Couture asked about drainage and soils information. Ms. Feagans stated that the drainage report is preliminary and she wants to get more information from the Public Works Director. The information does not discuss the connecting of the Dwyer pipe.

Commissioner Couture said that based on the size of the project, there is not enough information yet for him to make a decision. He wants to see what it would look like from across the valley and would like additional story poles, and if orange tape were placed on the poles, it would be easier to view. The story poles need to be shown on the site plan. Not sure what the driveway materials and driveway would look like and the type of material used is important. The terrace seems to be quite gracious on the site and would have an impact on the trees; not shown if it is sod or irrigated. Breaking up the long retaining wall would help. The size of the house seems okay but the mass is his concern.

Commissioner Jochum asked for clarification on the height. Ms. Feagans stated that you could go to 35 feet in the hillside. She measured it at 39 feet but she did not do an average of the elevations.

Commissioner Jochum stated that he likes the house. The north elevation could be helped a lot to shadow the building. He would like to see the story pole plan. If they want to see the site he is not sure the additional poles would help. He has no comment on the drainage and soils information at this time. Size of the house is fine and done architecturally fine and not out of character with the neighborhood. He would suggest new elevations that would show the articulation better.

Chair House said that the house is large and would like a swatch of color put on the house after it is constructed before she can make a final determination on color. Wants a requirement that the landscaping would have a drip irrigation system. Part of the problem with all the windows is the light that comes out of them at night. She wants a different rendering because it is difficult to see how the building is articulated. She understands the desire to have a flat outdoor space, unfortunately they are difficult in the hillsides and there are too many retaining walls required for that space. It needs to be reduced in size. She supports the idea for the deed restriction regarding the current trees. They may want to look at the plate height in reducing the building height. She wants to see if drainage plan.

M/s Jochum/Couture, and unanimously passed (3-0), to continue to the meeting of 11/20/00.

7. **V-0033/DR-0036/U-0009 – Pete Pederson, 637 and 641 San Anselmo Avenue and 14 Kientz Lane, 637 San Anselmo Avenue: 1) Design Review; 2) Use Permit to create a 475 square foot studio apartment in the rear portion of the existing dry cleaner business (637 San Anselmo Avenue); and 3) Parking Variance for two tandem spaces: 1 standard 9'x19' and 1 compact 8'x16' (Code requires 7 standard spaces (6 for cleaner and 1 for residential unit). Project also includes creating outdoor patio/dining area behind the cleaners and coffee shop and exterior improvements to the 1 bedroom apartment/storage building at 14 Kientz Lane. 641 San Anselmo Avenue: 1) Use Permit to create an 800 square foot studio apartment in the rear portion of the ceramic business; and 2) Parking Variance for two 8'x19' spaces (Code requires 8: 7 for ceramics business); 1 for residential unit). Project also includes commercial Design Review to renovate and upgrade the rear elevations of the business, including landscape and drainage improvements. Property is located within the C-2 Zoning District. (Staff: Feagans)**

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2000**

Ms. Feagans gave a brief staff report.

Pete Pederson, architect representing the applicant, stated that this started as a drainage problem. They wanted to change the warehouse feeling and wanted to tie the building together. They are doing a more modest approval from what was previously approved. They are increasing the planting and adding trellising and want to tidy up the back of the building.

Commissioner Couture asked if there are other first level residential in the downtown area. Ms. Feagans said there is no policy against it. Generally, the Town wants to preserve the first story retail space along San Anselmo Avenue.

Commissioner Couture said he can appreciate the need for small units in the rear. There seems to be quite a lack of windows in the units. Mr. Pederson stated that there are existing skylights and they are proposing partial glass windows.

Commissioner Couture said that there is a courtyard and he would like to see the units opened up to the courtyard, even by just a window, but it is purely a recommendation.

Allyn Styer, owner, stated that he wants to utilize the spaces in the rear. People who are in retail do not want to use the rear space in such a long narrow building. This is a way to have two fronts, which also allows for economic housing.

Commissioner Couture said that this project may be a blue print of doing it more in town.

Chair House asked about the window type. Mr. Pedersen responded that some are existing, double clad windows. Would be happy with true divided lights.

Mr. Styer responded that he will not use cheap materials.

Chair House said her concern is that it looked a little busy and wanted comments from the other Commissioners.

Commissioner Couture said that this is a funky place to live and doing things a little different with old windows and doors would be wonderful.

Commissioner Jochum agreed. It looks like an old town train station and it would look terrific.

Chair House asked if there is a proposal to address the air conditioner units above the door. Mr. Styer stated that he has not talked to the tenants about long term leases but want to address the air conditioning units at that time.

Chair House said the planters in front looked good but the flowers are now dead. She would like to see a drip irrigation system in the planter boxes.

Mr. Styer stated that he wants to beautify and improve the property and has no problem with that.

Chair House stated that the parking in the rear is reserved parking now for employees. She would not like to have it reserved for employees but would like it available to the public. Mr. Styer stated that he would be willing to work with staff with logical recommendations. Ms. Feagans noted that it was not unreasonable to condition the project that way because they are asking for a parking variance.

M/s Couture/Jochum, and unanimously passed (3-0), to approve the project with the added condition that parking cannot be reserved for employees only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

**BARBARA CHAMBERS  
PLANNING TECHNICIAN**