

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 1989

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order on August 21, 1989 at 8:00 p.m. in the Town Council Chamber by chairman Sias. Staff present: Lisa Wight.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Hayes, Kroot, Yarish, Kanis, Julin,
Sias

Commissioners Absent: Harle

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. U-629/U-633 - Lenny Lerner, 1535 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-153-01, six month review of use permit to allow: 1) automotive repairs; and 2) cellular telephone sales, service and installation.; and review of current proposal for two canopies on the west side of the building.

Joel Lerner and their Attorney, George Silvestri, were present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report noting that the applicant has presented two schemes for the awning but prefers "B". In addition the fabric samples are only available for scheme "B" and the applicant would like the Blue and gray.

Commissioner Julin questioned the purpose of the bus on the premises and Commissioner Kanis asked about the limo.

Mr. Silvestri said he was not familiar as to why the vehicles are parked there but the bus is registered to Mr. Lerner.

Joel Lerner said the "inquire within" sign and the limo can be removed from the site if the Commission prefers. They keep used clothing in the bus which they sell at the Flea Market. He was under the impression that as long as they did not exceed four parked cars on the lot, there would be no objection.

Commissioner Hayes said he was comfortable with the six month review of the use permit in that it does not violate the spirit of the use but was concerned about the bus being on the premise and does not believe it is compatible with the use. The area should not be viewed as a parking lot in the "off hours". He supported staff's recommendations and would like staff to work with the applicant to find plants that will grow in the planter boxes. He preferred option "B" noting that the colors proposed were not offensive.

Commissioner Kroot supported the application saying that the business was being run within the terms of the use permit and the other recommendations from staff.

Commissioner Yarish thought the applicant has done a good job of complying with his use but would prefer to have the trailer and bus removed. He did not like either proposal for the awnings, noting that he thought they were light and flimsy.

Commissioner Kanis thought scheme "A" was a more interesting design and that a solid blue would be more attractive than the colors proposed. The limo should be removed from the site because it is not part of the use approval.

Commissioner Julin agreed with staff's recommendations and suggested drought tolerant plants on Oak Knoll and Sir Francis Drake rather than annuals. She would prefer scheme "A" in a solid color for the awning.

Chairman Sias endorsed the use permit but wants to see the bus removed because the site is not to be used as a storage area. He also agreed with staff's recommendations. With regard to the awning, he would prefer a solid color in scheme "B".

M/S Yarish, Kroot approve U-629 - Lenny Lerner, 1535 Sir Francis Drake Blvd, A/P 5-153-01, six month review of use permit to allow 1) automotive repairs; and 2) cellular telephone sales, service and installation on the basis that the premises has been maintained largely in compliance and that there will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the Town; and the granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner. The special conditions are: a) deer resistant, drought tolerant plants to be in all the planter boxes and properly maintained (staff recommends consultation with a local nursery or the Sunset Western Garden Book) b) dismantled car and trailer be removed from the property; c) the two additional banner signs, "Interstate Batteries" will be permitted; d) no signs be posted in vehicles;

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 1989

Discussion:

Commissioner Hayes asked if the bus and limo should be part of the motion. Commissioner Julin said that overnight storage was for customers having their cars detailed. Chairman Sias concurred with Julin.

Mr. Silvestri said that they will be happy to move the bus off site or out of site, whatever the Commission would like.

M/S Sias, Hayes to amend the motion to include: e) vehicles not necessary for the business purposes for which a use permit has been granted are to be removed from the property.

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

There was a further discussion about the color and design of the awning. Commissioner Hayes would prefer a solid color that blends in with what is there now. Commissioner Kroot said the canopy would be very visible from the street and would like to see pictures of the building, including the canopy proposed for scheme "B". Commissioner Kanis did not think this application should drag on to a future meeting and therefore was prepared to vote for scheme "B" and agree to the samples proposed by the applicant. Commissioner Julin preferred a solid color.

M/S Hayes, Kroot, to continue U-633 until the meeting of September 11, 1989 for the purpose of additional details, including colors for scheme "B" as shown on the plans dated 7/1/89. The central objective is to choose colors that will minimize visual impact of the proposed structural.

Ayes: Kroot, Julin, Hayes, Sias, Hayes

Noes: Kanis

2. V-2300 - John Paletta, 903 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-114-11, a 20 foot rearyard variance and a 5 foot west sideyard variance for the remodel and reconstruction of a one car garage (by more than 50 percent) within 0 feet of the rear property line and within 3 feet of the west side property line; a 6'9" east sideyard variance, a 6" east sideyard variance, a 9 foot rearyard variance, a 16'6" rearyard variance, and a 16' frontyard variance for architectural trellis extensions to be within 5'3" of the east side property line; within 11'6" of the east side property line; within 11' of the rear property line, within 16'6" of the rear property line; and within 4' of the front property line; a 2'6" frontyard variance for a bay window extension to be within 17'6" of the front property line; a 5'2" foot rearyard variance for garbage can and hot water heater enclosures to be within 14'10" of the rear property line; and a 4" width variance for two parking spaces to be substandard in width measuring 8'8" each - AFTER THE FACT.

The applicant, and his architect, Art Chartock, were present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

Mr. Chartock presented a slide show of the project relating to the variances. He stated for the record that there was no malicious intent on their part in doing this project and that the window bay was added because it seemed logical to increase the dining area. He thought it was in the setbacks and did not realize until recently that it would require a variance. It was Mr. Chartock's understanding that he had building approval and all the work was within the setbacks. He noted that other houses in the neighborhood are very close to the property line.

Jean Arnold, 108 Madrone, is unable to get in and out of her driveway if cars are parked in front of the applicants property and she feels the trellises are a hazard. She wanted to know what controls can be placed on future projects so builder will have to build what was approved.

Bill Permar, 113 Madrone, said the plans approved through the Planning Department do not reflect what was built. He said this project has removed 140 feet of parking by adding the second unit on a street that has existing parking problems. He said that there was no reason to enclose the carport when the variance was originally approved, therefore there should be no need now. This dwelling is the highest density for any house on Madrone.

Gail Permar, 113 Madrone, presented documents showing the original drawings that were approved through Planning and pointed out the differences of what was actually constructed. She added that there are three meters for two units. She would like to see the improvements taken out of the garage and have the carport reinstated as originally approved and have a maximum of two meters. The kitchen window over the sink looks out into her livingroom and she would like to have that changed or modified. In addition, she would like the washer/dryer drain be restricted to 2" rather than 4" and 3/8" jib board should be on the parking wall. Lastly, she said there is an inadequate fire exit from one of the sleeping areas because the porch was enclosed.

Mr. Chartock said that parking and roof structure are virtually the same as it was prior to the remodel. The intent of the third meter was to have the washer and dryer and the outside lights on a

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 1989

separate meter. The applicant is willing to sign a deed restriction stating there will only be two units on the site.

Ms. Wight said that UBC specifies a 4" drain is minimum for a washer/dryer. With regard to the kitchen window, it is not in the setbacks and therefore not an issue. Also, the question about number of meters is not a planning issue.

Commissioner Kroot was sympathetic with the neighbors although many of the items addressed as problems are within the setbacks and not planning items. He did not think the placement of the water heater would be a detriment and the owner has also said he would sign a deed restriction about only two units. With regard to the bay window, it would have been better if it was done with the proper approvals but he did not think it was a detriment. The bay window works well with the floor plan and looks towards San Anselmo Avenue, not Madrone. He viewed the trellis as attractive. He therefore supports the variances.

Commissioner Yarish echoed the comments of Kroot, adding that he visually liked the addition of the bay window at the northeast corner of the building. He felt that accurate drawings should be submitted to the building department that reflect the changes.

Commissioner Kanis concurred with Kroot and added that he appreciated the concerns of the neighbors that there should not be a 3rd unit at the site. He said he could support the application because many of the concerns of the neighbors are not within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission, and those relating to the garage would not be a detriment.

Commissioner Julin was in support of the recommendations in the staff report. She feels the addition is out of scale in the neighborhood and the trellises add to an already bulky building.

Commissioner Hayes agreed that many of the issues could not be addressed because they are within the setbacks but was concerned about the permanency of the parking, noting that he wanted it to remain the way it was originally proposed. He also wanted to guarantee that there would not be a 3rd unit on the site in the future. Overall, he felt that the project is an asset to the community because of the design.

Chairman Sias wanted to see the skylights and insulation removed from the garage. He could approve the variances relative to the parking and trellises. He was not able to make the findings for the bay window because it was previously approved without it. The presence of a dining room is not necessary. He was dismayed that the applicant did not know the appropriate procedures to follow. Although not a planning issue, Chairman Sias wanted to make sure the safety issues were addressed in the Building Department and hoped the applicant heard the concerns of the neighbor and raised the kitchen window to allow for privacy.

There was a discussion as to whether revised drawings should be submitted to the Planning Commission prior to making a decision on this matter. The consensus was to have the matter continued until the next meeting to allow the applicant time to present new drawings.

Mr. Chartock said the owner would prefer the Commission to reach a decision tonight, noting that any revisions would be relatively minor than what is already in the Building Department.

M/S Julin, Kanis, to continue V-2300 - John Paletta, 903 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-114-11, to the next meeting of September 11, 1989 to allow time for revised drawings showing "as built" elevations of the garage and duplex be prepared by the applicant and reviewed by the Planning Commission.

All ayes.

After the break there was discussion among the Commissioners as to the length of the agenda and the hour approaching 10:00 p.m. It was likely that they would not get past Item Number 5. Applicants John and Nancy Riordan, 121 Oak wanted to be heard regardless of the hour. Applicants Mr. and Mrs. Patton, 219 Laurel and Gabriel and Carol Freqoso, 60 Tamalpais, would be willing to be continued until the next meeting of September 11, 1989.

3. C-501 - Rosie Echelmeier and Essam Elmahgoop, 145 Tunstead Avenue, A/P 7-251-13, appeal of Planning Director's approval of: 1) expansion of the flower market use to the front building and continued use of the rear building; 2) the exterior color change - AFTER THE FACT; and 3) use approval of a wine wholesaler for a 159 square foot area within the rear building for primary use as an office and secondary use for wine storage.

The applicants were present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report, adding that she has prepared a preliminary agreement based on what she thought were the concerns of both parties.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 1989

Rosie Echelmeier said that when the front of the building was for lease she received encouragement from her neighbors to expand her business. She wanted to paint the building to reflect her business and was unaware that she needed approval for this. When she painted the back wall her neighbor did not like it and added white color to the paint to decrease the pink tone to satisfy her neighbors. Now her neighbors have appealed staff's opinion and she does not feel she should have to repaint for the third time. She was continued from the last meeting because her neighbors were going on vacation and would not be present but they never went on vacation. The delays are causing her great costs and she is anxious to open her business.

Essam Elmahgoop said that on May 12, 1989 he posted the appropriate signs on the building from the Alcoholic Beverage Control stating that he was proposing to have a liquor wholesale business on the premises and there were no complaints. With regard to the concerns about the neighbors eight year old daughter's safety because of the nature of his business, he is a wholesaler, not retailer. He said the liquor license requires that he also have an importers license from the Federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms but he has not applied for an application for firearms and has no intention to have them on the premises.

Susanne Lindelli, 159 Tunstead, presented photographs showing of the rear wall as viewed from her kitchen. She said her intent was not to put the applicant out of business but she had several concerns as follows: 1) the liquor wholesale business attracts bad people and she has an eight year old daughter; 2) the liquor business will also have a permit for firearms; 3) the posting of the liquor license was in the rear of the building and went unnoticed because it was posted in the rear of the building; 4) exhaust fumes come up into her kitchen and she suggests the applicant construct a wall to separate the two buildings; 5) was unsatisfied with the colors of the building and would like to have the applicant repaint the sides and rear of the building to a more subdued color; and 6) the owner of the property was not notified of the color change.

Vic Canby, 141 Tunstead, felt that the applicant was a good neighbor but was concerned about the use for the easement between the buildings. The color of the building could have an adverse impact for him specifically because he has a prospective tenant who is a photographer and the glare would affect his building. In addition, he would like to continue this item until the two owners can work out the problems associated with the easement. He feels the wholesale liquor business is too intense a use for the site.

Igor Canby, 141 Tunstead, said the questions regarding the use of the driveway easement between the two properties has not been worked out yet between the two property owners.

Al Lindelli, 159 Tunstead, does not like the color because of the reflection into his dining room and does not approve of the wholesale liquor business on the site.

Steve Heath, 69 Tamalpais, said he was able to obtain 60 plus signatures in support of the applicant. In addition, the Lindelli's house is yellow, which, like pink, is a pastel color, and the applicant's colors are in keeping with the neighborhood. He felt the real issue is that there was a commercial business next to a home.

Barbara Smitt, said she is a frequent customer of the shop and loves to bring her grandchildren to admire the flowers. The shop was very clean but very cramped and therefore time for Ms. Echelmeier to expand. She did not think fumes from vehicles parked in the easement could be an issue because there is a distance of 30 or so feet. She felt the Town needed some added color and she did not object to the colors that were used.

- Andy Corwin, 150 Tunstead, thought the color of the building was attractive and would actually benefit the Lindelli's flower business because of the complementary colors.

Buzz Cruezer, 169 Tunstead, did not like the color of the building and thought the liquor business was already at the maximum capacity for the site now and would increase traffic.

Paul Elliott, 57 Summit, thought there would be precedent setting if the wholesale liquor business was permitted and he was concerned about safety for the children because his children play with the Lindell's child.

Neil Wolf, 192 Tunstead, did not think the color of the building matched his taste but it is not his building. He said that there currently is a wine broker across the street on Tunstead and there have been no problems. He felt parking in the area has been a problem for a long time and this use will not cause an increase.

Ms. Echelmeier said she has not parked a vehicle between the buildings in over a year and therefore the fumes are not an issue. She noted that when Mr. Canby had his building painted she paid a portion of the costs. She said that she was unaware that permits were necessary to paint her building and she was only trying to have her building reflect her business. She said she has an agreement with Mr. Elmahgoop that he is not going to expand his business.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 1989

Mr. Elmagoop commented that if the neighbors were unable to view the 30 day posted sign regarding the potential for a wholesale liquor business, how would the children be affected if no one can see the business.

Vic Canby said he went through the appropriate channels for his building and was given approval from the Planning Commission. If this appeal is denied it will have an impact on his building and he might have to make modifications.

Robert Herman 120 Brookmead Court, son-in-law to the owner of 145 Tunstead, said they are working on an agreement regarding the easement and they have agreed to have the wholesale liquor business sublet from Rosie Echelmeier as long as the space is not increased from 159 square feet.

Commissioner Yarish thought The Flower Market expansion is a great idea and that the liquor wholesaler would not threaten the neighborhood. With regard to color, he did not feel the colors used were that much different than other buildings in the area although it would be nice for both parties to mutually agree on a color facing the appellant's house.

Ms. Echelmeier said she did not have earth tones in mind for her building, and suggest that the appellants erect a lattice fence and plant ivy on it to shield her building from them.

Commissioner Kanis felt that The Flower Market was wonderful and a benefit to the community and that the liquor wholesale business as described, had no public access and a limited business. With regards to the security issue, it should be noted that liquor businesses are more secure than other businesses because of the monitoring by officials. He did not think the sides and rear of the building needed to be the same as the front. He thought the colors in the front should remain. He also felt that the cost to repaint the rest of the building should be shared by the appellants.

Commissioner Julin thought the expansion of the flower market was wonderful and the wholesale liquor business was an appropriate use for the location. She thought the colors for the entire building were quite appropriate for the neighborhood and in line with the colors of the neighbor's house. She felt the issues regarding the easements are disputes between the property owners and not a planning issue.

Commissioner Hayes supported the use, including the agreement describing the conditions prepared by staff. He said he takes note of the glare into the neighbors home and thought there should be a mutually agreed upon color to satisfy the owner of the business and the neighbors for the rear of the building. Whatever was decided would be acceptable to him. He felt, however, that the cost should be borne by the applicant.

Commissioner Kroot thought the color on the rear of the building would have a negative impact on the neighbors. He would like to see the color "toned down" to a mutually agreed upon color by the neighbors and the applicant.

Chairman Sias agreed that the rear building needs to be addressed and would like to see the neighbors and the applicant work together to find a suitable color.

M/S Hayes, Kanis, to deny the appeal of the Lindells from the Planning Department approval of C-501 - Rosie Echelmeier and Essam Elmagoop, 145 and 145A Tunstead Avenue, A/P 7-251-13, appeal of Planning Director's approval of: 1) expansion of The Flower Market use to the front building known as 145 Tunstead; and 2) continued use of the rear building known as 145A Tunstead, on the grounds that they will not be a detriment to the neighborhood and conditioned upon the uses described in the staff report dated August 21, 1989.

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

M/S Hayes, Yarish, to uphold a portion of the Lindellis appeal from Planning Department's approval of C-501 - Rosie Echelmeier and Essam Elmagoop, A/P 7-251-13, and deny a portion of the appeal of the exterior color on the front and rear buildings, known as 145 and 145A Tunstead Avenue, as follows: a) The exterior colors on the front building, known as 145 Tunstead Avenue, are to remain as currently existing. b) The exterior color on the rear building be changed to a color mutually agreed to by the applicant and appellants, and that such color is to be compatible with the color of the front building. c) The exterior walls of the rear building are to be painted to the mutually accepted color within 30 days, and failure to do so will result in staff's referral of this matter back to the Planning Commission for their color selection. Further, that the cost of repainting the walls of the rear building is to be borne by the applicant. The basis for upholding this appeal is granted on the basis that the color as painted on the rear building presents unacceptable glare from the appellants building.

Ayes: Julin, Yarish, Hayes, Kroot, Sias

Noes: Kanis

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 1989

4. V-2300 - Tom and Susan MacAusland, 42 Barber Avenue, A/P 6-191-03, a 17' rearyard variance to reconstruct a first story addition within 3' of the rear property line; a 4' south sideyard variance to construct a first story addition within 8' of the south side property line; a 14.5' frontyard variance to construct a first story addition within 5.5' of the front property line; a 10' frontyard variance and a 5' north sideyard variance to construct a garage within 10' of the front property line and within 3' of the north side property line; a 3' north sideyard variance to construct a first story addition within 5' of the north side property line; a 3' rearyard variance and a 14' frontyard variance to construct a second story addition within 17' of the rear property line and within 6' of the front property line (the additions are to have a 2' roof overhang); and a parking variance for a second required parking space to be substandard in length.

The applicants were present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

M/S Kroot, Julin, to approve, V-2300 - Tom and susan MacAusland, 42 Barber Avenue, A/P 6-191-03, a 17' rearyard variance to reconstruct a first story addition within 3' of the rear property line; a 4' south sideyard variance to construct a first story addition within 8' of the south side property line; a 14.5' frontyard variance to construct a first story addition within 5.5' of the front property line; a 10' frontyard variance and a 5' north sideyard variance to construct a garage within 10' of the front property line and within 3' of the north side property line; a 3' north sideyard variance to construct a first story addition within 5' of the north side property line; a 3' rearyard variance and a 14' frontyard variance to construct a second story addition within 17' of the rear property line and within 6' of the front property line (the additions are to have a 2' roof overhang); and a parking variance for a second required parking space to be substandard in length on the basis: 1. Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under an identical zoning classification, and the granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated specifically the small size of the dwelling and this is the only place the house can be added to; and 2. The granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner, specifically this is a much smaller house then others in the neighborhood and will still remain a small house; and 3. The granting of such variance, under the circumstances of the particular case, will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood, specifically the letter of support from 24 Barber. This approval is conditioned that the applicants plant privets in any open space between No. 24 and also that the applicants protect the elm tree. This id based on the drawings dated 6/10/89.

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

5. U-579/V-1028 - Jack Doherty, Golden Years Retirement Home, 931 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-114-21, an amendment to the existing use permit and parking variance to add two additional guest rooms.

Commissioner Kroot stepped down.

The applicant was present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

Mr. Doherty said he wants to provide a private room for each person.

All the Commissioners supported the application. Commissioner Hayes added that his support for the variance is strongly influenced by the fact that this business is a public service and therefor is warranted.

M/S Yarish, Kanis, to approve U-579/V-1028 - Jack Doherty, Golden Years Retirement Home, 931 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-114-21, an amendment to the existing use permit and parking variance to add two additional guest rooms on the basis: Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under an identical zoning classification, and the granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated, specifically that due to the use of the property, the number of guests is being reduced from 23 to 20 persons, which should, therefore, decrease the need for on-site parking; and the granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner so that he can have single rooms rather than double rooms for his residents; and The granting of the variance will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 1989

property of the applicant and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood.

Ayes: Julin, Hayes, Yarish, Sias, Kanis
Abstain: Kroot

6. V-2301 - John and Nancy Riordan, 121 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-271-44, a third story variance to create living area in an existing unfinished and enclosed space.

The applicants were present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

Mrs. Riordan said they needed the addition for their growing family.

M/S Kanis, Julin, to approve V-2301 - John and Nancy Riordan, 121 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-271-44, a third story variance to create living area in an existing unfinished and enclosed space on the basis: 1. due to special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under an identical zoning classification, and the granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated; and 2. The granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner; specifically that this addition will provide a den and family room for their growing family; and 3. The granting of such variance, under the circumstances of the particular case, will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood. This is based on the drawings provided for tonight's meeting dated 8/21/89.

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

7. V-2302 - Mr. and Mrs. Patton, 219 Laurel Avenue, A/P 7-161-23, a 5 foot rearyard variance to construct an open deck within 9 feet of the rear property line; and a 7 foot rearyard variance to install a hot tub within 13 feet of the rear property line; and a height variance for a wood privacy screen fence up to 9 feet in height to be constructed surrounding the decks. CONTINUED UNTIL SEPTEMBER 11, 1989.

8. V-2303 - Gabriel and Carol Fregoso, 60 Tamalpais Avenue, A/P 7-211-32, a parking variance to allow the two required parking spaces to be substandard in width and length and located within 0 feet of the front and side property lines - AFTER THE FACT. CONTINUED UNTIL SEPTEMBER 11, 1989.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 7, 1989

M/S Julin, Kanis, to approve minutes of August 7, 1989 with the following amendments: page 2, 4th paragraph from the bottom to added: "And further advised them with billings and other correspondence sent to clients." page 3, under Jacob Friedman, insert: "Commissioner Kanis stepped down."; page 4, 7th paragraph from the bottom: "Commissioner Kanis abstained"

Ayes: Julin, Kanis, Yarish, Kroot
Abstain: Hayes.

E. ADJOURNMENT TO SPECIAL MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 11, 1989.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:30 a.m. to the next special meeting of September 11, 1989.

BARBARA CHAMBERS
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY-TECHNICIAN