

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
JULY 2 2012**

Commissioners Present: Chair Sisich, Co-Chair Brasler, Commissioners Brown, Overberger
Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Krebs, Schinner, Zwick

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sisich called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION

No one spoke.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Senior Planner Phil Boyle advised that both Commissioners Sisich's and Schinner's terms conclude in August and that Commissioner Schinner's seat is available.

Commissioner Brown asked for an update on the housing element.

Boyle advised that a revised version of the proposed housing element has been received from the consultant. The state has signed off and the plan is now in environmental review.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

CONSENT AGENDA

Minutes of Planning Commission Meeting May 21, 2012

Brown abstained as he was not present at the May 21, 2012 meeting. Approval of the minutes was continued to the next meeting for a lack of quorum.

REGULAR AGENDA

DR-1204, Scott and Sharon Hamilton, 18 Grove Lane, APN 007-161-04, Design Review to construct a new 2,362 square foot two story residence with a 400 square foot attached garage at 18 Grove Lane. The project site is located in the R-1 zoning district. (Staff person: Boyle)

Boyle presented the staff report.

Brown asked for clarification as to whether or not proposed adjustments to windows were reflected in the current plans.

Boyle advised that the structure has been reduced one foot in height from the original plans; however, the story poles were not revised and are currently one foot higher than the proposed structure. One window has been revised. Neighbors asked the applicant to revise bedroom windows and the applicant declined to do so.

Boyle further clarified that the accessory structure had been granted a setback variance in the past in regard to an extensive remodel.

Sisich noted that there was orange tape around one or two large oak trees on the property and asked if the trees were slated for removal.

Boyle replied that the arborist has recommended removal of a large tree because it is a significant hazard; however, removal of the tree is not part of the current application.

Sisich asked if there had been any conditions of approval regarding the 2004 lot line variance.

Boyle indicated that there were no conditions of approval in terms of future development on the lot. The rationale for the variance may have been that an addition in the corner in question would have had minimal impact on neighbors.

Sisich asked if the parcel is in the current revised flood plain.

Boyle does not believe it is.

Sisich invited the applicant to make comments.

Architect Eric Layton provided photographs from the site of the proposed upper story windows, indicating extensive evergreen screening between the properties.

He explained that the goal was to design a conforming structure with a modest amount of bulk and mass in consideration of the proximity of neighbors. The design includes quite a bit of articulation to provide privacy and setbacks. Layton further described the placement of the structure in relation to the setbacks. He noted that the roofline pitch had been lowered in consideration of neighbors' concerns and that revisions to the gables would be considered for less shade impact if the Commissioners believed it to be worthwhile. While the stairwell window has been modified, the bedroom windows have not; Layton noted that the windows provide natural light and that shades and window coverings are typically used for privacy.

Brown noted that there appears to be a window missing from the plans on the east elevation in the upstairs bathroom.

Layton confirmed, explaining that the window would probably be a 4 x 4 picture window with a shade to allow filtered light.

Discussion ensued with regard to revising the roof gables and the way in which this could be achieved without affecting the exterior wall.

Sisich asked for clarification of ceiling heights.

Layton confirmed that the downstairs ceiling height is 9 feet and the upper floor ceiling height is 8 feet.

Sisich further requested clarification of the roof pitch.

Layton advised that it is 5 and 12 on the upper roof and 3 and a half and 12 on the lower roofs.

Sisich asked if there was considerable attic space as the roof appears to be quite large.

Layton explained that it is a truss roof with no attic space. There is one shallow vault in the master suite.

Sisich advised that occasionally the Commissioners ask applicants to consider raising windows and frosting lower sashes. He further asked for clarification that the structure is only a few feet off grade.

Layton explained that the structure was kept as low as possible in an attempt to match the grade of the accessory structure and the pool.

Sisich opened the public hearing.

Kathy Day, Madrone Avenue, is the homeowner on the west side of the project. Her primary concern is privacy and she believes the windows facing her back yard as well as her daughter's bedroom and dressing area are too large. Further, the greenery shown in the photographs shared by the applicant's architect at the beginning of the meeting is not extensive and has reached maturity.

Day was not aware of plans to remove trees as part of the project and asked Boyle for clarification as to which tree or trees were slated for removal.

Boyle advised that a large bay with two sizeable trunks is deemed to be in poor condition and removal is recommended by the arborist who inspected the tree.

Day further stated that she asked the applicants to raise of the upper story windows and that they declined to do so. She believes obscured glass of some kind should be used so that the applicants cannot look directly at the roof and backyard of her one-story home and so that her daughter's privacy will be maintained.

Christopher Probert, grandson of a resident on Grove Lane, submitted two photographs indicating that the story poles for the proposed structure are visible from both the living room and a bedroom of his grandmother's home, adding that the proposed structure is eight feet from his grandmother's home. Mr. Probert's concerns are the generation of noise during construction, the extensive hours of construction, and the second story bathroom window that faces his grandmother's second story bedroom. He is also concerned about potential parking problems.

Tom Rakowski of Laurel Avenue believes the proposed structure is attractive and relatively small; he supports the project.

Sisich invited the applicant to respond to the public comments.

Layton acknowledged that the windows are a good size, understands the neighbors' concerns, and noted that the applicants do not wish to negatively impact their neighbors. He explained that raising the sill height of the windows does not necessarily affect visibility from the windows and that this is why they are hesitant to consider this course of action. He further indicated that the windows would have shades and coverings and suggested that more screening could be provided in the way of native materials, such as evergreens.

He added that the hours of construction should be addressed by Boyle, noting that the construction crews would be commuting from a significant distance, and suggested that the earliest part of the work day could be dedicated to quiet set-up time and, as the project approaches completion, interior work such as painting.

Finally, Layton confirmed that parking will be planned in such a way that it does not negatively impact the neighbors.

Applicant Sharon Hamilton explained that the bay tree slated for removal is dangerous and that she and her family have been advised to stay away from it by the arborist.

Sisich closed the public hearing.

Overberger likes the design of the structure, appreciates the articulation, and noted that the structure is relatively small for the size of the lot. While recognizing that it is difficult for residents to accept the fact that neighbors may want to build a two story home, she believes the structure will fit in nicely within a couple of years. She would like to see the size of the bathroom window reconsidered.

Overberger acknowledged that the western elevation does show the greatest amount of living space and that it will impact the neighbor; she suggests that both parties place coverings on the windows in question. Shortening the hours of construction leads to a project of longer duration. In conclusion, Overberger supports the project and believes that the applicants need to consider the neighbors' concerns and the neighbors need to expect change.

Brasler noted that the project sponsor has been generally cooperative with regard to the issue of the windows and agrees with Overberger that a few more concessions could be made. He noted that the project sponsor has indicated a willingness to address the concerns regarding hours of construction and confirmed that he generally supports the project.

Brown generally supports the project. He appreciates the concessions regarding the roof gables as the gables are the greatest component of shadowing on neighboring homes. He suggested the applicants consider examining the way in which the windows of the proposed structure line up with those of the neighbor to the west. Brown further agrees that changes to the bathroom window should be considered. In conclusion, he believes the biggest concern related to the project's construction will be parking and not hours of construction; a parking management plan should be provided.

While Sisich generally supports the project, he would like to see a motion to continue the project and to take the opportunity to look at the project site from the Day residence, even though he is uncertain that the proposed structure will create an unreasonable view of the Days' yard. Although the long picture windows may not create an intrusion of privacy, the architect may want to consider reducing them to please the neighbors. Sisich strongly believes the roof needs to be modified and that the bathroom window should be smaller, higher, and obscured.

Brasler is in general agreement with Sisich regarding the windows, although he sees no need to modify the bathroom window. He could support the project as it is and trusts that the neighbors and applicants will continue to discuss possible modifications.

Overberger believes the roof is the biggest concern and suggests the applicants revise the roof plan, consider changes to the bathroom window and other windows, and return to the Planning Commission. She advised that natural screening is always a good privacy measure and encourages the applicants to begin planting as soon as possible.

Sisich requested that the story poles remain in place at the project site.

M/s, Overberger/Sisich, to continue the project until the meeting of July 16.

AYES: Brasler, Overberger, Sisich

NOES: Brown

ABSENT: Krebs, Schinner, Zwick

ITEMS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

There were no items from the Planning Commission

ADJOURN TO THE MEETING OF JULY 16, 2012

Sisich adjourned the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Harris