

227

The Regular Meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman David Ainsworth at 8:00 p.m. in the Town Hall on August 2, 1976.

1. ROUTINE TRANSACTIONS

a. Roll Call

Commissioners Present: Ainsworth, Bolles, Eisgrau, Goltz, Greenfield,  
Ragan  
Commissioners Absent: Fairchild

b. Approval of Minutes - July 19, 1976

Without objection, the Chair moves for the adoption of the minutes of July 19th. Seconded by Commissioner Greenfield.

Motion carried: Ayes: Ainsworth, Bolles, Greenfield  
Abstain: Eisgrau, Goltz, Ragan

c. Announcements - Chairman made the following announcements:

1. There has been a notice circulating announcing that there would be a rezoning of the Isabel Cook School site for commercial development at tonight's meeting. There is nothing like that on the agenda.
2. There is a review of an existing use permit for the Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center. There is nothing on the agenda for its expansion, and the proceedings should be limited to the existing use. The Commission will not at this time go into the matter of any expanded use.
3. The Commission would be without the representation of Staff this evening as Mr. Robbins had gone home ill.

2. SET HEARINGS - No Action

3. OLD BUSINESS

- a. U-403 - Reconsideration for Use Permit granted for the Montessori School, 176 Tunstead Avenue for possible modification of the conditions permitting this operation or for the possible revocation of the permit due to complaints received. Zoned: R-2

The Chairman announced that this item had been continued from the last meeting. The Lords', representing the Montessori School; the James' who own property to the rear of the school (55 Magnolia); and the Horres' representing a tenants association, were all invited to address the Commission again tonight to see if they had come to a solution to the noise said to be created by the school.

Mr. Lord stated he had provided the Commissioners with a copy of a letter resulting from the meeting between the James' and the Horres'. He stated that after much discussion, he had several proposals:

1. Not to introduce any toys which would generate excessive noise;
2. To see that the Staff was sensitive to the needs of the neighbors; and
3. To establish a buffer zone -- an 8' fence 15' from the rear property line, or at the suggestion of one of the Commissioners, plantings to help absorb the sounds rather than the fence.

Mr. Lord stated there had been some discussion of smaller groups of children going outside at a time. This would not be satisfactory, as the children's natural day governs the program. To regiment them would not be as productive for self-directed learning.

Mr. Lord stated that many of the neighbors had stated the school did not bother them.

Joyce Wernsman stated she had been asked to represent the James' who were ill.

Ms. Wernsman stated the three groups had met for about two hours to work out an agreement. She stated the James, as well as the Horres felt that if the children were put into groups of 12 or 6 children, that this would be a more normal single-family type situation.

DDB863

Ms. Wernsman stated the James' were concerned that the additional fence would not be the ultimate solution. Their particular objection was the noise, and if the methods tried by the Lords did not prove to be a solution, then the James would have to come back before the Commission again. As long as the noise was curtailed, that was all they were concerned with.

Ms. Wernsman stated the school had previously tried to go into another neighborhood and they were refused by the neighbors.

Mr. Horre stated he felt they could come to some kind of an agreement. He felt it was a well thought out program, the only problem was the playground supervision.

Mr. Horre felt that by getting rid of the noise sources, "Batman" and the "Big Wheels"; and with the realization that the neighbors and the Planning Commission meant business, the Lords' would take steps to find a solution.

Mrs. Horre stated that after the group's meeting she had considered withdrawing her complaint. She wanted this action by the Commission and neighbors to go on record, however, in order that the noise would be kept down as promised by the Lords.

Chairman Ainsworth stated this hearing was just an evaluation of the use permit. The Planning Commission had not given notification of their intent to revoke the permit.

Mr. Kreuzer, 169 Tunstead Avenue stated he did not like the idea of breaking up the children into smaller groups. He felt that would create a high school type situation and he felt that was not the way this school should be run.

Mr. Kreuzer stated he had no problems with the Lords or the neighborhood. He felt the neighborhood was just naturally noisy, and the school was not that much of a noise factor.

Bess Kilgore stated she was the property owner of 176 Tunstead Ave. She had opened the original nursery school, Lads and Lassies, back in 1968. There had never been any complaints. She felt that the people who built the apartment house knew of the school, as did anyone who moved in.

Ms. Wernsman stated that when people were looking for apartments they did not stand around to hear what kind of noises there were. She stated she did not know what the difference was, but the current school was noisier.

Mrs. Williams, 190 Tunstead stated her apartment was right over the school's playground area, and she was not bothered by the children. She felt the children did not create any more noise than the other noises of the neighborhood.

Mr. Kreuzer stated he had lived in the neighborhood (169 Tunstead) at the time Lads & Lassies was in operation. He felt Lads & Lassies was noisier.

Commissioner Goltz questioned Mr. Lord as to whether there were any traffic problems created by the operation.

Mr. Lord stated they never had any traffic congestion. The street was wide and the children were dropped off at different times.

Commissioner Ragan questioned whether there had been any playground equipment added from that used by the previous school. Mr. Lord stated there had been a modest addition.

Commissioner Ragan stated the person most effected by the playground was Mrs. Walter of 174 Tunstead. He had spoken with her at great length, and her only request was that the noise be controlled until at least 10:00 a.m. and that possibly the swings could be moved farther away from the side property line.

Commissioner Ragan stated he also spoke with the James', 55 Magnolia and Mrs. Doyle of 47 Magnolia. Their concern was for better playground supervision.

Commissioner Ragan felt that if the equipment was moved and there was more supervision of the playground to control the noise, then he would not consider revocation.

Commissioner Greenfield stated that noise was a very subjective thing. He was puzzled by the fact that the people in the apartment house to the left (190 Tunstead Avenue) which was even closer to playground had no complaints. He felt some compromise could be worked out, and agreed with Commissioner Ragan to not consider revocation.

Commissioner Bolles also agreed not to consider revocation. He was concerned that the Planning Commission was becoming a sounding board for neighborhood disputes. Commissioner Bolles hoped for the sake of the Town that this did not happen.

Commissioner Eisgrau agreed with Commissioner Bolles.

Commissioner Goltz felt Commissioner Ragan was exactly right and questioned what the modifications were going to be.

Commissioner Goltz disagreed with Commissioner Bolles regarding the Commission not getting involved in squabbles. It was his feeling that where uses impinged upon one another, the Planning Commission should help solve the problem.

Commissioner Bolles agreed. However, he felt the Commission was getting too many subjective complaints and the complainants were not even attempting to talk to their neighbors before coming before the Commission.

Commissioner Goltz felt that because of the sensitive residential neighbor, plantings, elimination of noise making toys, and better supervision of the children would be the solution. He felt it was not the Commission's place to tell the Lord's how to operate their schedule.

Chairman Ainsworth stated it was the general concensus that no one was interested in revoking the use permit. It was his feeling that with the elimination of the "Big Wheel" and "Batman" it was quite possible the problem would go away. He felt the suggested plantings would be both a long term and expensive project.

Mr. Lord stated he would accept any corrections the Commission might have. It was his intention to do everything possible to get along with the neighborhood and to take remedial action so as not to have to come before the Commission again.

M/S Ragan, Eisgrau, Mr. Chairman, that the Planning Commission reject consideration of revoking U-402 for Montessori School, 176 Tunstead Avenue, on the grounds that there are no legal reasons for revocation.

Motion carried: Ayes: Ainsworth, Bolles, Eisgrau, Goltz, Greenfield, Ragan  
Nays: None

Commission took a 15-minute break.

- b. U-445 - Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center, 35 Elm Avenue, A/P 7-052-49, review of existing use permit (Planning Commission condition in 4/5/76 use permit approval.)

Chairman Ainsworth stated this item was simply a review of the existing use permit previously granted by the Commission.

DDB863

Commissioner Goltz stated he had received a copy of a letter from the San Anselmo School Board regarding the Fairfax-San Anselmo Children Center's interest in securing a lease for the entire Yolansdale School site. Commissioner Goltz stated that since there were obviously people at the meeting to speak on this matter, and he would like to hear them talk.

Mrs. Ethel Seiderman, Director of the Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center stated she was only present to discuss the continuation of the present use. The Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center Board of Directors would not make up their minds until their August 17th meeting as to whether or not they would accept the lease offered by the School District. It was her understanding that tonight's meeting had nothing to do with the possibility of expanding the Children's Center.

Chairman Ainsworth opened the meeting to the public with the request that remarks be limited to comments that address the problems or lack of problems which had arisen in the past use. Chairman Ainsworth requested the audience refrain from speaking on any expanded use.

Chris Yule of the Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center stated the school had eliminated the parking problem in front of the school. She stated the people across the street had thanked them for not allowing parents to park in front of the school.

Larry Santucci, 69 Foothill Rd. felt it was unfair to consider this use in bits and pieces. The people wanted to discuss any negotiations for a lease which would expand the use.

Al Widenhofer, 60 Elm stated he did not understand the autonomy of the school district. He questioned how it was that a use permit was granted without anyone being notified.

Commissioner Goltz stated that the school had originally operated in the Yolansdale School location for three years without a use permit. A conditional use permit was granted April 5, 1976, and neighbors 150' around the school property lines were notified of the meeting. There were also postings (in three locations) surrounding the property.

Mr. Widenhofer felt there were several reasons for not issuing a use permit to allow a school/day care center. The area has two dwellings on one lot on as many as 7-8 houses within a block. The surrounding streets are narrow and the parking ridiculous. While some of the people may walk their children to the site, most of them arrive by automobile. It was his feeling that it just didn't make sense that the streets of the area should bear all of this traffic. He felt he knew what the plans for the site were, and he did not believe that it was the place for a day care center.

Sue Hulpke, 35 Foothill. She stated that when she moved into the area it was really kind of a slum. In the last five years there have been alot of changes, homes are being remodeled, and the area has taken an interest.

Mrs. Hulpke stated that out of 47 residential dwellings there were 11 second units in the area. The area is congested, there's never enough parking and most of the people have an overabundance of cars.

Mrs. Hulpke was against an auto-oriented use which would only compound what is already a serious problem. She stated that she would like to see a decrease of the autos in the area.

Mrs. Hulpke felt that without the public school, there was land available with which some solid planning for the area could be done.

Mrs. Hulpke was concerned about the non-compliance of one of the conditions of the use permit granted in April.

She stated that while the day care center was suppose to serve 30 children, on April 17th she read that the suppose to serve 30 children, on April 17th she read center served 34 children, and in a memo dated June 24th from Alan Bruce to Jim Reed she read it served 35 children.

It was her feeling that this kind of non-compliance would be the kind of thing they could expect to see with this kind of use and she felt the use should be discontinued

Steven Melish, 28 Scenic Avenue seconded Mrs. Hulpke's suggestion to revoke the use permit. He felt that only until the Planning Commission acted could the people begin to finalize a permanent use.

John Blackwell of Scenic Avenue stated that everyone was concerned about their property, but no one had talked about what the kids got out of the day care center.

Theo Selinger stated the day care center had never had any more than 30 children. She could not see the difference between a public school and the day care center. She could not see how their use could bring any more traffic and she was against the permit being revoked

Mr. Santucci stated the issue was traffic which related to expansion. With Yolansdale school, a large part of the children walked which was different from the day care. This is a planning issue and he was disturbed that the people could not address how the land should be used.

Stanley Seiderman stated that the day care center staff required 4 parking spaces, while the school required 11 parking spaces. The need for these 11 spaces no longer existed.

Mr. Seiderman stated the major portion of traffic was from the morning and evening commuter traffic. He could not see how the 30 children, when many of them walked, could increase the traffic.

Carol Brown, 99 Scenic stated since there was no longer a school, the people had a new problem to deal with which was the day care center. She did not want to see either a school or a day care center on the site.

Ken Leven stated he had watched the traffic situation every day since the day care center had come before the Planning Commission. He felt that the center's use of the area had decreased because of their desire to keep the neighborhood from giving them a hard time. It was his feeling that the traffic was less than when the permit was originally granted.

Mr. Widenhofer asked who the school board answered to. Commissioner Goltz felt the Town, through the Planning Commission and final approval/implementation of the Council, would determine the final matter of land use in this case.

Carlos Ynostroza, 1300 San Anselmo Ave. stated he respected the Commission not wishing to concern themselves with something that was not before them. He stated he had not prepared for discussing only the current use permit but had expected consideration of the full use of the school. He requested the Commission allow him three minutes to present a chart with projections of traffic created by the possible expansion of the day care center compared to the traffic created by the previous use.

Chairman Ainsworth explained to Mr. Ynostroza that while he realized everyone was anxious to present their ideas for the area, that was not what was before them tonight. The projection would be absolutely immaterial and would have no value of what the Commission was considering tonight.

DDB863

Commissioner Goltz stated the reason the people wanted to speak about the expansion was because there is a very real negotiation with the school board going on.

Commissioner Greenfield asked whether or not it was true that unless the Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center was granted a use permit to allow for use of the entire Yolansdale School, the lease would not be signed. This was true.

An unidentified gentlemen objected to Commissioner Goltz' comments. He felt Commissioner Goltz was out of order, was acting opinionated, and should abstain from any action.

Carmen Gardenhire, 1323 San Anselmo Ave. stated she had a dual role as she is a property owner and has children that attend the day care center.

Ms. Gardenhire objected to those people in the audience stating they represented the neighborhood as she had never been contacted. They did not represent her viewpoint. She stated she had no objections to the school remaining.

Cindy Miller, a teacher at the day-care center, objected to the complaints by the neighbors as there had been no definite idea of expansion.

An unidentified woman from Center Blvd. stated she was interested in the hearing on Montessori School and how it had been stated they had no problems with traffic since the people came at different times. She felt this school was equivalent.

Mr. Ynostroza presented a chart to the Commission the neighbors had prepared. Titled "Street Traffic Will Increase 4 Times With Day Care At Yolansdale", the chart indicated traffic conditions caused by the Yolansdale School during 1975/76 and projected figures of traffic by the proposed expanded day care center.

Mrs. Seiderman objected to this presentation as she felt it deprived her of equal representation. It was not the issue before the Commission and she was not prepared to discuss the possibility of the day care's enlargement.

Mr. Lothar Salin, 147 Scenic, stated he failed to understand why this application was so unusual. He could not think of a better use of the school than as a child care center.

Mr. Santucci stated he was not opposed to the day care center, but felt it should be in a better location.

John Hulpke stated he was not opposed to day care centers, but he felt that at the shutting down of the school the Planning Commission should determine what would happen to the 7 lots. They should determine the best use of the site. It was his feeling that the Isabel Cook School site was the best location for the day care center.

Chairman Ainsworth stated the Commission was concerned about the future plans for the site, but until such time as there was a use permit there wasn't much they could do.

Commissioner Greenfield asked the audience whether, aside from the traffic, there were any other special complaints about the current use at the Yolansdale school.

Commissioner Ragan questioned Mrs. Seiderman as to compliance with use permit conditions. He asked whether the day care center group had violated a condition by extending their play area into that of the school's. Mr. Seiderman stated they had not.

Commissioner Bolles felt the Commission had spent alot of time on this issue, and he questioned how this item could be studied to talk concretely about the problem. He felt there had to be

Commissioner Goltz stated that since he was the architect for this project he would abstain from any action as a commissioner.

Mr. George Couch of West Coast Properties stated the site was a very sensitive one. Only half of the site is buildable due to the creek. He felt the architect had done a fine job designing the building, and had attempted to conform to the intent of the old creek ordinance.

Mr. Goltz presented the plan. He stated he had followed the existing fence and retaining wall line. He did not want to build into the creek.

He explained the building has a plaza and an area where people can walk down to the creek. It would provide a scenic walk for people who used the Lincoln avenue bridge.

Commissioner Bolles questioned whether or not the building actually required 11 cars. Mr. Goltz stated it did, but a lot of the space in the building was for mechanical equipment, and this being a PPD/SPD application there would be no need for a variance. The size of the parking spaces were 9' rather than the 10' required by Code.

Commissioner Ainsworth stated the retaining wall was showing signs of stress. He felt it was only a matter of time before it collapsed.

Mr. Goltz stated there would be no structures placed on the wall. The deck would be supported by piers.

Commissioner Bolles stated there was no designation for a service yard, where trash would be picked up and deliveries made.

Commissioner Bolles stated there was about 200' more space than was needed, there were no provisions for deliveries or trash pick up, and the parking was one space short. He was inclined to ask for adequate service yard space.

Commissioner Bolles asked whether there was a possibility that a food concession would go into this building. This type of use would create a lot of trash.

Commissioner Greenfield questioned whether an antique store would go in. Antique stores sometimes require delivery of very large pieces of furniture.

Applicant stated the nature of the building would preclude furniture store or fast food outlet.

Chairman Ainsworth felt the requirement of a service area was not the same in this application as, for instance, The Pool Scene on Bridge Avenue where a loading zone was mandatory.

Commissioner Ragan asked the applicant whether he managed property throughout Marin. Mr. Couch stated mostly San Francisco. Mr. Jim Graziani of 205 Stuyvesant, San Anselmo stated he and his wife were partners in the operation.

M/S Ragan, Eisgrau that the Planning Commission recommend to the Town Council approval of Z-156, West Coast Properties of San Francisco, application to rezone 160 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. from PPD/C-3/F (Preliminary Planned Development, presumptive use General Commercial District) to SPD/C-3/F (Specific Planned Development, presumptive use General Commercial), based upon plan prepared by D.H. Goltz, for West Coast Properties and received by San Anselmo on July 23, 1976.

Motion carried: Ayes: Ainsworth, Bolles, Eisgrau, Greenfield, Ragan  
 Nays: None  
 Abstain: Goltz

DDB863

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. U-454 - Sydney & Maureen Philcox, 727 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., A/P 6-083-07, application for use permit for 1) extension of previously approved living quarters secondary to commercial use for current owner, and 2) request for the on-sale business of selling beer and wine in conjunction with a tea room.

Applicants were present. Applicant stated half of the business would be a small retail business serving English food and teas. The hours of operation had not been determined. They would provide approximately seats for 40 people.

Commissioner Ragan questioned what effect the legally recorded easement between 727 and 729 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. would have on the applicant. Commissioner Ragan questioned how many parking spaces the building at 727 Sir Francis Drake had.

Applicants stated they had 5 parking spaces. Two would be taken up by the tenants of the apartment.

Commissioner Goltz was concerned about the possibility of generating a lot of people by serving beer and wine. Parking was the main problem.

Commissioner Bolles stated that both the restaurant at 729 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. and this one had a problem with parking. He felt there was a way to develop a common driveway/parking area to provide for a more workable solution.

Chairman Ainsworth felt the development of a common driveway/parking area would do nothing to create any more parking. He explained to the applicant that the Commission had to consider the use permit application on the basis that it created additional traffic. Parking was only adequate for the residential use.

M/S Ragan, Greenfield to approve U-454 for Sydney and Maureen Philcox, 727 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., A/P 6-083-07, application for a use permit for extension of previously approved living quarters secondary to commercial use for current owner for the reason that this affords owner property rights which they are entitled to, and does not have any adverse effect upon neighbors of San Anselmo. Further move that the applicant's request for on-sale business of beer and wine for tea room be continued for a maximum of 90 days.

Motion carried: Ayes: Ainsworth, Bolles, Eisgrau, Goltz, Greenfield, Ragan  
 Nays: None

- b. VAR-686 - Wm. O. Cross, 45 Medway, A/P 5-154-09, application for a 5.6' variance to allow construction of a room addition 1.6' from side property line and an 11' rear yard variance.

This item was held over until August 16, 1976.

- c. VAR-687 - Craig Putnam, 1 Indian Rock Rd., A/P 177-250-17, application for 7' side yard variance and 18' front yard variance to construct garage 1' from south side property line and 2' from front property line.

Applicant was present.

Applicant stated the lot had an extremely steep slope, and it would be impossible without digging into the bank to move the garage 20' from the front property line. He stated he had no problems with the location of the house.

Mary Johnson of 5 Indian Rock Rd. was present and objected to Mr. Putnam's request for a 7' side yard variance.



a specific form in which to bring together the School Board and representatives of the community.

Commissioner Bolles stated he was not ignorant of the neighbors' feelings, but he felt tonight's meeting would not resolve the problem and that it was being done in an inappropriate manner. As far as continuing the present use permit, until there was evidence presented against the current use, he would vote to continue it.

Chairman Ainsworth felt the proper form for considering a use for this site was for the applicant (School Board) to apply for a use permit. This was the perfect form for dealing with land use planning.

Chairman Ainsworth stated it was impossible to explain the reaction of the neighbors for the use involved. It was his suspicion that neighbors felt the site should become a park. He stated the Commission had noted in the General Plan that the neighborhood needed a park.

Chairman Ainsworth stated he had heard very little which was relevant and to show that the use was a detriment. He felt the statistical information was very useful information and he felt it would be helpful to compare it with the statistics about the existing use. The Commission would rely on information provided by Staff.

Commissioner Goltz felt there was non-compliance with the use permit as there was some indication that there were more than 30 children.

Commissioner Goltz felt the major difference between this use and the previous use was the cars. He did not like the idea of revoking a use permit. The area has an impacted traffic situation and it was his feeling that the Commissioners had to decide whether the future use would create more of an impact or release some of the pressures that currently exist.

Commissioner Eisgrau stated she had not come to the meeting expecting to consider revocation of the use permit. She felt that reducing the maximum number of children would deal with the immediate situation.

M/S Goltz, Ainsworth that the Commission neither revoke or continue U-445, use permit for the Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center at 35 Elm Avenue, because all of the facts are not before us tonight and to direct the applicant to apply for an expanded use permit after it is determined at the August 17th board meeting that the expansion is in accordance with the day care center policy.

If an expanded application is not required then I move that the present use be reviewed at the October 4th meeting for continuation, modification or revocation.

Motion failed: Ayes: Ainsworth, Eisgrau, Goltz  
Nays: Bolles, Greenfield, Ragan

Mrs. Seiderman stated she just couldn't believe what was happening. The use permit she was asking for was for a continuation. The program had never had any complaints, and it was her feeling that the people needed the day care center.

Commissioner Bolles stated he was opposed to the action because it really did not get to the heart of the issue. It was also his feeling that Commissioner Goltz was playing politics rather than trying to get to the heart of the issue.

Commissioner Goltz felt that if the board policy changes that would not be playing politics. If the day care center was going to expand their current use the matter would come back before the Commission, if not expansion would not be discussed.

M/S Goltz, Eisgrau that the Commission neither continue or revoke the present use permit U-445, because at the hearing we held tonight

DDB863

not all of the facts were before us.

Further move that this review hearing be put over until the October 4th meeting.

Motion failed: Ayes: Eisgrau, Goltz  
Nays: Ainsworth, Bolles, Greenfield, Ragan

M/S Ragan, Bolles that U-445, use permit for the Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center at 35 Elm Avenue be continued until such time as a) the Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center Board of Directors desires to expand the present use; or b) legitimate complaints are received from neighboring property owners.

Motion carried: Ayes: Ainsworth, Bolles, Eisgrau, Goltz, Greenfield, Ragan  
Nays: None

Commission took 10 minute break and reconvened meeting at 11:50 p.m.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Z-155 - Herman Bauer, 590 Red Hill Avenue, A/P 6-091-59, application to rezone A/P 6-091-59 from R-1 and C-3 to PPD R-3 or PPD R-2

Applicant was present. Mr. Bauer stated he had three schemes to present to the Commission. He was only looking for conceptual approval.

Scheme 1 showed a triplex on the upper bench and a single family dwelling below. Scheme 2 had a duplex on the upper bench and a single family dwelling below. Scheme 3 had a triplex located on the upper bench only.

Mr. Weinger, owner of 600 Red Hill Ave. stated the slope of the driveway was very steep. He felt there would be problems with the steep driveway and he questioned the drainage system.

Nancy Polly owner of a shop at 510 Red Hill Avenue felt the cars going up to the homes would be a source of noise and pollution.

Ben Rippe, 504 Red Hill Avenue questioned who would be responsible for road maintenance and what guaranty the Town had that if the road became broken down it would be repaired.

Mr. Bauer stated the driveway would be constructed out of concrete and there would be an agreement by the homeowners for maintenance.

Commissioner Goltz felt PPD was the only way this piece of property could be developed. Through his calculations, zoning it to R-3 would mean the applicant could get 30 units; R-2 four units and R-1 two or three units.

Chairman Ainsworth stated that as a matter of planning he had trouble with constructing residences too close to the commercial zone. As a suggestion to the applicant, Chairman Ainsworth noted that the living portion of the houses were in front where they received most of the noise. The parking area was toward the back of the lot where there was less noise.

M/S Goltz, Ragan that the Planning Commission recommend to the Town Council that rezoning application Z-155 for Herman Bauer, 590 Red Hill Avenue, A/P 6-091-59 be rezoned from R-1 to C-3 to PPD-R-1. This rezoning does not conflict with the General Plan.

Motion carried: Ayes: Ainsworth, Bolles, Eisgrau, Goltz, Greenfield, Ragan  
Nays: None

- b. Z-156 - West Coast Properties of San Francisco, application to rezone 160 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. from PPD/C-3/F to SPD/C-3/F

Commissioner Goltz felt there was no reason for the garage to be two stories high. This made it seem like there were two dwellings on the lot.

Applicant stated he had added 4' to an already 13' high roof to make a more useable space.

Chairman Ainsworth stated there was no hardship to allow the granting of a variance to permit the workshop.

M/S Goltz, Ragan that VAR-687, for Craig Putnam, 1 Indian Rock Rd., A/P 177-250-17, application for a 7' sideyard variance be denied for the reason that it does not meet the requirements of the Town's variance ordinance.

Further move that variance for 18' frontyard to construct a single story garage for 2' from the front property line be granted for the reason that the site is extraordinarily steep and granting of this variance is necessary for executing property rights and will not be detrimental to those living and residing in the neighborhood. This variance is approved with the stipulation that the applicant prepare a design for the roof structure to be presented to the Design Review Committee for their comments. Passed

Motion carried: Ayes: Ainsworth, Bolles, Eisgrau, Goltz, Greenfield, Ragan  
 Nays: None

Commissioner Goltz noted that Staff should be aware of the fact that there is a Heritage Tree on the lot and that there should be a permit obtained for any cutting.

6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

- a. Proposed Resolution establishing maximum number of second units to be permitted on single family lots in each neighborhood.

HELD OVER


- b. Proposed Condominium Conversion Ordinance

HELD OVER

- c. Proposed Amendments to Subdivision Ordinance

HELD OVER

- 7. ADJOURN - Meeting adjourned 2:00 a.m.

  
 Catherine Carpenter, Exhausted Secretary

DDB863