

122
The Regular Meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman George Buckle at 8:00 p.m. on January 16, 1978, in Room 6 of the Isabel Cook Community Center. Representing Town Staff: Charles R. Leitzell, Director of Public Works/Planning, and T. J. Robbins, Associate Engineer/Planner.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Buckle, Goltz, Harle, Kapranos, Ollinger, Ragan
Commissioners Absent: Olive

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 17, 1977

Amendment: Item 3-A, Paragraph 8: change to read, "Mr. Negin responded to Mr. Leitzell's comments that it would not be financially feasible . . ."

M/S Goltz, Ragan to approve minutes of October 17, 1977, as amended.

Motion passed unanimously..

B. November 14, 1977

Amendments: Item 4-B, #2 in Motion: change to read, "The outdoor patio shall be closed no later than 10:00 p.m.

Item 4-D, Paragraph 5: change to read, "Mr. Howe said that without the fascia the building would not look very good."

Item 4-E, Paragraph 5: change to read, ". . . He feels there is no justification to allow the rear setback variance."

Item 4-E, Paragraph 6: change to read, ". . . She felt he could at least improve the area on top with a deck."

Item 4-E, Last sentence of motion: change to read, ". . . since it appears that two physical parking spaces can be provided off of Brookmont Circle."

Item 4-F, Paragraph 4: change to read, "Mr. Stubblefield said if his cars broke loose, they would fall into a retaining wall."

Item 4-F, Paragraph 6: change to read, "Commissioner Goltz said that the parking variance requirement is wrong and will bring it up at the joint meeting . . ."

M/S Goltz, Ragan to approve minutes of November 14, 1977, as amended.

Motion passed unanimously.

C. December 12, 1977

Amendments: Item 3: change to read, "Commissioner Goltz nominated George Buckle to serve as Chairman. Commissioner Olive seconded the nomination. Commissioner Goltz moved the nominations for Chairman be closed, which Commissioner Olive seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

"Commissioner Goltz nominated Mary Olive to serve as Vice-Chairman. Commissioner Buckle seconded the nomination. Commissioner Goltz moved the nomination for Vice-Chairman be closed, which Commissioner Buckle seconded. Motion passed unanimously."

Item 4-B, Motion: change to read, "M/S Buckle, Harle to approve V-750 . . ."

Item 5-B, Paragraph 8: change to read, ". . . the Planning Commission does not make decisions without visiting the site . . ."

Item 5-C, Paragraph 1: change to read, "T. J. Robbins said the application to rezone this property was procedural since it already exists."

Item 5-C, Paragraph 1: change to read, "A scenic highways frontage ordinance was adopted one week later."

Item 5-I, Paragraph 3: Change to read, "Commissioner Ragan commented that it is a good idea to put the parking closer to the residence."

Item 7-A, Motion: change to read, "M/S Goltz, Buckle to recommend to the Town Council the deletion of the Historical Preservation Ordinance from the General Plan."

M/S Ragan, Goltz to approve minutes of December 12, 1977, as amended.

Motion passed unanimously.

D. January 9, 1978

Amendments: Item 2-B/C, Between Paragraphs 12 & 13: Insert, "Commissioner Goltz asked Ms. McGovern how the Creek Ordinance got on the agenda. She answered that she was following the Town Council's priority list of ordinances that needed to be studied to implement the General Plan."

Item 2-B/C, Paragraph 16, Delete first three sentences to read, "Commissioner Goltz stated that if the creek ordinance is going to keep the Town from doing anything, then that part should be deleted from the General Plan. Before that is done, we must be sure it will not affect the entire General Plan, which it may."

Item 2-B/C, Between Paragraphs 16 & 17: Insert, "Mr. Sargent, from the audience, asked Commissioner Goltz to give his views on the Creek Ordinance. Commissioner Goltz stated that the General Plan was developed two years ago by a citizens committee. None of its principles have been implemented because the old Creek Ordinance was so divisive and now nobody is willing to propose any implementation."

Item 2-B/C, Paragraph 18: Add, "Commissioner Buckle directed staff to ask the Town Council to consider an ad hoc committee and to give the Planning Commission new policy directions."

Item 2-B/C, Paragraph 21: change to read, "Commissioner Ragan pointed out to Mr. Baumsteiger that problems must be resolved, otherwise they will reappear in the future."

Item 2-B/C, Following the Motion: Add, "Commissioner Goltz thought the Planning Commission had to have a public hearing before recommending a change to the General Plan."

Item 2-A, Paragraph 3: change to read, ". . . but there is a lot of asphalt for parking."

M/S Ragan, Goltz to approve minutes of January 9, 1978, as amended.

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. SS-206 - Edward and Janice Tonini, 1361 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-052-05 and 7-052-06, HELD OVER UNTIL FEBRUARY 6, 1978.

B. Amendments to Title 10 of the San Anselmo Municipal Code

The Planning Commission agreed to hold this item over until the end of the meeting for discussion.

4. NEW BUSINESS

- A. U-498 - Esther B. Frankel, 126 The Alameda, A/p 5-102-45, Application to permit the home occupation of a psychologist's office for private practice.

Esther B. Frankel, applicant, present.

Dr. Frankel said that she has put a down payment on the house at 126 The Alameda and will buy it if her use permit is granted. She stated that her practice would be limited to two patients, who would be referred to her by school teachers, college psychologists, etc. She will not permit anyone on the premises who has not been screened by herself.

Commissioner Goltz questioned how the operation would work physically in the house.

Dr. Frankel said there is a small bedroom close to the entrance of the home which would be used as an office. The patients would go through an entrance at the side of the house.

Mrs. Lucas, 2 Berkeley Avenue, stated there is no way she wants this practice in her neighborhood, no matter how small the practice that is proposed. She also showed concern about the parking situation.

Mr. Bianchini, 150 The Alameda, said that he has lived here for 52 years and does not want this type of practice in his neighborhood.

Mrs. Sullivan, 135 The Alameda, mentioned that children play on the field by the school and this practice would just bring in more people.

Mrs. Ubaldi, 110 The Alameda, said she is concerned about keeping the residential area that way. The neighbors have fought these types of operations at 104 The Alameda for the last five years, i.e., Marin Open House, primal therapy, etc. She feels that once the door is opened to change, it mushrooms; two patients would soon become four, and then eight. 104 The Alameda, which is under the County of Marin's jurisdiction, was just recently rezoned back to R-1 and they do not want to go through it again.

Commissioner Buckle assured Mrs. Ubaldi that the R-1 zoning would not change if the use permit was granted.

Addition

See P. 11 →

Dr. Frankel told the Commission that she can appreciate the kinds of operations that the drug programs brought to this neighborhood and emphasized that her type of psychological practice would be very different. She said that the numbers of patients are limited by her employers and she can only work 12 additional hours per week. As far as having her neighbors screen her patients, she felt this would not be fair to either party because it is very uncomfortable. She also stated that her patients could be from this neighborhood and are no different to look at or talk to than anyone else living there. Regarding the parking situation, Dr. Frankel said that one person would be coming to her home at a time and there is a place on the parking pad for them.

Commissioner Ragan said that a home occupation must not be prejudicial to the best interests or the welfare of the neighborhood in order for a use permit to be granted; obviously the neighbors are opposed in this case. He said that although every use permit is granted on its own merits, home occupations are permissible, i.e., seamstress, piano teacher, etc. He was not opposing the neighbor's arguments, but wanted to point out that home occupations do exist in R-1 neighborhoods.

Commissioner Goltz asked the neighbors about the primal therapy house at 104 The Alameda. Mrs. Ubaldi explained that the original proposal was for two doctors to have 22 patients in a three week period, with others coming in shifts. One doctor left and it was difficult for the other doctor to sell the property. Eventually, Marin Open House moved in and they, too, sounded

encouraging. Within three months the original group of people who had promised so much to the neighbors were gone; funds were lost and they gave up the facility.

Commissioner Goltz asked Mrs. Ubaldi if she thought the same thing would happen in this case. Mrs. Ubaldi said there is no guarantee.

The neighbors mentioned that the street is very busy because people off of Indian Rock Road and Arroyo Avenue park their cars on The Alameda because they cannot do so on their own streets.

Commissioner Goltz said that this home occupation will not generate any traffic and problems that some non-home occupations do generate. Persons applying for these things should get a public hearing for them. He stated that he would like to try small home occupations such as this for three months or so, but understands what the neighbors are saying. They have tried it and are afraid of it because it may be detrimental to the neighborhood. He feels this home occupation would be reasonable if the neighbors were not making their points against it.

Commissioner Ollinger asked Dr. Frankel why she wanted to practice her occupation at home. Dr. Frankel said it is necessary for economic reasons. She cannot buy a house without her private practice since without her practice.

Commissioner Buckle stated that he does not have the same kinds of feelings the audience has in regard to the applicant and the intended use, but does understand the traffic problem. He added that the use permit needs the support of the community in order for it to pass.

M/S Goltz, Ragan to deny U-498 for Esther B. Frankel, 126 The Alameda, A/P 5-102-45, zoned R-1, to allow a home occupation of a small private practice as a licensed psychologist for the reason that because of the physical condition of the street, parking arrangements on the street, and the use of the street by the adjacent school, it would be detrimental to those living and working in the neighborhood.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

B. EU-23 - Leslie Avant, 290 Redwood Road, A/P 7-095-35, application to permit existing second unit.

Leslie Avant, applicant, present.

Ms. Avant stated that four years ago she and her previous husband had purchased the property at 290 Redwood Road. Now she lives upstairs with a roommate and rents the downstairs apartment. As long as she has owned the property there has been a second unit.

Commissioner Ragan feels the parking is not adequate because there are only two comfortable parking spaces for three cars. Ms. Avant said there has never been a parking problem and there is a way to fit three cars in the parking area. She stated that if she had to find another legal parking space, she would look for one.

Mr. Otsler, 40 Sequoia Drive, said that it is in the interests of the community to encourage low income housing.

M/S Ragan, Ollinger to approve EU-23 for Leslie Avant, 290 Redwood Road, A/P 7-095-35, to permit an existing second unit for the reason that this will give the applicant sufficient property rights and not be prejudicial to those residing in the neighborhood, with the following conditions:

1. That the number of cars allowed to be legally parked to be two and any additional vehicles at this location must have

DDC425

legal off street parking spaces before this permit becomes effective.

2. A smoke detector shall be installed in the second unit.
3. That a rent guarantee contract be entered into between the applicant and the Town and that it be consummated within 60 days and failing that, a revocation hearing be set.
4. That the rights granted under the permit are personal to the applicant and are not transferable or assignable to any other person or legal entity whether any person or legal entity does or does not own a contractual or property interest in the particular property.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- C. V-758 - Ronald Sanchez, 61 Yolanda Drive, A/P 7-043-05, application for an 8' sideyard variance with a 0' sideyard setback to permit the construction of a carport.

Ronald Sanchez, applicant, present.

Mr. Sanchez stated that the carport would be in the same area as the prior garage, which was just recently torn down by him because it was in bad shape. He says he has had no objections from his neighbors.

Commissioner Ragan asked Mrs. Sanchez if she plans to put in a concrete driveway or leave it dirt. He feels that because of the rains it looks sloppy this way.

T. J. Robbins said the driveway will have to be paved with asphalt or concrete and this should be in the motion.

M/S Ollinger, Ragan, to approve V-758 for Ronald Sanchez, 61 Yolanda Drive, A/P 7-043-05, an 8' sideyard variance to allow a 0' sideyard setback to permit the construction of a carport on the basis that there is no alternative location for a carport; a concrete slab exists where the previous garage was located, thus constituting a condition of the building on the site; that the carport will not be detrimental to the neighborhood because the driveway shall be paved to the approval of the Town Engineer; that the granting of this variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; and that this variance is based upon the drawings dated December 19, 1977, as submitted to the Town of San Anselmo.

Motion passed unanimously.

- D. V-759 - Robert and Kaaren Maize, 48 Sequoia Drive, A/P 6-165-06, application for a 5'10" sideyard variance with a 2'2" sideyard setback to permit a room extension.

Robert and Kaaren Maize, applicants, present.

Mr. Maize stated that the setback proposed is 3'3", not 2'2". Mr. Robbins assured him that one foot will not decide the approval of the application.

In referring to the staff memo, Mr. Maize pointed out that his driveway is already paved.

Mr. and Mrs. Maize explained that they have already expanded their house and need an extra room which will be used for sleeping and as a family room during the day. They said they would not want to build this room on the east side, as opposed to the west side, because it is a long narrow area that their family uses for sports activities. Building on this side would also ruin the architecture of the dining room. Sunlight would also be limited.

Commissioner Buckle asked the applicants why they planned to expand 13' rather than 12' or 14' (usually people use modules of 4'). Mr. Maize said he wants as much room as possible, but left 3' for the side walkway.

M/S Goltz, Harle to approve V-759 for Robert and Kaaren Maize, 48 Sequoia Drive, A/P 6-165-06, to allow a 5'10" sideyard variance with a 2'2" sideyard setback for the construction of an additional room on the basis that to build the addition in the area where a variance would not be required would be counter to the intent of the ordinance because of the existing location of the adjacent building, thereby constituting a condition of the building as defined in the ordinance; that the granting of this variance will not be detrimental to those living and working in the neighborhood; and the granting of this variance is necessary for the applicant to enjoy substantial property rights; to be based on drawings received December 27, 1977, by the Town of San Anselmo.

Commissioner Ragan said to Commissioner Goltz that he better add the parking variance.

Commissioner Goltz said no, he would leave that out of the motion.

Commissioner Buckle asked if there was any more discussion on the parking aspects of the application.

Commissioners Ragan and Goltz responded no.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- E. V-760 - David Allen Barni, 145 Spring Grove Avenue, A/P 6-212-33, application for a 12'8" frontyard variance with a 7'4" frontyard setback and a 3' sideyard variance with a 5' sideyard setback to enclose an existing carport.

David Allen Barni, applicant, present.

Mr. Barni stated there is an existing carport with a roof. He plans to enclose the top with redwood siding for his car and some storage area, and to enclose the bottom underneath, which could not be seen very much from the road, with stucco and concrete blocks to be used for storage. He said it does not obstruct anyone's view.

Mr. Barni said there is a large beam going down the center of the carport and has decided to make it into two rooms, rather than one, because of the costs involved.

Commissioner Ollinger noted that according to the staff memo, the applicant is asking for a 7'4" frontyard setback, but the drawing indicates a 5' frontyard setback.

Mr. Robbins said that Lynn McGovern had measured it and came up with the figure of 7'4" and the Commission should stick with that figure.

Mr. Barni said that he had spoken to some of his neighbors and they didn't have much to say. He plans to match the redwood siding on the carport with the front of his house.

M/S Ollinger, Ragan to approve V-760 for David Allen Barni, 145 Spring Grove Avenue, A/P 6-212-33, to permit a 12'8" frontyard variance with a 7'4" frontyard setback and a 3' sideyard variance with a 5' sideyard setback (setbacks are already in existence) as shown on the drawings received December 30, 1977, by the Town of San Anselmo to allow an existing carport to be enclosed on the basis that the carport exists, constituting a condition of the building on the site; that the enclosure of the structure is of a minimal effect; it will not be detrimental to persons living in the neighborhood; and is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- F. V-761 - Ralph Curran, 57 Indian Rock Road, A/P 177-250-25, application to use an easement as an access and dual use of a driveway.

Ralph Curran, applicant, present.

Mr. Curran said that he plans to build a house on the lot at 57 Indian Rock Road and is applying for this variance so that his neighbor can drive into his garage.

Mr. Robbins said the driveway is practically Mr. Curran's whole frontage.

M/S Ragan, Harle to approve V-761 for Ralph Curran, 57 Indian Rock Road, A/P 177-250-25, to allow the use of an easement for access to 53 Indian Rock Road, A/P 177-250-24, over the property at 57 Indian Rock Road, A/P 177-250-25, and a variance for dual use of a driveway by both the above parcels on the basis there is a hardship in the topography, making it impractical to construct a separate driveway for 53 Indian Rock Road in addition to the hardship resulting from existing development; that this approval will not be detrimental to the neighborhood as practically the same condition has existed for a number of years; and is necessary to afford property rights in allowing a reasonable development of 57 Indian Rock Road.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

- G. SS-208 - Irene Jackson, 1352 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-051-06, application for a three lot subdivision.

Cole Jackman, representing Mrs. Jackson, present.

Stan Jackson, son, present.

Mr. Carradine, buyer, present.

Mr. Jackman, referring to Section 10-2.706 of the San Anselmo Municipal Code, said that the lot on which the house is situated that is looking for an exception is in the middle of the parcel with flat land all around. There is no feasible, justifiable economic use of the land except for building sites. Each parcel would be in excess of 7,500 square feet. He also said that the house needs considerable repairs and the buyer plans to fix it up.

M/S Ragan, Goltz to approve the Negative Declaration for Irene Jackson, 1352 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-051-06, for a three lot parcel split.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

Commissioner Ragan commented that if the lot is to be subdivided, it should be in three parts, not two, because the house is in the middle of the lot.

M/S Ragan, Kapranos to approve SS-208 for Irene Jackson, 1352 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-051-06, a three lot parcel split and waive the requirement for a 60' frontage for Parcel 2 on the parcel map prepared by Hool & Lockett dated October, 1977; and this waiver is being granted in compliance with Section 10-2.706, Paragraph B, since the strict application would result in an improper parcel split since the existing residence is located in the middle of this parcel, and to require a 60' frontage for Parcel 2 would then make the frontages of Parcels 1 and 3 below the standard required by Code; and the granting of the exception will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the immediate vicinity and it will not be contrary to the objectives of this chapter; and this approval will be in conformance with the San Anselmo General Plan. The building permits will not be issued

for Lots 1 and 3 until water meters are available.

Motion passed unanimously.

Applicant was advised of the ten day appeal period.

5. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

A. Reconsideration of Motions Made at Meetings of December 12, 1977, and January 9, 1978, and Set Date for Public Hearing Regarding Amendments to the San Anselmo General Plan.

(1) Conservation Element

Mr. Leitzell, referring to an action memo written by him to the Planning Commission, explained that in order to make an amendment to the General Plan the Commission has to give everyone an opportunity to speak on the matter by holding a public hearing. This public hearing requires a legal ad in a newspaper:

Commissioner Goltz said that he thought it was necessary to hold a public hearing and brought it up at the last meeting. He feels the Commission should hold a public hearing to deal with the General Plan where it specifically says something about the Creek Ordinance of 1975. At this point we shouldn't take a document that took three years to prepare that has some inoculating goals and take it out of the General Plan. The public hearing should go specifically to implementation. He directed the Commissioners' attention to Page 24, Section IV, Item A, 1(b), which says the Town shall regulate the implementation of the Conservation Element with flood risk zones (flood plain, stream buffer); . . . He feels this should come out of the General Plan because this is what the 1975 Creek Ordinance was all about. He also feels it is necessary to review the entire Conservation Element for any possible revisions needed.

For Correction

Page 133

M/S Ragan, Goltz to reconsider the motions made to amend the General Plan taken by the Planning Commission at its meetings of December 12, 1977, and January 9, 1978, for the reason that the actions taken were not possible under the Government Code, and to set a public hearing for March 13, 1978 to discuss the possible amendment to the San Anselmo General Plan to include the deletion from the Conservation Element of the General Plan, Item A, 1(b) (stream buffer), from Section IV titled, "Implementation." This hearing will also discuss any additions or deletions to the Conservation Element.

Motion passed unanimously.

M/S Goltz, Ollinger that the Planning Commission recommend to the Town Council that they appoint a conservation implementation committee made up of citizens to develop and implement revisions to the Conservation Element to be advisory to the Planning Commission. The make up of that committee shall be at the discretion of the Town Council, but we recommend it be partially made up of people who will be directly affected by any implementation.

For Correction

Page 133

Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Goltz said that without a citizens committee, it is difficult to resolve matters. He cited the committee that dealt with the second units ordinance. Differences were worked out and they came up with an ordinance. A committee dealing with the Conservation Element may not come up with an ordinance, but at least there will be some input. He feels the committee should look at the implementation of the entire Conservation Element, not for each individual element.

For Correction

Page 133

DDC425

3. OLD BUSINESS

B. Amendments to Title 10 of the San Anselmo Municipal Code

- (1) Proposed Ordinance to provide for specific limitations on the ratio of residential to commercial floor area in C-1, C-2 and C-3 zones.

Mr. Leitzell said that at one time the ratio of floor areas was left completely open and this did not work. The staff recommendation was 1:1; residential floor area not to exceed commercial floor area. This could be done by amending Section 10-3.902. This can be applied to C-2 and C-3 zones if the Commission feels this is appropriate.

M/S Ragan, Goltz to recommend to the Town Council that Subsection (a) of Section 10-3.902 is to be amended to read as follows: Uses permitted in R Districts, except that living quarters may be permitted only upon the securing of a use permit. The ratio of residential use area to commercial use area shall not exceed 1:1. To recommend that this same amendment be made in Subsection (a) of Section 10-3.1002 and Subsection (a) of Section 10-3.1102.

Motion passed unanimously.

- (2) Proposed Ordinance to change the minimum square footage requirement for automatic lot merger when in contiguous ownership from 5,000 square feet to _____ square feet and the average width from 50 feet to _____ square feet.

Mr. Leitzell said that this has come up before the Planning Commission a number of times in the past, and most recently with the property at 21 Allyn Avenue. The purpose of this Ordinance is to eliminate substandard lots. If two lots are owned by the same person and one is under the minimum square footage requirement, it is combined with the other. He read a letter from Mrs. Moore, 141 Sequoia Drive, who owns a corner lot which is 5,698 square feet. She explains that she has been paying taxes for years on a buildable lot and if the required footage is changed to 7,500, that leaves her without a buildable lot. She feels this is unreasonable.

Commissioners Ragan and Goltz both agreed that there is no point in changing the minimum requirement.

Mr. Otsler, 40 Sequoia Drive, said that he would like to leave the minimum as it is.

Mr. Robbins explained that the State law says the minimum is 7,500 square feet, unless the local jurisdiction changes that. Our code says if the undeveloped lot is under the minimum, then combine the two lots; the State law says if either lot, developed or undeveloped, is under the minimum, then combine the two.

M/S Goltz, Kapranos to recommend to the Town Council to not make any change in Subsection (d) of Section 10-3.1908.

Motion passed unanimously.

- (3) Proposed Ordinance to change the allowable maintenance on legal non-conforming uses of buildings during a period of five years from 50% of the assessed value of the building to _____ % of the _____ (Section 10-3.2302).

Mr. Leitzell said that the figure is now based on the assessed value, which the Town Council thinks is too low and would like to see changed from 50% of the assessed value to 100% of the assessed value.

Commissioner Buckle asked what is wrong with having it 50% of the market value. Mr. Leitzell said the intent is to phase out non-conforming uses. If a structure becomes too deteriorated, it is phased out. However, if a structure is kept up and a fire destroys it, it is not that person's fault (this relates to Section 10-3.2303).

Mr. Leitzell explained that we are dealing with non-conforming uses. If an individual lets a structure run down, the thought is to abate the use and make it conforming. The idea is to phase it out or keep up the maintenance.

M/S Ragan, Ollinger to recommend to the Town Council that Section 10-3.2302 be amended to read as follows: No existing building designed, arranged, intended for, or devoted to a use not permitted under the regulations of this chapter for the district in which such building or premises is located shall be enlarged, extended, reconstructed, or structurally altered unless such use is changed to a use permitted under the regulations specified by this chapter for such district in which such building is located; provided, however, authorized maintenance shall be permitted not exceeding a total amount during a period of five (5) years of 25% of the assessed fair market value.

Motion passed unanimously.

- (4) Proposed Ordinance to exempt access structures on steep downsloping lots from the variance procedure when parking and residence conform to the setback requirements.

Mr. Leitzell said that if a person meets all the setbacks for his structure, but has to construct something to get to his parking area, he must come before the Planning Commission for a variance. Staff feels there is no useful purpose to this.

M/S Ragan, Ollinger that the Planning Commission recommend to the Town Council that the last paragraph of Section 10-4.05 be amended to read as follows: The term "improvement", as used in this chapter, shall be liberally interpreted and shall include the construction, alteration, and repair of all buildings, structures, access structures on steep downsloping lots, and facilities permanently affixed to real property and appurtenances thereto. No improvement subject to Design Review shall hereinafter be constructed, located, repaired, altered, or thereafter maintained, except in accordance with a design approved as provided in this chapter.

Motion passed unanimously.

5. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION (CONT'D)

B. Hap Phillips - 11 Madrone Avenue, Parking Situation

T. J. Robbins presented a drawing to the Planning Commission, showing revisions the Design Review Committee had made to their parking arrangement. Design Review proposed to put only nine parking spaces at an angle, rather than ten; and two spaces parallel to Madrone Avenue, rather than four perpendicular. This way they would lose three parking spaces.

For Correction M/S Ragan, Harle in regard to parking at the old Mohawk Station to recommend to leave the parking ~~parallel~~ to Sir Francis Drake Boulevard per Planning Commission approval and to delete two parking spaces along Madrone Avenue as recommended per the Design Review layout.

Page 133

Motion passed unanimously.

6. ADJOURN

The San Anselmo Planning Commission regular meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m. to the next regular meeting of February 6, 1978.

Lisa Burglin

Lisa Burglin
Planning Commission Secretary

Addition: Between Paragraphs 9 and 10: Mrs. Riebeling, 106 The Alameda, said there is a fine line between what neighbors know and what actually goes on. There is a difference with a seamstress who only uses machinery in his work. The County of Marin did not divulge any information about the Marin Open House until we saw the change happening. We have been used by the County and we now need a rest.