

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by vice Chairman McPeak on May 2, 1983 at 8:05 p.m. in the Council Chamber. Lisa Wight of staff present.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Harle, Signorelli, Sousa, McPeak

Commissioners Absent: Bergeson, Sharp, Hayes

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

M/S Signorelli, Sousa, minutes of April 18, 1983 be approved as written. Passed with three Aye votes; Commissioner Harle abstained.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. V-1054 - James and Gail Stroupe

Mr. and Mrs. Stroupe were present. No one else in the audience wished to comment on the application.

M/S Signorelli, Harle to approve V-1054, application of James and Gail Stroupe, 274 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-231-02, for a third story variance to allow remodeling and reconstruction and construction of an addition to the dwelling. This variance is necessitated by the fact that it is an existing dwelling; that no additional height will be added; it will also enhance the area by its improvement and is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights; will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property involved and will not be materially detrimental to the property involved and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood. Passed unanimously.

The applicants were notified of the 10 day appeal period. P/C 5/2/83

B. V-1055 - Chester and Eva Hunter

The proposed tenant, Mr. Resonsky, and his builder, Bruce Payne were present. There was no one else in the audience to comment on the application.

Staff reported a requirement of 14 parking spaces. Applicant proposes 13. Staff said a requirement would be to stripe spaces 1 through 4; space 4 would have to be marked for compact cars; space 13 should be changed to be only 8 feet wide and should be marked as such on the pavement; hence the need is for a variance for one space, and a size variance for spaces 4 and 13.

M/S Harle, Signorelli, to approve V-1055, application of Chester and Eva Hunter, 19 - 21 Ross Avenue, A/P 7-284-48, for a parking variance, necessitated by the increased intensity which is going to be consequent upon turning a portion of the building into a tax office; granting of the variance is necessitated for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights, will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property involved, and will not materially be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood. Approval is based on the sketch dated 4-29-83, request for a variance of one parking space and a size variance for two stalls. Passed unanimously.

Mr. Rezonsky and Mr. Payne were informed of the 10 day appeal period. P/C 5/2/83

C-194 Chester and Eva Hunter

Staff had no comment.

Mr. Resonsky said the garage door would come out and be replaced with windows. There would be signs painted on the windows, and there would not be a canopy or canvas awning. He hoped to have the building painted. He chose a color scheme of off-white for the building and dark brown trim. This would be on the Ross Avenue frontage and all insets.

M/S Signorelli, Sousa, to approve C-194 application of Chester and Eva Hunter, 19 - 21 Ross Avenue, A/P 7-284-48, design review of exterior alterations, color to be off-white with brown trim around windows and door frames, as per plan dated May 2, 1983, deleting plan note No. 3. The Planning Commission finds the plan is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area; provides for protection against noise, odors and other factors which may make the environment less desirable; will not tend to cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy, investment, or orderly development in the area; will not create unnecessary traffic hazards due to congestion, distraction of motorists or other factors and provides for satisfactory access by emergency vehicles and personnel and will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area.

C. V-1056 Louis Lituanio

Mrs. Donna Lituanio was present with her stepson, Nick Lituanio who made the presentation. He presented photos of the property and stated the proposed addition is lower than the present building. He said he was aware of the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Brugaletti objecting to the variance. First, he discussed light blockage, saying the above above the Lituanio lot had a very high building which blocks light for both the Lituanio and Brugaletti dwellings; he also said there were bay trees in the Lituanio rear yard which also cut off light. One of the bay trees is being removed, and the others are being topped this month. There is a large old oak tree in the middle of the yard which they are most anxious to save. The present house (which was originally a small summer cottage) has one bedroom, 8 x 12 in size, in the house and a separate sleeping room outside in the garage. The washer-dryer and refrigerator are located on the screen in backporch because there is no other place to put them. They must, because of the location, not use the washer or dryer after 9:00 p.m. so the noise will not bother the neighbors. This is an inconvenience for them. The lot, he said, is wedge-shaped and without the variance the wall would have to be angled. The variance would vary from a request for a 3 foot sideline variance to a 1 foot sideline variance. Because they are aware of the Brugalotti's objection to looking at a blank wall, they have planned to have only a small bathroom window on the east side and would compromise by using a shed-type roof with a 7 foot ceiling on the east side to 8 feet on the west side (next to the house) thusly arriving at the 7.6 foot ceiling height to conform to the UBC.

Mr. and Mrs. Brugaletti, property owners to the east, said for 40 years they have enjoyed the sunlight and air. Mr. Brugaletti said originally there were driveways on either side of their property and that insured open space for them. They opposed the variance. He said an addition 8 feet from the property line was bad, but 4 feet would be intolerable. Mrs. Brugaletti said she hoped the Commission would oppose the variance. The Lituanio's are night people, she said, and she and her husband go to bed at 10 or 10:30. She said the Lituanio's had three bedrooms and 2 baths. Mrs. Lituanio stated this was not true. Again Mr. Brugaletti reiterated that even the allowable 8 foot sideyard setback was not enough, especially since their own home is constructed within 4 feet of the property line. He said they had lived there for 40 years, paid taxes on the property, and they should be allowed to live out their years there.

It was the consensus of the Commission that the plans were inadequate to see what the proposal of the Lituanios was exactly.

Commissioner Harle said this was another in the continuing episode of existing small lots. He said he found it very difficult to deny a variance on a lot this small.

Mrs. Lituanio said she did not wish to continue the application and spend more money on drawings only to have the application denied. She said she and her husband were planning to take their vacations at the end of the month to start site work for the addition. She said they could place the addition 8 feet from the sideline; however, the building would have undesirable stepdowns and jogs in it. They could do a much nicer looking building with the variance.

Commissioner Harle agreed that living by setbacks alone forces a person to construct unreasonable structures at times.

M/S Signorelli, Sousa, V-1056, application of Louis Lituanio, 73 Scenic Avenue, A/P 7-081-09, proposed three foot east sideyard variance to construct a living addition within five feet of the east side property line be continued to the May 16 meeting. Passed unanimously. 5/2/83

4. May 16th was the date set for the Public Hearing on the proposed revisions to the subdivision ordinance. Copies will be furnished the Commission previous to that meeting.

The Chairman reminded the Commissioners that May 10 was the deadline for submitting any copy they wished to distribute for the density hearing to staff for reproduction for the Public Hearing.

At 9:30 p.m. the meeting adjourned to the next regular meeting of May 16, 1983.

Thelma Foster