

A regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order on October 6, 1986 at 8:05 p.m. in the Council Chamber by Chairman Kroot. Planning Technician Wight was present.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Hayes, Heubach, McPeak, Zaharoff,
Chairman Kroot

Commissioners Absent: Harle, Manning

APPROVAL OF MINUTES, SEPTEMBER 15, 1986

On page 5, the paragraph beginning "Chairman Kroot..." was amended to read, "Chairman Kroot commented that this condition..."

M/S, McPeak-Zaharoff, to approve the minutes of September 15, 1986 as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

SS-264 - Alma R. Wiederhoeft, 327 Butterfield Road, A/P 5-022-62, two-lot parcel split and the initial environmental review.

Mrs. Wiederhoeft was present with her daughter and son and engineer, Dietrich Stroeh of Stuber-Stroeh, civil engineers.

The proposal is to split the developed parcel at 327 Butterfield Road into two lots, with the new lot to access off an easement across A/P 5-022-61 off Bay Tree Lane. Exceptions are requested for inadequate width and lack of street frontage for Parcel B.

A proposal was made in 1971 to split the lot into three parcels with access to two of the parcels off Bay Tree Lane. Planning Technician Wight reported that neighbors opposed the lot split since Bay Tree Lane was the proposed access for two of the parcels, and that according to neighbors, years before the applicant's mother, as owner of the property, had declined to contribute funds to improve Bay Tree Lane on the grounds she had no plans to use it for access. The Commission referred the proposal back to the applicant on the grounds that two lots were substandard in size and lacked legal access to a public street.

The Town approved a two-lot parcel split in 1972 with the developed lot to continue to be accessed off Butterfield Road and the second parcel to be accessed off Bay Tree Lane. It is the developed parcel that Mrs. Weiderhoeft now proposes to split.

Staff recommended a Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact but expressed concern about the impact of the project on the neighbors and the access to the new parcel across the adjacent property.

Deitrich Stroegh noted that off-street parking and a driveway will be provided which will add space for parking and turn-around space for emergency vehicles. He said Parcel B could get access off Butterfield but would entail substantial grading and removal of several trees. He recommended access off Bay Tree Lane as the most sensible approach.

Henk van de Broek, 12 Bay Tree Lane, adjacent to the subject lot, objected to the proposal. He said the original design of Bay Tree Lane was for a maximum of four lots, which are already developed, and more than four was not included in the original

subdivision nor was it allowed in 1971. Bay Tree Lane is not sufficient to accommodate the existing traffic without having additional traffic. Emergency vehicles have difficulty turning without entering his property and his neighbor's property, and it is impossible to have two emergency vehicles on the street. It would be a health, fire and safety hazard to add traffic to Bay Tree Lane, he said. Furthermore, he did not understand how much of his view would be shortened by an additional home.

Kevin Course, Angela Court, said a lot split and development of another home would adversely affect his property values and detract from any views he has. In addition, there are drainage and slide problems on this property creating environmental hazards.

Robin Strong, 286 Butterfield Road, supported the lot split application. She said the purpose of the subdivision was to allow Mrs. Wiederhoeft's children to live next door to her. She questioned why Mrs. Wiederhoeft should be denied the joy of living near her children.

Ted Broess, 13 Bay Tree Lane, said the proposed 24 foot wide driveway accessing both lots was too narrow, the parking was not workable, and trucks turning around on the street must use his and Mr. Broek's driveways. The driveway would not be wide enough for parking and access.

Dodge Reedy, 273 Butterfield Road, supported the lot split application. He said he has not seen much of a traffic problem on Bay Tree Lane when he has been up there during the day.

John Bruce, 9 Bay Tree Lane, said the cul-de-sac pavement is cracked, and it was his understanding that the front lot would access off Butterfield. He questioned how one driveway could serve two lots.

Ms. Strong said her home was accessed by a driveway serving five homes.

Mr. Stroeh said the property was quite stable, consisting of a tight sandstone/shale material. The building site will be above the creek and active drainage area at the northern boundary.

In response to Commissioner Zaharoff's question about alternative access to the new lot off Butterfield, Mr. Stroeh said such development would entail removal of an excessive amount of dirt and large trees, including the large bay tree in the middle of the front of the property, to bring access around to a garage at the lower level of the property. Such grading would require a lot of retaining walls, he said.

Mr. Stroeh acknowledged that a soils report had not been done on this property but it was his observation from years of experience as an engineer in Marin County that the type of material on the property is more stable than alluvial areas.

Commissioner Zaharoff proposed that story poles be erected to allow neighbors on Bay Tree Lane and Angela Court to see the height of a new house on the proposed new lot.

Commissioner McPeak asked the reason for the 1971 denial of the three-lot subdivision. Ms. Wight responded that the two lots were substandard and had no legal access.

Mr. Bruce said that the development of Bay Tree Lane was paid for by the four original property owners using it for access. He said it was their understanding that only those four lots would ever use it for access and that Mrs. Wiederhoeft's mother declined to contribute funds to improve Bay Tree Lane because she did not plan to use it to access any of her lots.

Mr. Broese added that the former owner of 13 Bay Tree Lane sold a triangular portion of his lot to the Wiederhoefts to establish a right of way to the subject property. It was later deeded back to the Town when it was discovered this property was needed to access the driveway at 13 Bay Tree Lane.

Commissioner McPeak noted that the 1971 lot split request was similar to the current proposal but was denied, adding that the neighbors had an understanding about a certain scheme of development and spent a certain amount of money based on those understandings. He said he had a difficult time going along with the lot split.

Commissioner Hayes commented that he agreed with Commissioner McPeak's statement, adding he felt a compromise was reached in 1972 for development of two, not three, parcels.

Commissioner Heubach expressed his agreement with the previous two commissioners' comments, noting that exceptions to average width and access requirements were requested and there is nearly a 20 foot grade change from the upper to the lower corner.

Chairman Kroot asked if there had been any zoning change to this property since the former Commission action on the lot split. Planning Technician Wight responded negatively.

Carol Wiederhoeft, the applicant's daughter, said she did not see that there would be any problem with parking or access to the lots, noting there would be more turnaround area if the lot is divided and the proposed driveway is installed.

Mr. Stroeh asked the Commission their general opinion if a the proposal was brought back with access off Butterfield Road.

Commissioner Heubach responded that his concern was with density and development on hillsides and would like the project less if the access was off Butterfield. Commissioner McPeak said that proposal would also require exceptions. Commissioner Zaharoff said she would have less of a problem with access off Butterfield but was concerned about the amount of grading and tree removal which would be required.

M/S, McPeak-Heubach, to disapprove SS-264, Alma Wiederhoeft, 327 Butterfield Road, A/P 5-022-62, two-lot parcel split and the initial environmental review, based on inadequate width and the required access off the adjacent property. Motion passed unanimously.

SR-342 - Chevron, U.S.A., 700 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-091-40, sign variances to add an additional sign.

Richard McKinley was present to represent Chevron.

Staff reported that the applicant recently proposed to add a freestanding product price sign. Some of the existing signs have been approved but there are no records of approval for others, therefore staff recommended review of all the signs for conformance. Planning Technician Wight submitted a numbered list of the 11 existing and one proposed sign in her staff report dated October 1, 1986.

Mr. McKinley proposed to remove signs 5, 7 and 8: the banner, "Hi-Tech Techroline" cardboard sign and 56 square foot freestanding product price sign respectively. He disagreed with the removal of sign #6, the 27 square foot Chevron Gasoline Self/Full Serve - 6 prices" sign but agreed to permanently affix it to the building.

It was noted that signs 9 and 12 are two signs mounted together on the same post.

M/S, McPeak-Heubach, to approve SR-342, Chevron U.S.A., 700 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, for the list of signs in the staff report dated 10/1/86, deleting signs 5, 7 and 8, and granting a variance for additional square footage for sign #3: a 5 square foot poster, "Visa and Mastercard," and a variance for additional signs for signs 4 and 6, based on the grounds that strict application of the ordinance would result in unreasonable practical difficulties or in unnecessary hardships for the applicant, which difficulties or hardships are unique to the applicant and his use and the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare or be detrimental to or endanger or depreciate the property located in the surrounding area, with such approval to include the proposed new sign, #12, a 34 square foot freestanding sign. Motion passed unanimously.

NU-54, Jose Luis De La Roca, 1120 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-031-12, use permit for a new second living unit in a single family residential zone.

Mr. De La Roca's son was present.

The applicant submitted revisions today changing the second bedroom into a den and a statement from the neighbor agreeing to use of the shared driveway easement for an additional unit. Planning Technician Wight reported that although the extra room was a den, it could be used as a second bedroom and generate more traffic.

Commissioner Zaharoff said the size of the second unit should be reduced or a fourth parking space added.

Commissioner McPeak said he still had a problem with the increase in use of the shared driveway easement but felt the parking would be a self-policing situation.

Commissioner Hayes expressed concern about the intensity of use on the property. Commissioner Heubach said he still had the same concerns as he had at the last meeting about the intensity of use and density on the property.

Chairman Kroot commented that this was a good location for a second unit. He said the 600 square foot unit was small, he would hate to see it smaller and it appeared that three off-street parking spaces are adequate.

Mr. De La Roca noted that the improvements will allow cars to exit facing forward onto Sir Francis Drake.

M/S, McPeak-Hayes, to approve NU-54, Jose Luis De La Roca, 1120 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-031-12, use permit for a new second living unit in a single family residential zone, on the grounds it is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights, will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons living or working in the neighborhood, will not be material detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood, with the special circumstances being that the Town desires to have second units, in reference to the drawings received by the Commission October 6, 1986, which amends those received July 30, 1986, with the condition there be no more than three cars domiciled at the residence.

There was a lot of discussion among the Commissioners about the motion, particularly on strategies to limit the number of cars parked on the property. The question was called and the motion to approve the second unit failed by the following vote:

AYES: McPeak, Kroot

NOES: Hayes, Heubach, Zaharoff

The applicant was informed of the ten day appeal period to the Town Council.

U-614, Quik Stop Markets, Inc., 4 Bolinas Avenue, A/P 7-302-17, use permit to open at 5:00 a.m. and close at 11:00 p.m. (hours of 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. permitted without a use permit)

Larry Buchanan represented Quik Stop Markets.

M/S, Heubach-Zaharoff, to approve U-614, Quik Stop Markets, Inc., 4 Bolinas Road, A/P 7-302-17, use permit to open at 5:00 a.m. and close at 11:00 p.m., on the grounds that it grants substantial property rights, will not affect adversely the health and safety of persons living and working in the neighborhood.

M/S, McPeak-Heubach, to amend the motion to limit the approval to a trial period of 6 months at which time it is to come back to the Planning Commission for continuance of the approval on a permanent basis or stopping it. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Hayes, Heubach, McPeak, Kroot

NOES: Zaharoff

The applicant indicated a 6 month trial period was acceptable.

The amended motion passed unanimously.

V-2140 - G. Catherine Orman, 27 San Rafael Avenue, A/P 7-211-06, a five foot sideyard variance to construct a two-car garage within three feet of the side property line and a 15 foot rearward variance to construct a garage within five feet of the rear property line.

Catherine and Stan Orman were present.

The applicant revised the plans to show a 8 foot rearward setback instead of a 5 foot setback for the garage following conversations with Ms. Souza, the neighbor to the rear.

Mr. Orman said changing the setback to 8 feet makes the turnaround more difficult, he thinks the original request is reasonable and they would grudgingly accept the 8 foot setback.

Commissioner Zaharoff commented that in looking at the story poles erected by the applicant since the last meeting, she thinks the 5 foot setback is a more reasonable plan and that the Souza's privacy would be more insured. She said she did not think the garage with a 5 foot setback would obstruct the Souzas' light and view and it would be less likely someone would walk behind the garage at 27 San Rafael than if there was an 8 foot setback.

Commissioner McPeak disagreed, saying the 8 foot setback improves the feeling that the Souzas are not in a hole.

Commissioner Hayes said he could support the revised plan, but preferred the 5 foot setback. He was concerned about voting on a 5 foot setback because the Souzas were not present and they had agreed in principle to the 8 foot setback with the applicant.

Commissioner Heubach agreed the 5 foot setback was better and he did not think there was that much difference between the two proposals in terms of their affect on the citizens.

Chairman Kroot said that he did not have a problem with both the 5 foot and the 8 foot setbacks.

Given the option of having the Commission vote on an 8 foot setback or continuing the application for two weeks to notify the Souzas that a 5 foot setback would be considered, the applicants chose the latter alternative.

M/S, Hayes-McPeak, to continue V-2140 until October 20, 1986. Motion passed unanimously.

SS-263. Paul Tietjen. 1348 San Anselmo Avenue. A/P 7-051-07. two-lot parcel split with exceptions and initial environmental review. CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 20, 1986.

V-2143 - Tony Gambardella and Judy Lococo. 8 Rivera Street. A/P 5-223-10. appeal of Planning Director's approval of eight foot high fence.

Tony Gambardella was present.

The proposal is for a six foot high solid fence with an additional two foot lattice on either side of the garage in the frontyard and along the north side property line. A height variance is needed because the fence exceeds six feet in height. The applicants are in the process of installing an in-ground swimming pool between the garage and the house; the Uniform Building Code requires the swimming pool to be enclosed with no less than a six foot high solid fence

The Planning Director granted an administrative variance for the fence height, which was appealed by Barbara Gamba, 45 Cordone.

Mr. Gambardella said the two-foot lattice would soften the fence, adding the he plans to put a vines on it. He said the lot is narrow, he is trying to obtain as much privacy as possible, and deer are able to jump a fence 6 feet high. He said no objection to the fence was received by the neighbor whose property it borders.

Ms. Gamba said development of this property has affected her privacy, while she has tried to obtain privacy within codes. Deer have not jumped her 6 foot high gate on the street side. She said she saw one fence 8 feet high in the neighborhood.

Ms. Gamba said the owner of the property that directly abuts the fence at 8 Rivera does not live on the property. She said the 8 foot lattice fence was not adequate for screening and there are plants which grown above 8 feet high that would afford more privacy and sound screening than a fence.

Mr. Gambardella said there are existing fences above 6 feet high, pointing to the frontyard fence of the neighbor to the east.

Ms. Gamba said that due to the proximity of Mr. Gambardella's house there are constantly lights shining into her home. She said the 2 foot lattice is not aesthetically pleasing, does not afford more privacy, the neighborhood begins to look walled in and she thinks the lot is very pleasing the way it is now.

Commissioner Heubach said the fence and not the development of the lot was the issue before the Commission. He said he felt the lattice softens the affect of a 6 foot solid fence and blends with the neighborhood, although it probably does not provide more privacy to the perspective of the neighbor. He said he was concerned with style consistency in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Hayes said he had no trouble with the 8 foot fence in the pool area and to the rear but he was less convinced about the height in the front yard, adding that a sense of a wall was beginning to emerge.

Commissioner McPeak said he appreciated the need for a fence on the west side but did not support the fence in the front. He supported an 8 foot fence in back of the south corner of the garage but felt the rest should stay within the 6 foot limit due to the proximity of adjacent buildings.

Commissioner Zaharoff said she felt the lattice work would soften the appearance of a 6 foot solid fence, and could support the application as it stands now or with any reduction.

Chairman Kroot said he supported the 8 foot fence on the west wall and could see an argument for making the 8 foot fence continuous into the front.

The Commissioners discussed varying the height of the fence to allow an 8 foot high fence in some locations but requiring it to be reduced to 6 feet in the front.

Mr. Gambardella objected to varying the height of the fence, saying that lattice work only on the west side looks patchy and a 2 foot lattice on all of the fence will create continuity.

M/S, Heubach-Zaharoff, for denial of the appeal of the administrative variance V-2143, Tony Gambardella and Judy Lococo, 8 Rivera Street, A/P 5-223-10, for approval of eight foot high fence, as depicted on the drawings received August 27, 1986, on the grounds that the granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights, it will not materially adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing in the neighborhood and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood, and the special circumstances of the lot being the close proximity of the residence immediately to the west and continuation of the fence will enhance the neighborhood; to require reduction at any portion of the fence would have an adverse visual affect on the overall style.

M/S, McPeak-Hayes, to modify the motion to approve an 8 foot fence on the west side of the property, north of the south end of the garage. The motion on the amendment passed by the following vote:

AYES: Hayes, McPeak, Kroot

NOES: Heubach, Zaharoff

M/S, McPeak-Hayes, to amend the motion to delete the portion stating, "and continuation of the fence will enhance the neighborhood; to require reduction of any portion of the fence would have an adverse visual affect on the overall style." Motion passed unanimously.

The amended motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Hayes, McPeak, Zaharoff, Kroot

NOES: Heubach

The applicant was informed of the 10 day appeal period to the Town Council.

V-2143 - Willa Quillen, 201 Laurel Avenue, A/P 7-161-26, a one foot sideyard variance to construct an addition within four feet of the side property line.

The applicant was present.

Planning Technician Wight reported that the property can accomodate four cars in tandem, the existing house is small and the owner cannot rent the addition separately.

M/S, Hayes-McPeak, to approve V-2143, Willa Quillen, 201 Laurel Avenue, A/P 7-161-23, a one foot sideyard variance to construct an addition within four feet of the side property line, on the grounds that it is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights, will not materially adversely affect the health or safety of persons living and working in the neighborhood, will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood, and special circumstances exist due to the proximity of the current structure to the property line, in reference to the drawings submitted to the Planning Commission October 6, 1986. Motion passed unanimously.

V-2142 - John R. Cowan, 66 Elm Avenue, A/P 7-053-24, a three foot north sideyard variance for a porch enclosure to be within five feet of the north side property line - AFTER THE FACT.

The applicant was present.

Mr. Cowan said he paid an unlicensed contractor in 1978 permit fees for the work and had assumed the necessary permits were obtained. During a recent inspection for the sale of the property it was discovered that a building permit had not been obtained and that a variance was also needed. He noted there was an open entrance to the porch and there was no doorway.

Al Widenhoffer, 60 Elm Avenue, said this was another incident in 4 years who have practiced aggressive encroachment into the setback without obtaining variances. He noted he had been denied permission to add windows into a wall built 60 years before Mr. Cowan's pool was built, yet Mr. Cowan was allowed to have 20 to 30 feet of windows. He said the privacy afforded between the properties was his foliage, which he claimed Mr. Cowan ripped out of the ground.

Mr. Widenhoffer said he was present to ensure that the same principles were applied to both of their properties, and he questioned why Mr. Cowan was allowed to have 20 feet of windows and he was not.

The Commissioners responded that the only issue before them was the porch enclosure, there was a difference between Mr. Cowan's application and Mr. Widenhoffer's application reviewed earlier this year, and that if there is any impact from this porch addition to Mr. Widenhoffer's yard it is by his driveway.

M/S, Heubach-Zaharoff, to approve V-2142, John R. Cowan, 66 Elm Avenue, A/P 7-053-24, a three foot north sideyard variance for a porch enclosure to be within five feet of the north side property line, after the fact, on the grounds it affords substantial property rights, it is not detrimental to property or improvements in the neighborhood, and the special circumstances of the property are the historic proximity fo the the building to the neighboring property line, with reference to the drawings dated September 10, 1986. Motion passed unanimously.

V-2141 - Mozart Kaufman, 601 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-212-47. parking variance to divide the building into three retail stores and one office (site of previous Kaufman's Men's Store - variance needed due to increase in intensity of use of the property.)

Mr. and Mrs. Kaufman were present.

The proposal was to divide the building, previously used for one business, into three retail stores on the first floor and one office using a portion of the first floor and the existing loft. Based on the size of the building, 12 off-street parking spaces are required and none exist.

Staff reported that the key problem with the proposal was the additional demand for parking generated by multi-business use compared to single-businesses use of the building. Public Works/Planning Director Kottage recommended the Commission employ one or more of the following strategies:

1. Eliminate one or more of the proposed stores, particularly Unit B since it fronts on Magnolia which has a narrow sidewalk.
2. Make all the businesses in the building subject to review by the Commission.
3. Remove part of the building to create on-site parking spaces.
4. Grant credit for the close proximity of the Magnolia Street lot (about which staff had reservations).
5. Impose an in-lieu fee to pay for the creation of future parking spaces.

Staff noted that parking is a real concern in the downtown at this time and it was important to look at parking in terms of the overall picture.

Mr. Kaufman said the downtown was in a critical situation, as it has been in previous times during his time in San Anselmo. He predicted the downtown would undergo alot of change, noting the impact of shopping centers in Marin County. He said the permit parking for employees in the downtown has helped get their cars out of the 2 hour parking zones, but noted that the Magnolia lot sits empty most of the time.

Staff said that 12 off-street parking spaces were required regardless of the number of businesses in the building. Mr. Kaufman said that the three stores would probably only have one employee working at a time.

Commissioner Zaharoff said she would like to help out the business community but was concerned about parking. She recommended the option to have the Commission review the businesses on a case by case basis.

Mr. Kaufman said he did not want to lease space for a restaurant, adding he did not think it would be good for his business across the street or the town.

Commissioner McPeak expressed concern about the intensity of use of the property, noting there was a high potential for one of the three retail stores to be highly successful. He found it difficult to approve Area B because of its access off Magnolia, and said something had to be done so that the project did not impact parking and traffic.

Commissioner Hayes said he appreciated the businesses' struggle and commended Mr. Kaufman for his contributions to the business community. He said he did not like Area B which accesses off Magnolia.

Mr. Kaufman said he felt the Commission would not have a problem with the tenants to whom he leased space. He recommended a compromise be reached on review of his tenants to allow Planning Director Kottage to review them and if he had any reservations he could put the proposed use(s) before the Commission.

Commissioner Hayes said he was more concerned about the total impact of parking from all the businesses and about setting a precedent for other landlords. Mr. Kaufman responded that his is the last large building in town, except for his other building across the street.

Commissioner Heubach said delegating a decision on use permits for prospective tenants to the planning director would require special legislation. Furthermore, he questioned whether this would be singling Mr. Kaufman for special treatment. Regarding Area B fronting on Magnolia, he recommended moving back the entry area from the street.

Mrs. Kaufman said requiring Planning Commission review of tenants placed a property owner in a difficult position due to the time delay and dearth of prospective tenants..

Chairman Kroot said he did not have a problem with the proposal except with Space B, noting that the sidewalk on Magnolia is too narrow and commercial spaces on side streets are typically not successful. He said there currently was not a parking problem in the downtown.

Commissioner McPeak suggested the drawing be referred back tot he applicant for elimination of Space B and a procedure to be worked out with the Planning Director for administrative review of a prospective use's impact on traffic and parking.

Commissioner Heubach said his primary concern with Space B was access, not the number of units. He said a change in use of the units in this building should be treated like a change in use for other buildings in the downtown. If staff sees a prospective tenant creating an increased use of the building, it should be referred to the Commission in the same manner as any other business.

Mr. Kaufman said he would prefer to have just one tenant but it is difficult to find a tenant willing to rent that large a space.

Commissioners Hayes and McPeak noted that their goal was to have low intensity use of the spaces that demonstrate little traffic or parking volume.

M/S, McPeak-Zaharoff, to approve V-2141, Mozart Kaufman, 601 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-212-47, parking variance to divide a building into two retail stores and one office area with no retail entrance on Magnolia and subject to the uses being allowed there to be low traffic generators as determined by the Town Engineer, that a variance be granted for parking on the grounds that if the conditions are met there will be no adverse impact to the public, the variance is necessary for the enjoyment of substantial property rights and the special circumstances are that there is an existing building with no parking on site. Use permits shall be required if the ensemble of uses of the spaces in the aggregate will result in significant increases in intensity of uses. Motion passed unanimously.

U-615 - Jon B. Paley and Raymond E. Jaquez. The Village Food Company. 645 San Anselmo Avenue. A/P 7-212-23. use permit for the off-sale of beer and wine.

It was the consensus of the Commission to continue the item because the applicant was not present.

M/S, McPeak-Hayes, to continue the application to October 20, 1986. Motion passed unanimously.

NON AGENDA ITEMS

Staff reported that the Red Hill Shopping Center was proposing a design modification of the trellis and asked the Commission if they wanted to review it or if they wanted staff to review it. It was the consensus of the Commission that they wanted to review it.

ADJOURNMENT

By motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Calamar