

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order at 8:00 p.m. on May 18, 1987, by Chairman McPeak in the Town Hall Council Chamber. Staff present: John Kottage, Director Public Works/Planning, Lisa Wight, Planning Technician, Barbara Chambers, Secretary and John Roberto, Planning Consultant.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Zaharoff, Sias, Kroot, Harle, Hayes, Manning and McPeak

Commissioners Absent: none

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S Kroot, Hayes to approve minutes of April 20, 1987, as written.

Motion carried; Commissioners Harle, Manning, Zaharoff abstained.

M/S Manning, Harle to approve minutes of May 5, 1987, as written.

Motion carried; Hayes, Kroot, McPeak abstained.

C. Discussion Item

John Roberto requested that he give a brief report on the Housing Agreement and Marin County Housing Authority. The unit is larger than first approved in that it is calculated on three persons per household and not two as originally stated. There will be two units, two bedrooms, two baths at 1,064 square feet per unit. The estimated price for each unit will be \$98,500 with the average income of \$35,800 and a fixed rate of 9 1/2% with 10% down. The Council approved that the selection priority will be given to employees of Town of San Anselmo and Ross Valley Fire Service.

Chairman McPeak asked if the selection priority for Town employees was standard. Roberto stated that although it isn't standard the Town Attorney said such a proviso could be upheld in court.

Commissioner Kroot asked if the Town employees could buy the property and then turn it over for a profit. John Roberto said that the property could not be sold to make a profit. Commissioner Manning wanted to know if the employee leaves Town employment would they have to sell their property. John Roberto said no.

Commissioner Hayes appreciates the low salaries of Town employees and the amount it takes to live in Town but he has a problem with giving Town employees or any group selection priorities.

John Roberto said that the decision probably would not change but if the Planning Commission had concerns perhaps a letter should be sent voicing the concerns to the Town Council.

1. Town of San Anselmo initiated amendments to the Zoning Ordinance - Title 10 of the Municipal Code - Hillside Density Districts (R-1 H) - to establish a new application processing procedure and standards for developments proposed within the R-1-H District and the initial environmental review.

John Kottage presented the staff report dated May 18, 1987 indicating that at the meeting of April 20, 1987, the Planning Commission requested the staff to propose a height limitation in the R-1 H district. Structure height within the ridge zone shall be limited by all of the following requirements:

A. The highest point in the roofline of any structure shall be no higher than the horizontal plane measured 18 feet vertically above the nearest point on the existing undisturbed ridge line.

B. The highest point in the roofline of any structure shall be further limited by being no higher than the horizontal plane measured 24 feet vertically above the existing undisturbed ground elevation located at the centroid of the building footprint.

C. The highest exterior wall shall not exceed 40 feet at any point.

In situations where these requirements are in conflict, the requirement which produces the lower height structure shall govern. Structures located within the R-1 H District, but outside of the ridge zone, shall comply with R-1 zone requirements. These requirements assume evenly graded ground surfaces. When local irregularities in the ground surface produce results which are in conflict with the intent of these requirements, the Planning Commission shall determine reasonable, average conditions in the vicinity of the key governing points and make structure height calculations based on these reasonable, average conditions.

John Roberto, Planning Consultant, stated that height limits is a good thing to have and believes it is an appropriate way to go. The Town wants to create a standard. The intent is to measure from existing grade even if you cut into the hill and in most cases the the object is to have the house go into the hill.

Johnathan Braun, 479 Scenic Avenue, wanted to know the meaning of the word centroid. Also, he felt that 40 feet for the height is inappropriate. Mr. Kottage defined the definition of centroid.

Commissioner Zaharoff was concerned about the 40 foot limitation because of it being in excess of the R-1 structure limitations. Also if 18 feet height was tied to the finished grade that would be clearer. She is also concerned about the less visible impact on homes on ridge. Can a reasonable home be built to extend 18 feet height tied to finished grade. She does feel that height limits are important in that it gives the Town and developers expectation of what can be built.

Commissioner Sias stated that he can not support 40 foot limit and feels that 25 to 30 feet may be appropriate because of the ridge. He supports excavation into the hill rather than ridge top sprawl.

Commissioner Kroot thinks that the 24 feet would be fairly low so that perhaps a 1 or 1 1/2 story could be constructed. He also isn't sure about the maximum 40 feet height.

Commissioner Hayes was unsure about the 40 foot height and wondered if a table could be set up.

Chairman McPeak said the size and bulk of 40 feet bothered him and wanted to see about 35 feet. Also, what the Commission is trying to address is visibility.

John Kottage stated that there were so many possibilities on slope and maybe the last paragraph of the staff report should give the Planning Commission more guidelines to make the limits less hard and fast.

Commissioner Manning liked John Kottage's concept to allow the Commission flexibility at the Design Review stage to fit the individual situation.

M/S Manning, Sias to have staff prepare a complete redraft of the ordinance for the next regular meeting of June 1, 1987.

AYES: All

2. GPA-2 - Planning Commission initiated General Plan Amendment of 1535 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-153-01, to change the land use designation from Mixed Residential, Predominantly single Family, 6 - 12 units per acre, to General Commercial, and review of the Negative Declaration.

Z-243 - Town Planning Commission initiated Rezoning of 1535 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-153-01, to change the zoning from C-1 (Neighborhood business District) to PPD R-3/C-1 (Preliminary Planned Development with a presumptive use of Multiple Family Residential and Neighborhood Business district) with a limitation on the number of residential units, and review of the Negative Declaration.

Attilio Segale and Gerald Segale, owners, present.

John Kottage explained the consensus of the previous meetings seems to be that use of the property needs to meet two general requirements: 1. Compatibility with the neighboring residential area which is predominately single family residential and 2. a use that will be a low traffic generator in order to avoid adversely impacting the traffic sensitive neighborhood. Staff feels that the two will give the Planning Commission control and property owners adequate development within the area. He also stated that the General Plan in the area is medium density residential.

John Roberto stated the only kinds of uses we are looking at are about 10 cars per day. That with this use we are not looking at grocery stores or liquor stores. Perhaps a mini storage could go in. These are examples of limited commercial for this property.

Lenny Lennard, San Rafael, wanted to know if we were changing the zoning to light residential and commercial would that not restrict general use of the property entirely. Kottage said no.

Commissioner Sias is in support of not generating more traffic.

Commissioner Kroot abstained.

Commissioner Harle wanted to know if PPD-R/C meant that any tract could have only one business. John Kottage explained that the General Plan designation would remain relatively flexible, but compatible with existing surrounding land use designations. It would also be in keeping with the historic use of the site. The zoning designation is more specific than the General Plan designation in that it identifies the site as a unique area needing special review and therefore needing a P.P.D. designation. Also the site is traffic sensitive and needs the additional limitation of low traffic generation in commercial development. This low traffic generation is not found in the Town's C-1 Zoning.

Commissioner Hayes suggested changing "traffic generation" to "traffic impact" or perhaps use the phrase "Community generated". Also in reference to single businesses - couldn't the use permit control the single business. John Kottage suggested the wording might say Single Neighborhood Compatible Business.

Commissioners Manning and Zaharoff support staff's recommendation.

Mr. Segale was unclear how we could measure the peak hour traffic impact. John Roberto said there were various ways to measure peak hour and there would be more limitations on daily average than peak hour traffic.

Chairman McPeak stated he doesn't like the wording of neighborhood compatible and feels the use can make those findings. Also, he feels the word "compatible" is subjective.

M/S Commissioner Hayes, Zaharoff to ask staff to prepare notice for the general public for a meeting of June 1, 1987 and change the wording "traffic generating to "traffic impact and "single business" to "Single Neighborhood Compatible Business".

M/ McPeak, to amend the motion to remove the phrase "Neighborhood Compatible."

Amendment died for lack of a second.

Motion carried:

AYES: Harle, Manning, Sias, Zaharoff, Hayes, McPeak

ABSTAINED: Kroot

3. U-620 - David Weinstock, Alive and Well!, 100 Shaw Drive, A/P 6-061-14, use permit for a private school at the old Red Hill School site.

David Weinstock, applicant was present.

Ms. Wight stated Alive & Well! is a California State accredited massage school. the applicant proposed to lease room 34 in Building C of the old Red Hill School. Unless Room 33 is leased to another party as of September 1, 1987, the applicant will also occupy that room. They plan to operate an educational institute of conscious bodywork to train and certify persons desiring to become professionals in this field. They are currently a certificate program for massage technicians and a certificate program at the graduate level for a conscious bodyworker. Courses are offered to regular students, as well as the general public, in nutrition, dance and movement, music, personal marketing skills, and other programs. Once monthly a community event held on a weekend evening with live music and dancing. The proposed hours of operation are between 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. seven days per week. The majority of classes are to be held in the evenings and on weekends. Classes are limited to 25 persons. The monthly community event is expected to attract from 50 to 75 persons. All classes and the monthly events are proposed to be indoors; however, the applicants may schedule these programs outdoors in the future. The Alive & Well! certificate classes and special classes will be for adults and invariably will result in parking demand. Each class attracts up to 25 students at any one time. Staff feels the available parking can accommodate this increase in parking demand. Staff is concerned that the community event will result in a parking demand that the school parking lot cannot accommodate and the result will be an overflow onto nearby commercial parking lots. The proposed community events seem vague and are unclear to staff, and that is the reason staff is concerned about the effect they will have on the circulation in the community. The use of the Red Hill School site for private schools is an appropriate use of the property since the rooms were designed for classes. The applicant is limited is limiting the number of students in the certificate and special classes at any one time to 25. There are 40 parking spaces available for the three schools. The majority of the classes will be held on weekends and evenings, which will help to alleviate any parking demand conflicts with the other tenants of the building. For these reasons staff can make the finds that granting of the use permit application will provide the petitioner with enjoyment of substantial property rights. Staff is not able to make this finding for the monthly community event as we are uncertain why such an event is necessary for the institute. David Weinstock had

advised that staff would be receiving letters of support from both the French and Montessori Schools and a clear statement of the purpose and description of the monthly community events. However, we have not yet received that information. any use permit approval should be conditioned that the use permit is to expire when the property lease expires; in any event, no longer than three years. The purpose of this condition is that the Town recognizes the fact that the District may wish to reopen the public Red Hill School at this location, if necessary, to accommodate students when the lease expires.

David Weinstock stated that he did not understand why the Montessori and French Schools did not send letters of approval to staff. He spoke with them both and was under the impression they would be forwarding the letters directly to staff.

Chairman McPeak wanted confirmation on number of students, size of room, and if classes would be for adults only. Also, is the occupancy approved under the fire code. He wanted confirmation on hours of classes and the community event, and also verification of parking spaces. The applicant stated there would be 25 adult students per class; the classroom size is 900 sq feet and 700 sq feet for the hallway and bathroom. The classes would end by 10 p.m. and the community event would start at 7:00 p.m. and might go until 11:00 p.m. at the latest. He said that the French School had a function on June 14 and over 100 people were expected and there has been no negative impact in the community. Lisa Wight stated that she assumed the School Board has checked with the Fire Department regarding number of occupants before the lease was signed.

Commissioner Sias wanted to know if Sunny Hills and other schools have been noticed. Lisa Wight affirmed.

Commissioners Kroot and Harle have no problem with approval of the use.

Commissioner Hayes was concerned about the events that take place out of doors and wanted confirmation that there would be no amplified music. Wanted to know if the calendar of events the same as shown in the brochure. Also wanted six month review of use if approved. Applicant said there would not be amplified music and the calendar of events have not changed.

M/S Sias, Harle move to approve U-620 for Alive & Well!, 100 Shaw Drive, a/P 6-061-14, use permit for a private school as described in the staff report prepared for this meeting on the basis that: 1) the use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood, or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the Town, specifically that this conforms with the intended use of the site as an education center 2) the use permit is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner, specifically the use requires expanded facilities for their operation and that on condition of a six (6) month review to see that it is not causing traffic problems.

All AYES:

M/S McPeak, Zaharoff to amend motion to stipulate no amplified music. ALL AYES.

M/S McPeak, Sias to amend motion to stipulate that the use expire at time of lease or not to exceed 3 years which ever comes first. ALL AYES.

Audience advised of the 10 day appeal period.

4. V-2175 - Robert and Kay Sisler, 212 Brookside Drive, -A/P-5-132-29, a four foot frontyard variance and a 3'6" southyard variance to enlarge a garage to accommodate two vehicles within 16 feet of the front property line and 4'6" of the south side property line with a one foot roof overhang.

Chris O'Connor, Contractor and the applicants were present.

Lisa Wight presented staff report of May 18, 1987 and stated that other properties in this area are developed with single story homes and single car garages. Approval of a two car garage will be a granting of special privileges not currently enjoyed by other properties in the area. However, providing additional on-site parking is encouraged by staff since the Town has an ordinance prohibiting overnight parking on Town streets. Due to the configuration of the existing structures on these lots it is impossible to expand a garage to conform to present frontyard setback requirements. It would be possible to conform to the south side setback requirement if the garage were expanded on the north towards the front entrance, which would eliminated a front window. Construction of the garage expansion should not be detrimental to views, light or air to neighboring properties. The westerly neighboring property at No. 208 decides to expand their garage in the future to accommodate two vehicles. No. 208 would also require a sideyard variance. For this reason, the Commission may want to recommend the garage expansion be reduced on the south side and expanded towards the north. While this would be more costly to the applicant, it would provide a six to eight foot west sideyard setback. Another possible adverse impact is that the driveway will not be reduced to 16 feet (not including the sidewalk area) in order to provide a storage area in the back of the garage. Vehicles presently parking on the 18 foot long driveway extend over the sidewalk, requiring pedestrians to use the street and this hazard will be further exacerbated with the reduction of two feet of driveway length. Staff recommends that the garage be set 18 feet back from the front property line. Staff suggests that the large bush next to the plum tree in the southwest front corner be trimmed or removed to provide better visibility for drivers backing vehicles onto the street.

Chris O'Connor submitted pictures of the property and also surrounding property. He stated that he wanted as much room and length as possible and that all the homes in the area are 20-25 feet in length to the street and the standard in that area is about 20 feet. He felt that he couldn't change the configuration of the garage because if any changes are made to the house side it would add another \$4,000 to the cost because the plumbing and electrical boxes would have to be moved. The Sisler's are retired and on a fixed income and only want the addition to their garage so they can keep their cars off the street and also allow for parking when their children come to visit. He also said that other homes in the area do have double car garages as shown in the pictures he submitted.

Mr. and Mrs. Lee, 208 Brookside, stated that originally they were told that the addition would be only 2 feet in the direction of their home and with the roof overhang it will be 7 feet. The space between the houses would be lost and the reason they chose this house was so they didn't have to be right next to their neighbors. Their space is important and Mrs. Lee stated that their privacy in the backyard will also be lost due to the addition. She also wondered that if this variance is approved will it mean that they would also be allowed to build a double garage.

Commissioners Harle and Hayes liked the idea of off street parking but also understands the neighbors concerns. The houses were built when a 5 foot setback was a standard and 4'6" is not much of an encroachment. Commissioner Manning wondered if the neighborhood was dominantly single family garages wouldn't this be an exception. Commissioner Zaharoff supports the application by saying there is a 2 car garage across the street and next door. By having the south side entrance from garage this should not affect the neighbors because it faces their garage and not their living space. She felt that shortening the driveway would be all right because they were the only one that had a sidewalk. Commissioner Sias felt that since there was no way to move the garage without causing the applicants several thousand dollars that he supports the application and the addition of more off street parking.

Commissioner Kroot likes the idea of more off street parking and feels another constraint of the applicant would be the porch and front door which would be an additional expense if the garage was moved

Chairman McPeak felt it important to listen closely to the concerns of the neighbors and also the special circumstances. He said that in looking at all aspects of the situation he feels that additional parking is better for the community and supports the application.

M/S Zaharoff, Harle to approve V-2175 for Robert and Kay Sisler, 212 Brookside Drive, a/P 5-132-29, a four foot frontyard variance and a 3'6" south sideyard variance to enlarge a garage to accommodate two vehicles within 16 feet of the front property line and three feet of the south side property line with a two foot roof overhang, on the basis that:

- 1) there are special circumstances associated with the frontyard and south sideyard variance request, specifically: the size of the lot and location of the house necessitate placement of the addition into the side and front setback;
- 2) the frontyard and south sideyard variances are approved because the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification; and do not entail zoning classifications;
- 3) the frontyard and south sideyard variances are necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights, specifically that there are other properties that enjoy two car garages in the area and covered property is desirable; and
- 4) the frontyard and south sideyard variances will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood, and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood, for the reasons that it is consistent with surrounding neighborhood in accordance with drawing received May 11, 1987.

Motion carried.

AYES: Zaharoff, Sias, Kroot, Harle, Hayes, McPeak

NOES: Manning

M/S Zaharof, Harle amend to change two foot roof overhang to read one foot overhang.

Motion carried.

AYES: Harle, Hayes, Sias, Kroot, Zaharoff, McPeak

NOES: Manning

Audience advised of 10 day appeal period.

5. SS-267 - Richard Hochschild, 281 A Crescent Road, A/P Nos. 7-222-21 and 7-222-42, lot line relocation with exceptions and environmental review. A lot line relocation between A/P Nos. 7-222-21 and 7-222-42 requires Planning Commission review because due to the steep slope, exceptions are required for A/P 7-222-21 to be reduced to a size of 10,240 square feet with an average width of 80 feet. No additional lots will be created.

In 1986 the Hochschilds proposed to construct a living addition within eight feet of the rear property line and 16 feet of the front property line; a retaining wall within 13 feet of the front property line; an open deck within seven feet of the rear property line; and an open deck within 13 feet of the rear property line. the construction of a living addition also required that there be two on-site parking spaces. The applicant proposed to construct a two car carport; however, the plan showed one space to be blocked in by the other. Due to the steepness of the lot in this area and the location of a large eucalyptus tree, locating a useable two car parking area would be difficult. For this reason, the applicant proposes to relocate his lot line with the neighboring property and gain 3,400 square feet. If this line adjustment is approved, then a two car carport can easily be constructed.

Due to the small scope of the project being a lot line relocation and the fact that no additional lots will be created, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have an adverse impact on the environment. Two on-site parking spaces are required for the applicant to construct additional bedrooms on his house. Due to the large eucalyptus tree on the north front side of the existing one-car carport and the steep slope of the property, the most practical place to construct the carport addition is to the west. The existing carport is only four feet away from the west side property line and, therefore, to construct towards the west requires that the lot line be moved. Although there are special circumstances for the lot line adjustment, staff feels it is not necessary to adjust the line so much. The existing parcel is already substandard and the necessary finding cannot be made to decrease this lot 25 percent. Staff recommends the line be adjusted so that an additional on-site parking space can be accommodated and the rear and side setbacks adhered to. This can be accomplished by only decreasing A/P 7-222-21 by three percent. The carport extension will still require a frontyard setback variance. Adjustment of the lot lines as proposed is not necessary for the enjoyment of substantial property rights as the carport can be extended with a much smaller lot line adjustment and there should be no adverse impact on the neighborhood whether the lot line adjustment is approved as proposed or as recommended by staff.

Mr. Hochschild stated that it would be impossible in his estimation to build the carport near the eucalyptus because of roots and the steepness of the area and felt that it would be better to construct the foundation on a flatter surface.

Commissioner Hayes supports the parking spaces however is concerned that the lot the applicant is acquiring is already substandard and it would not be an equal split. It could also lead to potential problems in the future.

Commissioner Manning also stated his concern about acquiring an already existing substandard lot.

Commissioner Zaharoff appreciates staff concerns about the carport but thinks applicant's idea would be safer and more appropriate. At this point she would support the applicant.

Commissioner Sias opposes the application and agrees with staff.

Commissioner Kroot agrees with Commissioner Zaharoff and feels that the land will be better with this parcel rather than the lower lot. It gives the applicant more space and follows the symmetry of the land.

Chairman McPeak supports the applicant and agrees with commissioner Zaharoff.

M/S Zaharoff, Kroot move to accept the Negative Declaration as prepared by staff for SS-267 for Richard Hochschild, 281A Crescent road, A/P 7-222-42, and 96 Woodland Avenue, A/P 7-222-21, on the grounds that there will be no significant adverse effect on the environment.

ALL AYES

M/S Zaharoff, Kroot move to approve SS-267 for Mr. and Mrs. Richard Hochschild, 281A Crescent Road, A/P 7-222-42, and 96 Woodland Avenue, A/P 7-222-21, lot line relocation, lot area and average width exceptions, on the basis that:

- 1) there are special circumstances associated with the lot area and average width requests, specifically that the location of a eucalyptus tree and the topography of the lot necessitate the lot line relocation and exceptions;
- 2) the exceptions are approved because the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification; and
- 3) the exceptions are approved as it will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated;
- 4) the exceptions are necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights, specifically that the lot line relocation will allow the expansion of a carport and place it in a safer location;
- 5) the exceptions will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood, and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood, for the reasons that such lot line relocation and exceptions will not impact the health and safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood.

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Zaharoff, Kroot, Harle, McPeak

NOES: Hayes, Manning, Sias

Applicant was notified of the ten day appeal period.

6. AR-7 - Terry Schenk, Cherne Lane (above Lillian Court), A/P 5-300-28, architectural review of a single family dwelling in an R-1 H zone.

Ms. Wight presented staff report stating that in June, 1984, the Planning commission approved the preliminary plan for this parcel and A/P 5-300-29, which is now 3 Lillian Court. The parcel split was approved in July, 1984. Architectural review of the dwelling at 3 Lillian Court was approved in April, 1985, and the dwelling was constructed in 1986. The applicant currently has an application under review with the Town's Planning Consultant to split this parcel, A/P 5-300-28, into two building sites. Such an

action requires an R-1 H rezoning, preliminary plan review, improvement plan review, tentative map review and architectural review. This plan has not yet been presented to the Planning Commission. The Planning Consultant is reviewing the information and when he determines the application is complete and a staff recommendation can be made, it will be scheduled before the Commission and Town Council. Staff mentions the lot split application because the plan is to construct a dwelling within eight feet of the proposed north east side property line. The placement of the dwelling on A/P 5-300-28, as currently proposed, will be highly visible from a distance as the structures are large and will be on an open sloped grassy area. Perhaps this construction would be better placed on another portion of this lot; however, this would mean precluding the proposed lot split. To preclude that area as a possible building site because a new parcel is proposed may be putting the cart before the horse. Perhaps the rezoning of the property should be determined before the architectural review of this house placement is approved. Prior to approval the Commission may want to require professionally set story poles with flags to better assess the visual impact of a structure on this open grassy area. Due to the proposed placement of the structures on the open grassy slope, exterior lighting should be indirect, low profile and low intensity in nature. Although the colors of the materials are to be natural the Commission may want to request samples. At the building permit stage staff will require that all construction work associated with this approval be subject to bonding of the Cherne Lane roadway leading to the project site, said bonding to be used to insure the repair of any damage to the roadway caused by the construction on this property. The specific nature of this roadway bonding shall be subject to the approval of staff. Staff will require at the building permit stage that the active slide areas on the east side of the lot above Lillian Court be corrected in accordance with the soils report and that drainage improvements be made as necessary. According to the Ross Valley Fire Department to access and water supply requirements have been met. The approved preliminary plan shows a paved driveway off Cherne Lane to a garage under the dwelling. The dwelling is located approximately 20 feet lower on the slope on the preliminary plan than on the architectural plan. This plan shows the construction within the same building envelope as the preliminary plan, so it is in substantial compliance. There is a large oak tree behind the proposed garage which should substantially screen the garage. Screening of the house by this tree will be minimal. The applicant proposes 17 15-gallon drought tolerant native trees, typically oak and bay, to be planted along the Lillian Court frontage and south property line to screen the structures. Staff approves of native trees to be used for screening; however, staff questions whether the trees will provide effective screening at their location. The siding and roof materials selected for this dwelling are to be natural materials and colors and will be compatible with the environment. There are several windows on the south elevation to have white enamel aluminum sashes. It is possible this could result in a glare.

Commissioner Manning wondered if it wasn't pointless for the architectural review if a lot split is imminent and also felt a color board would be helpful.

Commissioner's Zaharoff and Sias agreed with Commissioner Manning.

Commissioner Kroot said that the house could be taken as is but

wanted to hear what the other Commissioner's have to say.

Commissioner Harle stated that if the applicant was considering a lot split he is against it but it doesn't seem like an issue at this point.

Commissioner Hayes agrees with staff on the window trim and also feels a little uncomfortable about going ahead with the architectural review.

Mr. Schenk stated that this building location was approved at the tentative map stage and the Planning Commission agreed to work with him on any new proposals. He said that the home will be tucked away into the trees as much as possible and that he would like to have the project move forward - be it 2 or 3 parcels - whether the split is going to go through he would like to go forward with what is before the Planning Commission at this point. Mr. Schenk said that he built 3 Lillian Court and that is the style of this new home.

Chairman McPeak felt that he needed to see a color panel.

Gordon Chiarella, 35 Woodside Drive, expressed his concern about proper drainage at the site. He said it looks like a major slide had taken place and 20-30 yards of debris had come down the hill and into the storm drain. He went on to say that a trench was already in the street about 1 foot wide and 1 foot deep and washes in the street and into his driveway. Mr. Chiarella wanted the Commission to be aware of this problem before we approve and wants the drainage to be part of the provision.

The applicant thought everything has been done correctly by the Town Engineer and that the drains have all been added and completed by Engineering specs.

Chairman McPeak wanted to know if there are any specific reports.

Ms. Wight stated that slide repair was needed above Lillian Court

Commissioner Hayes said that since the Commission is requesting color panels they should also check on the drainage.

M/S Harle, Hayes to continue the item to the next regular meeting of June 1, 1987 to request colors and materials to be used and information from staff on the drainage issue that was discussed.

D. ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. to the next regular meeting of June 1, 1987.

BARBARA CHAMBERS
Administrative Secretary/Technician