

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning commission was called to order at 8:00 p.m. on November 2, 1987, by Chairman Hayes in the Town Hall Council Chamber. Staff present: Lisa Wight, Planning Technician.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Sias, Zaharoff, Yarish, Julin, Harle, Hayes
Commissioners Absent: Manning

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 14, 1987 and October 19, 1987

M/S Julin, Harle, to approve minutes of October 14, 1987, with the following amendments: Page 5, add "proposed amendments to" before the word "Resolution" in both paragraph two and three.

Motion Carried: AYES: Sias, Harle, Yarish, Julin, Hayes
ABSTAIN: Zaharoff

M/S Julin, Harle, to approve minutes of October 19, 1987, with the following amendments: Page 4, paragraph 8, change "M/S Julin, Manning" to "M/S Sias, Julin"; page 4, paragraph 8, add "and variances" after "R-2".

Motion Carried: AYES: Zaharoff, Julin, Sias, Yarish, Hayes
ABSTAIN: Harle

C. PUBLIC HEARING

1. U-626 - Joe Garbarino, Marin recycling, 100 Redhill Avenue (site of United Market), A/P 6-167-06, use permit for a recycling center.

Patty Garbarino, daughter of applicant, present.

Lisa Wight presented staff report stating that in compliance with AB 2020, there is to be at least one certified recycling center in a convenience zone (which is defined as the area within a 1/2 mile radius of a supermarket located in the Town). The plan is to have the recycling center at United Market. This will consist of one four cubic yard debris box, painted beige with Marin Recycling's logo; one folding chair and one cardtable occupying 32 square feet to be located behind the north side of the store against the bulkhead wall along Jordan Avenue. The center will be staffed by Marin Recycling Personnel Tuesday through Saturday from 12:00 noon to 6:00 p.m. When not staffed, the debris box will be locked. The applicant proposes to locate the box so that it a) does not occupy parking spaces and; b) will not result in a disturbance to neighboring property owners. The box will be set against the bulkhead wall next to Jordan Avenue. Staff suggests that placing the box on the northwest corner of the building would be a more appropriate location as it would be closer to the parking lot than the proposed location and would be more accessible to customers who park their vehicles in the parking lot. The San Anselmo Garbage Disposal just recently started picking up all recyclable items each week at a cost of \$.25 per month per household. There is the thought that since this curbside service is offered to Town residents, the residents may not use the recycling center which only refunds \$.01 per can. If this is the case, traffic generation will not be a significant factor along Jordan Avenue.

Ms. Garbarino talked with the people at United Market and it was their feeling that the northwest corner of the building would not be a good idea because it is the meat drop off and has up to 3 large trucks parked there at once. She did not anticipate much impact on traffic having the recycling box in the north corner and noted the dumpster will be picked up and taken away so there will be no excessive noise for the neighbors to contend with.

Commissioner Zaharoff thought that staff's point was well taken however the dumpster would then be closer to the residents and the noise could create a problem. She thought perhaps a six month review period would be appropriate.

Commissioner Yarish thought the location was not visible and perhaps people would not notice the dumpster. Commissioner Julin wanted to see it closer to the parking without obstructing the meat entrance. It would be better if people did not have to walk to the area. Chairman Hayes thought it would not be a convenient access where proposed and agreed with the idea of reviewing the use within six months.

M/S Zaharoff, Sias to approve U-626 - Joe Garbarino, Marin Recycling, 100 Redhill Avenue (site of United Market), A/P 6-167-06, use permit for a recycling center on the basis that: 1. The use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, 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, because the location of the recycling box is in such a place to minimize any type of detrimental impact to the neighborhood. 2. The granting of the use permit is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner, specifically, that such recycling site is actually dictated by State law and this is conditioned by a 3 month review of this particular use.

Motion passed unanimously. Applicant advised of 10 day appeal period.

2. V-2206 - Ed Johnson, 26 Rutherford Avenue, A/P 5-126-04, a two foot frontyard variance to construct a second story open deck within 12 feet of the front property line; a 20 foot frontyard variance to construct retaining walls up to six feet in height and providing an uncovered three vehicle parking area within zero feet of the front property line (encroachment permit will also be required with administrative approval); a two foot frontyard variance for a fence/railing up to 42 inches in height on top of the six foot high retaining wall within 12 feet of the front property line; and a two foot east sideyard variance to construct a retaining wall up to six feet in height and provide an uncovered three vehicle parking area within six feet of the east side property line (plans are to convert a one car garage to a workshop/storage area).

Ed Johnson, applicant, present.

Lisa Wight presented staff report stating the existing driveway is very steep and leads to a one car garage with a ceiling clearance of 6'9". UBC minimum standard for garage ceiling height is 6'6", so the garage does conform. However, it is not possible to park the owner's van in the garage. A second parking space is provided on the driveway, but due to the steepness of the driveway it is necessary to curb the tires or use blocks. The one car garage and the driveway are both legal size and provide two tandem parking spaces. Tandem parking is not always workable. Rutherford Avenue is Town maintained and, therefore, overnight parking is not permitted. Day parking is also limited in front of this dwelling because the neighbor at No. 23 has difficulty maneuvering in and out of her driveway when vehicles are parked on the roadway due to the narrow width of Rutherford Avenue paving. The project will provide three easily accessible off-street parking spaces. The open deck on the second story and matching deck and railing above the retaining wall may help to break up the boxy look of the dwelling. The first floor deck and railing are necessary to gain access to the proposed workshop/storage area as the existing driveway will be removed. the applicant states there is no usable storage and workshop area on the property. The 1,580 square foot dwelling only has a small unexcavated area

under the dwelling for storage and with the washing machine and dryer and stairway to the dwelling in this area, there is no room left for storage if a vehicle is to be accommodated in the garage. The applicant is willing to reduce the first floor deck width to eight feet from 11 feet as staff has marked up on the drawings in order to provide additional area for vehicles to pull up to the wall and be out of the roadway. Staff concerns are that the property may resemble a parking lot. Setbacks serve to provide open space in residential neighborhoods and six foot high retaining walls with vehicles up to the curb line may be imposing to persons across the street. However, it is realized by staff that parking is minimal on this lot and difficult to utilize. It is also realized that other properties in the area have their vehicles outside in front of the property. The applicant indicated the neighbors do not oppose his project. The southerly neighbors at Nos. 19 and 23 will look at a large retaining wall structure and vehicles. Whether the walls will have an adverse visual effect will be dependent on how the area is landscaped. The designer mentioned the possibility of growing rosemary down the sides.

Ed Johnson, applicant, stated he can not use the washer or dryer now with a car in the garage and he would also like to add a shop when he remodels. He does not plan to have the retaining wall over 5-6 feet in height and will surface it with lava rock.

James Gentry, 46 Rutherford Avenue, thinks that the area will look like a parking lot with 3 cars side by side and thought that the applicant was asking for too many variances.

Commissioner Julin thought she could support the applicant. Commissioner Harle thought the cars would be rather unsightly but the trade off will be off street parking. Commissioner Sias was in support of off street parking however he preferred 2 cars instead of 3 and was not opposed to parallel parking if necessary. Also, he would like to see details of screening and landscaping. Commissioner Yarish said that all the landscaping was mature and well maintained now would like to see two car parking with landscaping, perhaps lava rock and vines to hide the retaining wall. Commissioner Zaharoff echoed Commissioner Yarish and supports the 2nd story deck. Chairman Hayes had concerns about the parking but has no objection to the deck. He said the applicant has a parking situation that is not workable now and the steepness of the driveway is a problem. Chairman Hayes wondered if the applicant considered a 2 car garage and he wants to see plans on how the applicant can screen and soften the area before he makes a decision.

Mr. Johnson thought the cost would be the same for a 2 or 3 car parking area. His thought was to use lava rock and ivy for the retaining wall and would be willing to address the Commission's concerns.

M/S Zaharoff, Yarish, to continue V-2206 - Ed Johnson, 26 Rutherford Avenue, A/P 5-126-04, a two foot frontyard variance to construct a second story open deck within 12 feet of the front property line; a 20 foot frontyard variance to construct retaining walls up to six feet in height and provide a three vehicle parking area within zero feet of the front property line; a two foot frontyard variance for a fence/railing up to 42 inches in height on top of the six foot high retaining wall within 14 feet of the front property line; and a two foot east sideyard variance to construct a retaining wall up to six feet in height and provide three vehicle parking within six feet of the east side property line to the meeting on November 16, 1987 for additional information to be submitted as discussed.

Motion passed unanimously.

3. NU-20 - Christopher Urban, 20 Durham Road, A/P 5-202-16, continuation of a use permit for a second living unit in an R-1 zone.

Christopher Urban, applicant, present.

Lisa Wight presented staff report stating the Town Council passed a Resolution in 1980 permitting 14 second units in the San Francisco Boulevard neighborhood. There are currently 8 registered second units and three second units granted under the new use permit process. If this unit is retained there will still be three available openings in the San Francisco Boulevard neighborhood. There is a one car garage, one car tandem driveway and two car tandem parking on the southeast side of the driveway.

Helen Porterfield, 52 Durham Road, objects to the 2nd unit because parking is already a problem in that area.

All the Commissioners were in support of this application.

M/S Sias, Harle to approve NU-20 for Christopher Urban, 20 Durham Road, A/P 5-202-16, use permit for a continuation of a second living unit, for the reasons that: 1. The unit falls within the maximum number of second residential units authorized by resolution of the Council for the single family residential use area of the San Francisco Tract in which the unit is located; 2. The unit is located on an Assessor's parcel on which the owner of record will maintain his principal residence by November 2, 1988; 3. The unit does not encroach upon required setbacks, or cover land in excess of the maximum lot coverage in R-1 Districts, and on-site parking is adequate; 4. The unit was inspected in September, 1987, and meets all applicable Codes in effect at the time of the establishment of the unit; 5. The unit will be made the subject of a rent guarantee contract between the applicant and the Town; 6. The unit will not cause excessive noise, traffic, parking, or overloading of public facilities; 7. The unit will not be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the Town; and 8. It is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner. This approval is based on the plans dated 10-20-80.

Motion passed unanimously. Applicant advised of 10 day appeal period.

4. NU-59 - Chris Grainger, 65 Grove Hill Avenue South, A/P 6-122-18, use permit for a new second living unit in an R-1 zone.

V-2208 - Chris Grainger, 65 Grove Hill Avenue South, A/P 6-122-18, parking variance for the existing third parking space to remain within three feet of the front property line.

Patricia Mott, co-owner, present.

Lisa Wight presented staff report stating the newly constructed dwelling is situated at the end of Grove Hill Avenue South and is accessed by a non town maintained one lane road. There is a 21 foot wide by 22 feet deep driveway to a two car garage. The applicant has already provided the exterior door to the lower area of the dwelling where the second unit is proposed and has made application for building permits to create the second unit with the exception of the separate kitchen. a second living unit requires a use permit and the third parking space requires a setback variance. The Town Council passed a Resolution in 1980 permitting 5 second units in the Sequoia neighborhood. There are currently 3 registered units and one unit with use permit approval. If this unit is approved there will be no remaining openings in the Sequoia neighborhood.

Patricia Mott said the house is on a dead end street and therefore parking should not be a problem. Her thought was to have the tenant either park in the garage or to the side of the garage. Widening the driveway would be quite expensive.

Commissioner Harle supported the application saying that it looked like a nice second unit. Commissioner Sias would have liked to see an additional parking space but could support the applicant because the house is at the end of the road and will not block the access. Commissioner Yarish thought this was a good example of a second unit. Commissioner Zaharoff supported the application but wondered if alternatives were discussed about parking. Chairman Hayes said he generally supports second units however he thought parking will probably spill off the driveway onto the neighbors lot. He was inclined to give this his approval with perhaps a six months review. Commissioner Zaharoff said she agreed with a six month review.

Chris Grainger said he has talked to the next door neighbor and the neighbors down the street and they have no objection to the 2nd unit. He added that there is a 10 foot easement on both the east and west side which could be used for parking.

M/S Yarish, Harle, to approve NU-59 for Chris Grainger, 65 Grove Hill South, A/P 6-122-18, use permit for a new second living unit, for the reasons that: 1. The unit falls within the maximum number of second residential units authorized by resolution of the Council for the single family residential use area of the Sequoia Tract in which the unit is located; 2. The unit is located on an Assessor's parcel on which the owner of record must maintain his principal residence within one year of the use permit approval; 3. The unit does not encroach upon required setbacks, or cover land in excess of the maximum lot coverage in R-1 districts, and on-site parking is adequate; 4. The unit will meet all applicable Codes in effect at the time of the establishment of the unit; 5. the unit will be made the subject of a rent guarantee contract between the applicant and the Town; 6. The unit will not cause excessive noise, traffic, parking, or overloading of public facilities; 7. The unit will not be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the Town, specifically that this in an area that seems capable of handling the added use; and 8. It is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner, specifically that it allows use of space for the length of the garage. This approval is based on the plans dated September 9, 1987. This is with the condition to refer the application back to the Planning Commission 6 months from the beginning of occupancy of the 2nd unit to review the parking situation to see that it is not causing undue hardship on neighbors. For the parking variance: 1. Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated; and 2. The granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioners; and 3. The granting of such variance, under the circumstances of the particular case, will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood.

Motion passed unanimously. Applicants advised of 10 day appeal period.

5. U-627 - Harold and Christine Walton, 60 Red Hill Avenue, A/P 6-201-04, use permit for a dance school in a C-3 zone.

V-2208 - Harold and Christine Walton, 60 Red Hill Avenue, A/P 6-201-04, parking variance for a change in use of the property.

Harold and Christine Walton, applicants, present.

Lisa Wight presented staff report stating that the plans are to:

1. Renovate the building by removing the existing mezzanine and completing the installation of interior partitions to create two dance studios, two dressing rooms, an office and a waiting room.
2. Both dance studios will be rented to other instructors when Mrs. Walton is not teaching classes.
3. Future plans include the partitioning of a third dance studio.
4. Some students will drive, others will be dropped off and picked up, and others may have parents wait for them.
5. Schedule for use of the building are Monday through Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.
6. Mrs. Walton hopes to have a maximum of 20 students in each studio, which translates to a maximum of 40 students at any time.
7. Mr. Walton has advised staff that the dance school will have a non-profit status and will be governed by the newly forming Marin Dance Center Board. According to Mrs. Walton, the Board will have fundraising parties, which will include a performance, hor d'oeuvres, etc. There will also be in-house performances by students for their guests. The fundraising events and the in-house performances will take place approximately every two months. It is not known how many persons such events would generate. The Ross Valley Fire Department has advised that based on the square footage of the two studios, Studio A can accommodate 118 persons and Studio B can accommodate 98 persons. Parking: The gross floor area of the building is 5,000 square feet and based on the proposed use of the building, a minimum of 13 on site parking spaces are required. The applicant has shown a possibility of 12 on-site parking spaces. These include: two tandem parking spaces parallel to Red Hill Avenue provided in front of the building; six diagonal parking spaces adjacent to the east side of the building; and four tandem parking spaces perpendicular to Red Hill Avenue. The two tandem parking spaces parallel to Red Hill Avenue may not be practical. A legal size parking space is 9 feet by 19 feet. There is an eight foot width between the building wall and the sidewalk area. Two vehicles parked in tandem along the front of the building may be a hazard to persons using the sidewalk when vehicle doors are opened. The six diagonal parking spaces are workable. Based on a field check, the surveyor's mark is 38 feet from the east corner of the building into the parking lot, rather than 44.5 feet as indicated on the applicant's drawing. Therefore, the four tandem parking spaces perpendicular to Red Hill Avenue do not exist. Two parking spaces parallel to the building could be provided in front of the retaining wall at the rear of the property. Staff feels that practically speaking there are only eight on-site parking spaces. The proposed dance school appears to be a more intense use of the property than the previous retail use. Therefore, either the minimum Code required parking must be provided or a parking variance must be obtained. While there are merits to this proposal in that the property is zoned properly for this use, the use of the property as a dance school with the intensity proposed could result in a detriment to the safety and comfort to other persons working in the neighborhood for the following reason: The intended use is to have a maximum of 40 students at any time. The special functions to be held every two months include Board fundraisers and in-house performances. There are eight useable parking spaces on the property with some street parking available to all merchants and customers in the neighborhood. The traffic and parking requirements of the proposed uses appear to be much higher than that available at this site. It is in the interests of both the applicants and other merchants in the area to provide customers with safe, easy, and adequate access to the studios. Failure to adequately accommodate these traffic and parking requirements will not only threaten the viability of this new business, but will also threaten the viability of existing businesses in the area as well as the safety of the people using the facilities. Granting of variances require certain findings, such as hardship, unique circumstance, preservation of property rights and that it not be a detriment to the community. It is difficult to make these findings in this application primarily due to the realization that if property use and associated parking is allowed to intensify unchecked, in times of business

community success, the parking needs necessary to support the success cannot be met and, therefore, businesses will damage each other to the detriment of the community and each other.

Christine Walton felt the parking was adequate. Jerry Angel, Keeken & Coppin, said the building has been vacant for 2 years and he would like to see the applicant get the premises. He said that primarily students are being dropped off and parking should not be an issue. John Palmer, Mill Valley, was the manager of the building when it was Campo Linda in the 1970's and there was always a lot of traffic but parking was never an issue. He felt this would be an improvement to the area and the community

Commissioner Zaharoff said that since parking is based on square footage anyone going into the premises would have a problem with the parking requirements. Although 40 students is a more intense use than before perhaps there could be a condition placed on the application to review in six months.

Commissioner Yarish thought this is an excellent use of space but is concerned about the parking.

Commissioner Sias was in agreement with Commissioner Zaharoff and would like to see a review in 6 months.

Mrs. Walton wondered what would happen in 6 months if the use was revoked. She did not want a time limit placed on her application because she will not buy the building and make improvements if somewhere in the future the use permit could be revoked.

Commissioner Sias felt he could not approve because staff has pointed out the lack of parking required. Commissioner Harle felt he could support the application if there was adequate parking. Commissioner Julin thought it was a wonderful cultural amenity for San Anselmo but was concerned about the afternoon peak traffic. She wondered if there could be a condition placed on the classes during the peak traffic hour. Chairman Hayes wondered if the applicant could get permission to use some of the parking from the plant store next door. He shares the concerns of Commissioner Julin about the peak traffic and the turning movement onto Red Hill. Chairman Hayes said he was familiar with Mrs. Walton's reputation in the ballet world and would like to see the application approved if the parking could be worked out.

Mrs. Walton said that she cannot cut performances out and that she has exhausted all possibility of getting parking elsewhere. She has spoken to the owners of the plant store and there is no possibility of getting the use of some of their parking spaces because they will be expanding.

John Palmer said that most cars now are 5 to 6 feet wide and that 8 feet should be the width of a parking space not 9 feet.

Commissioner Harle wanted to know if the plant store would have a problem with parking if they expand.

Pedro Arroyo, owner of 60 Red Hill, said there was a long term lease for parking and it is not renewable. There has always been an intense use of this building but to the best of his knowledge there has never been an accident because of it.

Commissioner Zaharoff would support the application based on a six month review of the parking situation. Commissioner Sias said that the premises does not look workable for the applicant's business.

M/Yarish to approve U-627 Harold and Christine Walton, 60 Red Hill Avenue, A/P 6-201-04, use permit for a dance school in a C-3 zone and V-2208, a parking variance for a change in use of the property on the basis that: 1. The establishment and use under

the circumstances of the particular case 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 use will be a contribution to the Town of San Anselmo that would add to the character of the Town. 2. The granting of the use permit is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner. Regarding the parking variance: 1. due to the special circumstances being that no other parking solutions have been turned up in spite of a vigorous search the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification; and the granting of a variance will not constitute a grant of special privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification; and the granting of the variance 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; 2. The granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner; and 3. the granting of such variance, under the circumstances of the particular case, will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood in that there is adequate parking to accommodate this expansion.

Motion died for lack of a second.

M/S Zaharoff, Sias to revive the motion as stated by Commissioner Yarish with the added condition that there be a review of the parking situation within 6 months.

AYES: Yarish, Zaharoff

NOES: Julin, Harle, Sias, Hayes

M/S Sias, Julin, to deny U-627 on the basis that: 1. The establishment and use of property as proposed, under the circumstances of the particular case, 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. 2. The granting of the use permit is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner. M/S Sias, Julin, to deny V-2208 parking variance, on the basis that: 1. There are no special circumstances, the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification; and the granting of a variance will constitute a grant of special privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification; and the granting of the variance will constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated; 2. The granting of such variance, under the circumstances of the particular case, will materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant and will be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood in that there is not adequate parking to accommodate this use in that it is located on a street that is very busy during rush hour and the use of this space is too intense, parking is inadequate and it will be in conflict with the street fronting the property.

AYES: Harle, Julin, Sias, Hayes

NOES: Zaharoff, Yarish

Motion carried. Applicant advised of 10 day appeal period.

D. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. PP-9 - Robert M. Yeakey, 80 South Oak Avenue, a/P 7-241-50, preliminary plan review of a single family dwelling in an R-1 H zone - CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 16, 1987.

AR-7 - Robert M. Yeakey, 80 South Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-50, architectural review of a single family dwelling in an R-1 H zone - CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 16, 1987.

2. V-2207 - Wie-Shing and Lorraine Lee, 208 Brookside Drive, a/P 5-132-28, a 10 foot frontyard variance and a 4.5 foot north sideyard variance to enlarge a garage to accommodate two vehicles within 10 feet of the front property line and 3.5 feet of the north side property line. CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 16, 1987.

E. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Chairman Hayes discussed the Quarry Mountain appeal that went before the Town Council. The Council has asked that there be a meeting on Wednesday November 4, 1987 at 7:30 p.m. to discuss the meaning of low profile with the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Yarish said he was approached by Mr. Anawalt to see if he would be interested in attending a meeting regarding Kaufman's building being turned into a religious meeting hall. He wanted to know the feeling of the Commission. Chairman Hayes said it would be better to wait until the item is brought to the Planning Commission.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:25 p.m. to the workshop meeting of November 4, 1987.

Barbara Chambers
Administrative Secretary/Technician