

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order on November 7, 1988, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber by Chairman Hayes. Staff present: Lisa Wight, Planner, John Kottage, Director of Public Works/Planning, and Hadden Roth, Attorney.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Harle, Julin, Manning, Sias, Yarish, Kroot, Hayes

B. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Nancy L. Thurmond etal and Robert L. Thurmond etal, end of Oak Springs Drive, A/P 5-291-06, determination of violation in creation of the lot; and application for Conditional Certificate of Compliance for the lot.

The applicants were present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

John Kottage gave an overview stating that there are really two issues before the Commission. 1. Has this lot been created illegally, and if it has been, should a notice of violation be filed; and 2. Determine what conditions, if any, should be placed on the Certificate of Compliance. The Town, by law, is required to issue a Certificate of Compliance on this lot.

Molly Thurmond said they have several objections to the staff report. 1. The staff report said that there was no contract of sale on the parcel and that the Thurmonds were the original purchasers from Laster. This statement is not true as there was a contract of sale and a letter was submitted to the Planning Department stating not only a contract but also giving the terms. Also, the Thurmonds were not the original owners of the property. 2. With regards to Government Code Section 66499.35, and 36 the Thurmonds applied for a Certificate of Compliance and therefore this gives notice to the World. 3. With regards to the notice of violation and the Conditional Certificate of Compliance, there were different conditions in place in 1970 and the Thurmonds do not feel current conditions should apply. Additionally, all aspects of the R-1H should not apply as they are conditions for development. The cul-de-sac requirement should be attached to the development of the property, not the legality. With regards to the final acceptance of the parcel map, it was filed by Jerry Bruner several weeks ago.

Robert Thurmond said the contract they entered into with Mr. Laster stated specifically that "the seller further warrants that the said property has been surveyed and is in condition for approval by the Town of San Anselmo." The plot map that was with the title policy for the transfer of the land was to show conditions of this monument of survey. It was surveyed and the monuments are still there. Section 66499.30(e) of the Subdivision Map Act states "Nothing contained in subdivisions (a) and (b) above shall be deemed to prohibit an offer or contract to sell ...or finance real property... where such sale or financing is expressly conditioned upon the approval and filing of a final subdivision map or parcel map". The words "subdivision map" or "parcel map" were not used in the offer or the contract however the words "Record of Survey" were and the Record of Survey precluded a parcel map referred to in Section 66499.30 of the Subdivision Map Act.

Nancy Thurmond said she applied in 1986 for a Certificate of Compliance and nothing was done about it. Now that Mr. Kahn

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

is proposing to develop the adjacent property the Town is perusing it. She also did not feel it was fair to have them be responsible for 1/2 of the construction of the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Roth said the Town has not seen any evidence to support the statement a man named Vachet sold the property to the Thurmonds, therefore subdivision Map act section 66412.6(b) is not applicable. With regard to 66499.35/36, if the lot was created illegally then both sections apply. Mr. Roth stated he contacted Mr. Robert Merritt who is a leading authority on this subject and he concurs. Mr. Roth went on to say that the Town may impose current conditions, as provided for in Govt. Code section 66499.35, to the present owners of record rather than be limited to the conditions which existed at the time of the transfer. This could include staff's recommendations. The map the Thurmonds presented tonight it is not a legal document and has no effect on the proceedings.

Mr. Kottage said that in 1986 there was an application for Certificate of Compliance and at that time staff was of the opinion that the lot was created illegally, and until it was made legal, the Town could not issue a Certificate of Compliance. That information was provided to the Thurmonds in 1986 and they chose not to pursue it until recently. If this lot is to be created today it will be subject to the R-1H requirements just as the adjacent property will be.

Mr. Roth said application of the two sections, Government code 66499.35 and 36, to this property are consistent because as soon as the property is in compliance with the conditions imposed the notice of violation will be rescinded. Additionally, the Town cannot require that the conditions imposed be complied with at this time but only at the time of development.

Mr. Thurmond asked what evidence the Town had to prove that Mr. Kahn was the owner of the larger parcel.

Chairman Hayes said it is the Town's understanding that Mr. Kahn was the third owner of the larger parcel 5-011-60 and had no knowledge of a violation. Therefore the Town is required to issue a Certificate of Compliance for Kahn's property.

Mr. Roth said the planning issue is whether conditions shall be imposed as a part of the approval of the Certificate of Compliance. One condition could be that there be an application for a parcel map before development of the property.

Chairman Hayes said that the conditions will be placed on the property but presuming the conditions are met, the lot will then be in compliance. He asked the applicants if there were specific reasons against the conditions.

Molly Thurmond said they would be willing to comply with whatever conditions should be imposed on the lot however the R-1H question goes to the development of the lot and at this time the lot is undeveloped.

There was in depth discussion about the second or third party sale of the property. The applicants state they had no knowledge of the violation and their contract was with Vachet. The Town Attorney said there is no record of sale to a person named Vachet, the Thurmonds purchased the property from Laster and therefore there is a violation.

Mr. Thurmond said the notice of violation is a cloud on the title and harder to remove.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

Mr. Roth said the notice of violation will be placed on record at the Marin Recorder's Office and will remain until the parcel is developed in accordance with the conditions stated on the Conditional Certificate of Compliance. The notice of violation would be rescinded and removed on fulfillment of those conditions.

Commissioner Harle said he did not feel competent to make a decision as to the legality situation. The only planning issue is the conditions attached to the Conditional Certificate of Compliance. Mr. Roth agreed with Commissioner Harle.

Mr. Thurmond said that they have never "granted" real property creating a parcel as stated in 66499.35(b). He feels it refers to the innocent purchaser, not how many transactions there were. Mr. Roth said his interpretation of the section is that the use of "grant" refers to both the grantor and the grantee.

Commissioner Harle did not understand why the Commission was being asked to determine whether or not this is a legal lot.

Mr. Roth said that it is undisputed that this conveyance was by deed, not in compliance with the local ordinances at the time. Mr. Thurmond did not agree with Mr. Roth.

Commissioner Sias said a legal opinion has been rendered by the Town Attorney and he is forced to rely on that opinion.

Commissioner Manning said that the Commission will have to make the findings based on the expertise of Mr. Merritt and Mr. Roth. It will establish a clear and concise guidelines for development of the property.

Commissioner Julin felt the conditions placed on the Conditional Certificate of Compliance was acceptable and felt the Notice of Violation should be filed at the County Recorder's Office.

Commissioners' Harle and Sias thought the conditions applied to the Conditional Certificate of Compliance were appropriate.

Commissioner Kroot concurred with his colleagues, adding he did not really see the detriment to the applicants, as this is the process necessary to make the lot legal.

Commissioner Yarish agreed with the Notice of Violation, and concurred with the conditions but asked for clarification about condition #2. Mr. Kottage said it will show how the parts of the subdivision were divided.

Chairman Hayes concurred with his colleagues.

Molly Thurmond said they disagreed that condition 2 and 3 were attached to the Conditional Certificate of Compliance as the law refers to the development of the lot.

M/S Manning, Julin, to issue a Notice of Violation and additionally a Conditional Certificate of Compliance in the form that is attached to the staff report be recorded for Nancy L. Thurmond et al and Robert L. Thurmond et al, end of Oak Springs Drive, A/P 5-291-06.

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed. This can be appealed within ten days to the Town Council

Molly Thurmond said she would like to file an appeal to the Town Council.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

2. Town Council referral back to the Planning Commission of appeal of Planning Commission's conditions of (1) the removal of dogs from the property; and (2) the number of vehicles permitted on the property during the day for U-629 - Lenny Lerner, 1535 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-153-01, use permit amendment to allow: automotive mechanical repairs, cellular telephone sales; and two additional signs.

The applicant and Mr. George Silvester, Jr., attorney, were present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

Mr. Silvester is asking for a total of 17 parking spaces to be allowed on the site during the day, with no differentiation to it being used strictly by employees. He thought 17 was hardly a dense use for the property. He was also requesting that the dogs remain on the site during the day, adding the neighbors were only objecting to the dogs on the premises at night.

Commissioner Julin mentioned there were "for sale signs" on some cars in the lot and wondered if it was going to be a used car lot. She wanted the condition to stipulate that this was not to be used as a used car lot. She had no objection to the dogs being on the site during the day but felt that a maximum of twelve cars on site was sufficient.

Commissioner Harle echoed Commissioner Julin's comment about the number of cars on the site and the dog.

Commissioner Sias did not see any problem with seventeen cars on site because the site was adequate to handle that number and there did not need to be separate spaces assigned to employees. He added that there should be a review in six months.

Commissioner Kroot was in support of the application.

Commissioner Yarish felt that seventeen cars can be accommodated on the lot.

Commissioner Manning was inclined to agree with Commissioners' Julin and Harle.

Chairman Hayes thought that the guiding principal should be to produce an impact no greater than that in the R-1 zone. This principal would allow a maximum of 12 cars on this site.

Commissioner Sias said the business is doing well and thought that limiting the cars to twelve would be unfair. He would prefer to limiting the cars to seventeen to give the business a chance to operate as it has and review in six months.

Commissioner Julin said the original proposal was for two vehicles overnight indoors and ten during the day outdoors. The need for seventeen vehicles has not been established.

Commissioner Yarish did not feel that seventeen cars on site would make the area look crowded. He added that if the applicant would have originally asked to have seventeen vehicles, he would have supported the request at that time. It is important however, for the premises to remain as clean and uncluttered as they currently are.

Commissioner Kroot said the neighbors are not expressing any concerns at this time and therefore it does not seem to be a detriment to the neighborhood.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

Chairman Hayes asked Mr. Lerner how he came up with the number 17. Mr. Lerner responded by saying the property is large enough to handle more than twelve cars. He added that there was never a complaint about the dogs on the site during the day and he is asking the Commission to let them stay.

Chairman Hayes was not sure the applicant gave a compelling reason for the increase in vehicles but was leaning towards approval of the seventeen cars. He added that the site is creeping towards the maximum use and would therefore like to see a review in six months.

M/S Sias, Yarish, to amend the condition for U-629 - Lenny Lerner, 1535 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-153-01, use permit to allow a maximum amount of four cars on the site overnight and seventeen cars during the day; and that the dogs are allowed to remain on the site during the daytime only; and there are to be no "for sale signs" on the premises; and these are in addition to the other previous conditions. There will be a review of this application in six months.

Ayes: Kroot, Yarish, Sias, Hayes
No: Julin, Manning, Harle

Motion carried. Applicant advised of the ten day appeal period.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. U-631 - Cal Neon Signs, Safeway Stores, A/P 6-061-23, Specific Planned Development use permit amendment to allow two neon signs in the windows.

Craig Maynor representing Cal Neon Signs, was present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

All the Commissioners were in support of the applicant.

M/S Harle, Sias, to approve U-631 - Cal Neon Signs, Safeway Stores, A/P 6-061-23, Specific Planned Development use permit amendment to allow two neon signs in the windows and the changes in the design character of the logo for the following reasons: 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 under identical zoning classification; and the granting of a 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 located; 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. This approval is based on the layout of the store and other matters pertaining to the business that require changes. This is in reference to drawings dated September 30, 1988 and October 5, 1988.

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed. Applicant advised of the ten day appeal period.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

2. C-220/V-2259 - Craig and Wendy Campbell, 705 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-211-17, design review of exterior alterations, and a parking variance to reestablish an office use without adequate on site parking (two family residential use to continue).

Commissioner Kroot abstained from this application.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

There were no comments from the audience and the Commission was in favor of the application.

M/S Yarish, Sias, to approve C-220/V-2259 - Craig and Wendy Campbell 705 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-211-17, design review of exterior alternations; and a parking variance to reestablish an office use without adequate parking in a C-2 district on the basis that the design complies with the required findings in the staff report and specifically the proposed alterations are marked improvements to the current eyesore and consistent with good design. With regards to approval of the parking variances: Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, specifically that most of the commercial buildings in the downtown do not have adequate parking, the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under an 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; and The granting of the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner, specifically they wish to reestablish office use in the downtown area; and 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 improvement in such neighborhood. Also, the use should be a low traffic generator. The Planning Director should review the use. If he deems it to be too intense a use it should be submitted to the Planning Commission for review. This is in reference to the drawings submitted October 1988.

Ayes: Julin, Harle, Sias, Manning, Yarish, Hayes
Abstain: Kroot

Motion passed. Applicant advised of the ten day appeal period.

3. NU-62 - Bob Davis, 40 Entrata Avenue, A/P 6-241-25, a use permit for a second living unit in a single family residential district.

The applicant was present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

Christie Moore, 12 Entrata, was in support of the applicants desire to have a second unit.

All the Commissioners were in support of this application. Commissioner Julin noted that the street number should be made visible for safety reasons.

M/S Harle, Julin, to approve NU-62 - Bob Davis, 40 Entrata Avenue, A/P 6-241-45, a use permit for a second living unit in an R-1 District on the basis that: 1. Falls within the maximum number of second residential units authorized by

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

resolution of the council for the single family residential use area in which the unit is located; 2. Is located on an Assessor's parcel on which the owner of record maintains his principal residence; 3. Does not encroach upon required setbacks, or cover land in excess of 40 percent, or necessitate vehicular parking within required setback, unless a variance is granted; 4. Meets all applicable codes in effect at the time of the establishment of the unit; 5. Has been made the subject of a rent guarantee contract between the applicant and the Town; 6. Does not cause excessive noise, traffic, parking, or overloading of public facilities; 7. 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 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. The granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner. This is based on the drawings dated September 28, 1988.

All Ayes. Motion unanimously passed. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

4. V-2260 - Howard Phillips, 70 Forest Avenue, A/P Nos. 7-013-04 and 7-013-05, a 20 foot frontyard variance to construct a parking deck within 0 feet of the front property line (should the variance be granted, the applicant must enter into an encroachment agreement for the approach ramp to extend over the right of way), and a third story variance.

Terry Keasts, Westward Builders, representing the applicant, and the applicant was present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

Terry Keasts said there is no longer a need for a variance for the height because the plan has been changed. They also want to apply for a retaining wall in this application as Town staff is requiring it. Mr. Keasts did not agree with staff's proposal that the access be off Creek Road, adding that the access has always been off of Forest. There would be additional excavation necessary if the access is off of Creek. He also stated that they do not feel this application was substantially different than the previous house that was on the site and therefore staff should have been able to make a decision without Planning Commission review.

Ms. Wight stated that although the applicant has reduced the height, a variance is still necessary because of the three story height. With regards to the retaining wall that the Building Department is requiring, planning was not aware of it at the time the application was noticed so there will have to be another notice sent which includes the wall.

There was a discussion of what constitutes a third story. Lisa Wight said the lower area crawl space denotes a story and then read the pertinent ordinances. She added that staff is now interpreting stories differently. Commissioner Sias requested that there be a clarification from the Town Attorney.

Bill Nichols, 53 Creek Road, lives below 70 Forest and presented a statement to the Planning Commission about his concerns regarding the proposal to rebuild on the site of a landslide. He addressed soil creepage on the site, insufficient lot size to accommodate the building size, loss of light from the building and the damage the soils engineers have done to the area. He also asked who would be

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

responsible for road repair in the event the additional weight creates another slide.

Antone Sousa, 4 Glen Road, said there have been many slides in the area and this should be taken into consideration.

Rosemarie Davies, 43 Creek, would like someone to comment on the drainage and who will maintain it. She lives below 70 Forest and has already experienced soil movement since the engineers have been on the site.

Mel Steinberg, 61 Forest, concurred with staff findings about the parking deck as there is a blind curve on Forest and could cause a very dangerous situation.

Bruce Lombard, 180 Creek, Road, Fairfax, said the whole hill has a history of slides within the last 50 years. The weight of any structure on the site of the slide will add to a severe safety problem and the traffic is really at full capacity now.

Howard Phillips stated that there are problems with this property but it is his intention to rebuild his home so it will be safe and not to create any unnecessary problems with the neighbors. The nature of the slide that took place was primarily in the top soil as the engineering reports have shown. The reason the house slid is because it had shallow footings and the foundation was just in the top soil. With proper engineering and proper design a new house could be built.

Terry Keasts said a traffic flow study was done and it indicates that Forest Avenue would be the preferable parking area with approximately 200 plus feet visibility.

David Barenbaum, 145 Forest, Fairfax, did not agree with the results of the study. He was concerned about access onto Forest because the curb is blind and the corner and the access will create a traffic hazard. There are wide cracks on Forest now and increased traffic and heavy vehicles will only add to the problem. He urged the Commission to consider all the problems before making a decision.

Bill Nichols, 53 Creek Road, was in agreement with staff's recommendation about the parking deck on Creek. He noted that there is no record of the previous house plans on file in the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Sias asked the builder why they are against using Creek Road for the parking deck. Mr. Keasts said the soils engineer is against excavating the hillside and the additional expense and additional trucks moving the soil off the property would be required.

Mr. Phillips said he lived in his home for ten years with no problems accessing his home from Forest Avenue.

Rosemarie Davies, 43 Creek, would prefer to see the parking deck off of Creek and was concerned about any additional landslides on the area. She wondered what reassurance there would be for the neighbors that the site could be developed without another slide occurring.

Mr. Lombard, 180 Creek Road, Fairfax, asked if the Town would be liable if further problems occur relating to this site being developed. Chairman Hayes said the Town has an obligation to ensure the home is safely constructed. He added that the Building Department may put additional requirements on the application but the Planning Commission should be addressing the variances that are before them.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

Ms. Wight stated that Herzog and Associates will review the soils report for 70 Forest to ensure that their findings will not be detrimental to the crib wall that the Town had constructed.

Mr. Nichols wanted to see that the Town get a bond from the applicant as part of the condition of approval. Ms. Wight said the Town engineer has stated that a bond will be required.

Commissioner Yarish asked about the differences in the current design and previous house. Ms. Wight said the proposed house is not in the exact location and is of a different design, adding the old house was a modified A frame. Mr. Phillips said the old house was built in 1963 and would not meet the current building codes. He would like to apply the standards and design of 1988 to the new house.

Commissioner Yarish asked what the square footage was of the old house. Mr. Phillips responded saying he thought it was approximately 1,900 square feet however he has a double lot and is able to accommodate more.

Commissioner Yarish said that the foundation, if properly designed, would make the hillside more stable. With regards to the third story, he hasn't heard much comment from the neighbors and is undecided at this time although Commissioner Yarish did feel the new interpretation is very strict and perhaps unfair for hillside lots. He did not find a significant difference between accessing off of Creek or Forest.

Commissioner Manning felt there would be less adverse impact on the neighbors if the access was on Forest. He was also concerned about the interpretation of the third story.

Commissioner Julin would like to have a clarification of the third story and would like to know if there is immediate danger with the pieces of rocks/boulders or foundation that was addressed by Mr. Nichols. As far as the sight distance on Forest, it is just a condition of the roadway, so would be leaning towards reconstructing the carport where it was on Forest.

Commissioner Harle felt the access off of Forest is logical for this particular house if the street below is less adequate to traffic and if considerable excavation is required on Creek. He would like to have clarification of the third story but overall he can't believe that someone would want to rebuild on a site that is a proven slide area.

Commissioner Sias wondered if the soils report looked into the approach to the dwelling from Creek and if not, would like to see the idea explored. He also did not understand why the applicant would want to rebuild on a slide. The proposed dwelling seems too large for the lot but could be pursued if there is documentation that it would be safe. He would require a bond for the project.

Commissioner Harle added that the Building Department is responsible for obtaining all necessary information relating to the safety of the lot from the soils and geotechnical engineers and the Planning Commission is responsible for making decisions about the variances on this property.

Commissioner Kroot was not convinced about the terminology of the third story as it may tend to have people dig into the hillside and weaken the hillside. He felt the access off of Forest would be preferable because of better visibility. He felt the retaining wall on Creek Road was a

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

good idea and should be part of this application. He would like to see a drawing on the retaining wall.

Commissioner Kroot asked if the road slipped or the site? Mr. Phillips said the subterranean drain that is in the hill now was put in when the crib wall was built. Before that time all the drainage took place from Forest Avenue down the hill. The water seeped into the road and creeped slowly down the hill.

Chairman Hayes felt he could support reconstruction but he is also concerned about many of the same issues as the neighbors. He asked about the written agreement between the Town and Mr. Phillips and wondered what steps the Building Department will go through for this application to ensure the safety of the project. Ms. Wight read the contents of the agreement and stated that a soils engineer will review the current report and a bond will be required for \$150,000 for improvements.

Chairman Hayes said he needed more information on: (1) entering from Creek or Forest to better evaluate the pros and cons; (2) a plan for drainage and perhaps integrate it with a report for the causes for the slippage in the road; (3) retaining wall and drawings; (4) would like clarification on the third story; (5) staff to provide a list for the neighbors of the requirements that will be made at the Building Department level for this property; and (6) staff to renote to include the retaining wall. Chairman Hayes added that he would like to see a good argument in favor of the substantial increase of this dwelling before he could approve.

M/S Harle, Julin, to continue V-2260, Howard Phillips, 70 Forest Avenue, A/P Nos. 7-013-04 and 7-013-05, a 20 foot frontyard variance to construct a parking deck within 0 feet of the front property line; and a third story variance to the meeting of November 21, 1988 to give the applicant and staff adequate time to answer the questions that have been raised in tonight's meeting.

Commissioner Sias added that he would like Herzog to review the two approaches and provide a statement on the pros and cons.

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed.

5. V-2261 - John Paletta, 903 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-114-11, a 7 foot southeast sideyard variance for two parking spaces to be within 13 feet of the street (in conjunction with constructing a second apartment unit on an R-3 (Neighborhood apartment District) zoned property); and a variance for a second driveway on Madrone Avenue.

The applicant was present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

The Commission was in support of the application.

M/S Kroot, Harle, to approve V-2261 - John Paletta, 903 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-114-11, a 7 foot southeast sideyard variance for two parking spaces to be within 13 feet of the street and a variance to construct a second driveway on the basis: 1. Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, specifically the shape and configuration in the existing location, the strict application of the controlling zoning ordinance or regulation deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by the property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification; and the granting of a variance will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

the vicinity and zone in which such property is located; and 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. This is based on the revised drawings dated October 24, 1988.

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - August 29, 1988, September 26, 1988, October 17, 1988, October 24, 1988.

M/S Julin, Harle, to approve minutes of August 29, 1988 with the amendment on page 8, third paragraph should read: "The Planning commission requested that Julin prepare appropriate language for the next General Plan meeting.

Ayes: Sias, Harle, Julin, Yarish, Kroot,
Abstain: Manning, Hayes

M/S Kroot, Julin, to approve minutes of September 26, 1988 as written.

Ayes: Harle, Julin, Yarish, Kroot, Hayes
Abstain: Sias, Manning

M/S Kroot, Manning, to approve minutes of October 17, 1988 as written.

Ayes: Julin, Manning, Harle, Sias, Kroot, Yarish
Abstain: Hayes

M/S Harle, Julin, to approve minutes of October 24, 1988 as written.

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:30 a.m. to the next regular meeting of November 21, 1988.

BARBARA CHAMBERS
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY/TECHNICIAN