

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
APRIL 3, 1989

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order on April 3, 1989, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber by Commissioner Yarish. Staff present: Lisa Wight, Planner.

A. ROLL CALL:

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

Commissioners absent: Sias

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. SR-347 - Filippo and Nicola LoCoco, 638 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 6-102-37, a sign variance to permit a third sign to project from the building.

The applicant was present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Mr. LoCoco said the proposed illuminated sign is quieter and more efficient because the light is on the inside instead of the outside. The look is cleaner. Many of the restaurants in the area are closed in the evening therefore those restaurants have no need for a lit sign. He proposes the sign to be perpendicular and placed over the awning. He presented drawings of the proposed sign.

William Hendrickson, owner of the building, was in support of the applicant. He presented approximately 24 color photographs of illuminated signs within San Anselmo noting that Cybelle's Pizza on Greenfield has seven lighted signs.

Ron Basker, 106 Humboldt, had no objection to the sign however he thought the comparisons should be in the immediate area, not all over town.

Dixie Manwaring, 111 Crescent, asked if the Sign Ordinance differs from interior and exterior signs and from district to district. Ms Wight responded.

Mr. Hendrickson asked if the Municipal Code states that interior lit signs are permitted. Ms. Wight responded by saying that projecting signs are to be of wood and if they are illuminated signs then a variance is required.

Commissioner Julin did not think the proposed illuminated sign was the best solution although she had no objection to three signs. She thought a projecting wood sign would be acceptable but would prefer something on the awning.

Commissioner Harle said if the sign was not large and in garish colors, an interior lit sign is preferable. The exterior lit signs are spotty and not as neat. He commented that the gold lettering on the window, although it counts for a sign, is really more of an address. Commissioner Harle thought perhaps a compromise of allowing the three signs but decreasing the size of the sign from 6 square feet to a 3 foot strip sign that identifies LoCoco's Pizza. He noted that 1 Hr Photo has three signs but they are of wood and Comforts Restaurant has a group of signs, plus one over the awning. If the applicant were willing to reduce the sign and the prominence he would be willing to approve the application.

Commissioner Kroot was in support of the illuminated sign, noting that the applicant has a night business and the sign is fairly simple design to identify the business. In addition, there is no opposition from the neighbors.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
APRIL 3, 1989

Commissioner Hayes said the sign is a little more prominent than necessary and would rather see it under the awning. He noted that vehicular traffic has to stop at the corner, which is right in front of the restaurant. He would be more inclined to see the sign in the window rather than have it protrude. He was also concerned about the number of signs and setting a precedent if an illuminated sign were approved.

Commissioner Yarish was concerned about the impact of the sign and suggested that the sign be of a dark background, perhaps green or blue, with light lettering, suspended vertical rather than perpendicular.

Mr. LoCoco said he would agree to a vertical sign if that was the desire of the Commission but a sign in the window would be disturbing to his customers in the dining room.

Commissioner Hayes was not sure what the findings would be for allowing an illuminated, projecting sign and wondered how the Commission would be able to justify the decision to the next applicants that come in and ask for the same thing.

Commissioner Yarish said the sign will have to be less obtrusive.

Commissioner Harle would allow the sign as long as it isn't glaring. He again stated that a wood sign is less desirable.

Commissioner Kroot said this application is unique because of the night time business.

Commissioner Julin did not think it was necessary to have an illuminated sign and that something could be put on the awning to attract people.

Lisa Wight said that Alberto's Restaurant on Sir Francis Drake has an exterior illuminated sign that works well.

Commissioner Hayes was not willing to approve what was before the Commission but was willing to see a new design.

M/S Harle, Hayes, to continue SR - 347 - Filippo and Nicola LoCocco, 638 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 6-102-37, a sign variance to permit a third sign to project from the building for submittal of a specific design. This is to be continued to April 17, 1989.

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed.

Mr. LoCoco was willing to have the sign redesigned and to submit drawings but wanted a clear definition of what the Commission was looking for.

Commissioner Yarish thought dark colors, red, blue, or green with light lettering.

Commissioner Hayes said the sign must have a lower impact than the current one.

2. V-2278 - Steve G. Zamlich, 121 Humboldt Avenue, A/P 7-033-03, a 20 foot frontyard variance to construct an approach ramp, garage and single family dwelling within 0 feet of the front property line, with an 18 inch roof overhang (to replace a dwelling destroyed by fire in 1988).

The applicant was present.

Lisa Wight presented the staff report.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
APRIL 3, 1989

Paul Ferrarese, 24 Elm Avenue, was present to address the drainage problems that runoff Humboldt and down into his property. He stated that at the bottom of Foothill there are two catch basins that have to take the runoff of all the homes. Over the years the drainage problems have increased because of the development up hill and he feels he is suffering the consequences of the development. He was recently in touch with Mr. Kottage regarding another drainage problem in the same vicinity because the drainage off their property was causing severe problems to his property. He was able to help resolve this problem. He was looking for direction from the Commission on this current application.

Ron Basker, 106 Humboldt, said several trees have been removed from the property and he did not understand why the applicant was allowed to remove them without the neighbors being noticed. He is a landscape architect and he felt that those trees that have been cut back will never grow properly. This could also cause an erosion problem. He asked where the new house would be in relation to where the old one was. He noted that if the trees were not removed there would be no objection to this house because it would be hidden by trees. He objects to the garage because of the visual impact and to the height of the proposed dwelling.

Roger Van Craeynest, 112 Humboldt, was upset about the trees being removed without being notified. He said approximately 10 trees had been removed. It was a forested area and the aesthetics have now seriously changed. There is now a feeling of three houses close together. The size of the house will look larger because of no foliage. He also thought there should be some consideration given to the entrance on Foothill rather than Humboldt and would prefer the dwelling to be smaller. He suggested that staff look at updating the Tree Ordinance.

Steve Zamlich said he had no intention of alienating the neighbors and talked to several neighbors about the project. He has not removed all the trees and was given Town approval for those trees he has removed. Some of the trees were just trimmed and will grow back. He was on the site for seven weeks and did not understand why the neighbors did not voice their concern before. In addition, some of the trees that were removed were not by him. Another neighbor has also removed trees.

Commissioner Harle was in sympathy with the neighbors about the trees being removed. He was not sure of the purpose of clearing the lot expect perhaps that people build homes on hillsides to have a view. The mitigations as suggested by staff will help will off street parking in an area that needs it. He was in support of the application.

Commissioner Kroot said the proposed location of the house is the safest and most suitable location on the lot. He is not sure what can be required with regards to drainage but sure it will be reviewed by staff at the building stage. He would like staff to look into adding additional screening with trees, perhaps in the rear and front around twenty feet high.

Lisa Wight explained that the trees that were removed were not heritage trees and the lot was considered developed so the neighbors were not noticed and no permit was necessary.

Commissioner Hayes said it did not seem appropriate to cut so many trees without the neighbors being noticed even though the applicant did it with the approval of the Town. He thought that Council should look at the Tree Ordinance. He would like to see what could be done to screen the dwelling and would like to see a landscaping plan submitted

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
APRIL 3, 1989

and have the neighbors review it. There have also been good points raised regarding the drainage problems and they will be looked at by staff at the building permit stage.

Commissioner Julin said the house will be very stark and would like to see plans for screening the house. In concept she approved the variance.

Commissioner Yarish agreed with the comments of his colleagues and added that he did not agree that the 10" and 12" bay trees should be removed in light of the fact there have already been so many trees removed. He said there is roughly 25 feet between the bay and oak trees which will be adequate room for a parking space.

Commissioner Hayes said he would not rule out staff mitigation about removing the two trees to increase parking because the landscaping plan will show that proper screening around the property will be adequate.

Steve Zamlich said there is already parking available and the 10' and 12' bays do not have to be removed.

M/S Hayes, Harle to continue V-2278 - Steve G. Zamlich, 121 Humboldt Avenue, A/P 7-033-03, a 20 foot frontyard variance to construct an approach ramp, garage and single family dwelling within 0 feet of the front property line, with an 18 inch roof overhang for the purpose of a screening plan to screen to the extent feasible to the house and consider further the additional parking spaces on Humboldt. This is continued to the meeting of April 17, 1989.

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed.

Steve Zamlich asked if the screening should be for just the downhill side.

Commissioner Hayes said there should be some screening on the north, west and east sides of the lot or mitigations as to why it is not necessary.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS CONTINUED TO April 17, 1989 MEETING

1. Z-246 - Terry and Eugene Schenk, and Kintetsu Enterprises of America, Off cherne Lane, A/P Nos. 5-300-15, 5-300-24 and 5-300-28, proposed rezoning and environmental review to amend the Table of Hillside and Ridge Density Parcels to create a new building site by combining a portion of the Kintetsu property (A/P 5-300-15) with the Schenk property (A/P Nos. 5-300-24 and 5-300-28) in an R-1 H District. The Table of Hillside and Ridge Density Parcels is proposed to be changed as follows:

<u>Existing Maximum</u>	<u>Proposed Maximum</u>
<u>No. of Dwelling Units</u>	<u>No. of Dwelling Units</u>
A/P 5-300-15: 8 units	Portion of A/P 5-300-15: 7 units
A/P 5-300-24 and 5-300-28: 1 unit	A/P 5-300-24, 5-300-28, and portion of a/P 5-300-15: 2 units

2. V-2274 - Calvin and Linda Alhgren, 31 Kemp Avenue, A/P 7-171-06, a 17' frontyard variance and a 5' west sideyard variance to construct a two-car carport within 3' of the front property line and the west side property line, with a 1' roof overhang.

3. AR-8 - Doug Elliott, Quarry Mountain Partners, 53 Tomohawk Drive, A/P 177-250-66, architectural review of an inground swimming pool and fence.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
APRIL 3, 1989

4. V-2280 - Nelly Dolinsek, 37 Canyon Road, a/P 7-064-16, a 20 foot frontyard variance to construct a two story addition within 0 feet of the front property line, with a 1 foot roof overhang.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - FEBRUARY 27, 1989 AND MARCH 22, 1989

M/S Harle, Julin to approve minutes of February 27, 1989 with the following amendments: page 2, paragraph 4, spelling correction of "Cowperthwaiate" to "Cowperthwaite"

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

M/S Kroot, Julin, to approve the minutes of March 22, 1989 with the following amendments: Page 2, paragraph 6, change "He would consider.." to "He would be more likely to consider.."; page 3, paragraph 5, change "Commissioner asked.." to "Commissioner Sias asked.."; page 5, third paragraph from the bottom should read: "..but this is a plus because the street is almost too narrow to park cars and drive, also off street space will be created and...".

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

F. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Johanna Willmann came forward and asked the Commission would be able to determine if the large property at the end of Rancho Drive would be considered as a regular R-1 lot or fall within the 150' elevation. She said only a portion of the lot was in 150 foot mean sea level.

Lisa Wight said she has advised the applicant that this item has to be agendized before it could be heard and if the applicant wanted to do that, a letter should be submitted to the Planning Commission. Staff is also requesting a topo map of the area.

Commissioner Kroot further discussed his concerns about residents adding on to their existing homes and the potential of over building.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m. to the next regular meeting of April 17, 1989 at 8:00 p.m.

BARBARA CHAMBERS  
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY/TECHNICIAN