The regular Planning Commission meeting was convened in the Council Chamber at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Yarish. Staff present: Dain Anderson, Assistant Director of Planning; Lisa Wight, Planner; Jayni Barker, Planning Consultant; and Lisa Newman, Planning Consultant, were present.

#### A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Harle, Hayes, Julin, Kanis, Sias,

Yarish

Commissioner absent: Kroot

#### B. PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED TO APRIL 16, 1990

AR-9002 - David and Lydia Bell, Fernwood Drive, A/P 7-131-14, architectural review of a single family dwelling located in the R-1 C zoning district.

#### C. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. <u>DR-9004 - Redhill Shopping Center, 850 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-061-23, design review amendment to remove the entire arbor located in the center island near Longs Drug Store in the parking lot and replace with trees in the planter.</u>

Don Arntz, applicant, and Dan Goltz, architect, present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report, noting this item was continued from the March 19 meeting because of a tie vote.

Mr. Goltz presented sketches of the existing arbor height and a raised arbor, noting that raising this arbor would be out of proportion. Mr. Goltz also presented photographs of mature Bradford Pear Trees, which are proposed in the island planter in place of the existing arbor, noting they can reach a height of 40 feet and, with careful pruning, can clear trucks. The applicant proposes to plant 24" box trees which are 14' high, will reach a height of 25' in 5 years, and a maximum height of 40' in 15 years. There will be no impact on the signs on the businesses, Graceful Fashions and Easy Street Cafe.

Commissioner Sias was persuaded that raising the arbor will be out of proportion, but he was not persuaded that trees in this location will be a solution.

Commissioner Harle prefers trees in place of the arbor and added that the Bradford Pear is a beautiful tree and will retain its color into January.

Commissioner Julin agreed that raising the arbor will be out of scale. However, this is a self-created hardship that could have been avoided if the parking lot had been designed differently. She expressed concern that something so important to the people in this community has gradually been hacked away. There are few vines left, but it is still an amenity and trucks hitting the arbor is a management problem, not a planning concern.

Commissioner Hayes also likes the amenity of the trellis and is sorry to see the state it currently is in. However, noting that the Commission has received a petition from the merchants in support of the trellis removal, he is swayed that the trellis should be removed and added that over time the trees will look good.

M/S Harle, Kanis, to approve DR-9004 for Redhill Shopping Center, 850 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-061-23, design review amendment to remove the entire arbor located in the center island near Longs Drug Story in the parking lot and replace with 3: 24° box Bradford Pear trees in the island and 2 additional wisteria plants on the east side of the existing arbor by Easy Street Cafe, on the grounds that the trees will be functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the area; that there are no effects on noise nor odors, and other factors which may make the environmental less desirable; it will not tend to cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy, investment, or orderly development in such area; will not create unnecessary traffic hazards due to congestion, distraction of motorists, or other factors and provides for satisfactory access by emergency vehicles and personnel; and will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area. This is based on the plans dated March 13, 1990.

Motion carried: Ayes: Kanis, Sias, Harle, Hayes, Yarish

Noe: Julin

The audience was advised of the ten day appeal period.

Commissioner Hayes suggested that the applicant delay removal of the wisteria on the island arbor until it ceases to bloom this season.

2. <u>DR-9003/SR-9002 - Bay View Federal Bank, 305 San Anselmo Avenue</u>, A/P 7-280-20, design review of: 1) change of exterior paint color; 2) elimination of drive-up teller window; and 3) installation of ATM machine; and sign variance to permit 5 signs on the building.

Al Bovee, representative of Bay View Federal Bank, present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report and referred to a colored elevation of the building. She noted that since writing the report, she has been approached by one Commissioner who suggested the drive-up teller window remain for use by handicapped persons.

Commissioner Sias is attracted to the idea of landscaping the west side of the building to soften that side. With regard to the ATM location, he did not think that parking was typically a problem in that part of town. Wells Fargo Bank and Bank of America have ATMs on the main road, which is a marketing advantage and it is not fair to deny it for this business. With regard to the exterior colors, he prefers earth tones, but does not feel strongly one way or the other. He supports the idea of maintaining service to the disabled at the rear of the building.

Mr. Bovee said he has no problem with other colors, adding that the reason for selecting white lettering for the signs is to have flexibility with building colors. He advised the Commission that the drive up tellers are not used by customers.

Commissioner Harle is content with the proposed colors, and added that they are less objectionable than the existing colors. He said that ATMs do generate traffic but he did not want it in the rear for safety reasons during the evenings. He prefers to eliminate the driveway and gain one on-street parking space in front of the bank and additional landscaping.

Commissioner Julin agrees with the staff recommendations. She would like to see an accommodation made for disabled persons in the rear. She felt the information presented was fragmented and the proposed building color and company logo colors clash. She requested additional drawings indicating how the signs will look on the building.

Commissioner Hayes agreed with Commissioner Julin, but added that the colors are not appropriate and may make the building more prominent. He is opposed to the blues and greens and preferred to see earth tones, adding that darker tones may actually make the building appear more massive. He suggested painting a square on the building for the Commission to review. He said the building was modernistic and additional wood might soften it. He feels the sign application is incomplete.

Commissioner Kanis suggested that the applicant provide a photo backdrop so the Commission can review the colors in relation to the hillside and surrounding buildings. He believes that ATMs in a patio/parking lot have been proven to be a marketing advantage. He is not convinced there won't be a traffic problem as a result of the ATM machine.

Chairman Yarish feels the proposed colors are shadowy, forest colors and, therefore, considers them earth colors. The main intent of color is to diminish the appearance of a building and to make it innocuous, and these colors may do that. He requested a landscape plan, but has no problem with the proposed ATM machine location because parking is not an issue. He agrees that the sign application is incomplete, as it lacks the appropriate details and the scale is inadequate.

M/S Sias, Hayes, to continue this matter to the May 7, 1990 meeting for the applicant to submit: a detailed landscaping plan for the building; new colors to consider in keeping with the spirit of other buildings in Town and the surrounding hillside; and detailed colors, sizes, and locations of all proposed signs so the appearance of the entire building can be reviewed.

Motion carried: AYES: Sias, Harle, Hayes, Julin, Kanis

NOE: Yarish

3. <u>PP-14/V-2315 - James Helfrich, between 444 and 500 The Alameda</u>, San Anselmo jurisdiction A/P Nos. 5-043-16, 5-043-22, 5-043-31, and County of Marin jurisdiction A/P Nos. 177-133-13 and 177-220-54, subject properties, and the initial expanded environmental study for the development of 4 single family dwellings.

Applicant present.

Ms. Barker presented the staff report.

Mr. Helfrich said he accepted the staff recommended building sites, A, B, D, E (as shown on the constraints map prepared by Foley & Associates submitted this evening); however, he prefers site C to E.

Roberta Stoddard, 443 The Alameda, questioned why a notice was not sent after this matter was continued for 3 meetings. She said her house is below building site E and the grading associated with development of site E will be excessive and dangerous, and the dwelling will loom over her property.

Jan Back, 340 The Alameda, said a house on Site E will be too close to Ms. Stoddard and the house on Varborg Terrace. She prefers Site C to Site E. She also questioned why staff did not renotice the matter, indicating that many people were not present that have been interested.

A resident (name unknown) of 343 The Alameda said he prefers Site C to Site E.

Rick Fish, Deer Hollow, said that neighbors in his area were not aware of this meeting.

Dan Goltz, 107 Holstein, also questioned the lack of notice for this meeting. He feels the applicant has complied with the General Plan by keeping the building sites off the ridge, but he has not quite met the spirit of the General Plan because the roads should also be kept off the ridge partially to discourage future development beyond. He suggested that additional information regarding road locations should be required at this stage.

Ms. Barker and the Commission noted that the information requested by Mr. Goltz will be provided at future stages of the development process and is not necessary at this time.

Commissioner Kanis suggested continuing the meeting to renotice the neighbors.

Commissioner Sias said what is considered a legal notice is not always considered a fair notice. At the next meeting he wants to look at the preliminary plan for sites A, B, D, E, and alternate C.

Commissioner Hayes said he does not have adequate information on all 8 sites to make a decision - there are 6 potential sites, not 4. For the next meeting he would like to see: 3-D building envelopes viewed from vantage points on the valley floor, i.e., a typical 2 story or 18' house viewed from Deer Hollow Road; and story poles placed in the middle of each lot with a flag to roughly show where the proposed dwellings will be.

Mr. Anderson noted this application has been legally noticed and continued from previous meetings. Discussion ensued as to what is an appropriate notice without creating a precedent setting situation.

Mr. Goltz said the landslide area is developable and prefers to have all the development in that area and screen it with landscaping.

The resident of 343 The Alameda said he opposes building in the slide area and does not feel the residents on The Alameda should take the brunt of the development.

Commissioner Harle favors sites A,B,C,D,E, but feels site C is more suitable than site E.

Commissioner Julin agreed with Commissioner Harle, and noted the next step in the process does not have to be any more detailed than is necessary. She feels the Commission should set goals as to what should be accomplished at the next meeting so the application can move along.

Commissioner Hayes said he will consider sites A,B,C,D,E,F,and G: site D may have a greater vertical profile; site C is larger, but he does not like the roadway on the ridge or the potential for future development at the end of the driveway; he does not know the impact with site G yet; he can see the need for an exception on site D to have development closer than 20' from the road easement edge, adding that there is nothing magic about setbacks in hillsides; he is not wild about site F because it may cause damage to The Alameda, but many other houses are there so perhaps this will be no worse. Prior to the next meeting he wants to know what needs to be done to stabilize the slides. If the slides have to be rebuilt anyway, then it may not be a big deal to put houses in that area.

Commissioner Sias is willing to consider sites A,B,C,D, and G, although site D is visible.

Commissioner Yarish is not sure of site G; site D is on the hillside and may experience soil creepage. He believes site D is viable within the constraints, but if shifted into the ridge zone it may be less visible. He is interested in seeing a comparative analysis of shifting D into the ridge zone. Development on The Alameda will require vegetation removal and have a negative impact on the immediate neighbors; however, it will be better visually for distant neighbors.

Mr. Helfrich added that site D can be developed behind a large oak tree.

M/S Sias, Kanis, to continue PP-14/V-2315 for James Helfrich to the meeting of April 16, 1990 for: 1) noticing to all people within 300 feet and those names on the signed petitions in the file (persons who have indicated interest in this matter) and the issuance of a press release to local newspapers; sites A,B,C,D,E,F,and G are to be marked with prominent 3' posts with flags in the center of each building envelope to enable the neighbors, Planning Commissioners, and any other interested parties to see where these are actually situated on the property; photos to be developed with 3-D building envelopes that show how the buildings would look from the perspectives of Woodside Drive, Deer Hollow Road, and Fawn Drive; a plot map of the sites showing where the tentative driveways, particularly to site C, will be located and how they will be accessed. The goal of this entire exercise is to attempt to narrow down the number of lots to 4 at the next Planning Commission meeting on April 16, 1990 to be included in the preliminary plan.

Motion passed unanimously.

4. <u>V-9007 - Grizzly Hills Construction Company, 12 Martha Lane</u>, Variance to construct a garage within 0 feet of the west side yard property line at the end of Martha Lane; A/P 5-031-32, in an R-1H zoning district.

Applicant present.

Commissioner Hayes said that should there be a similar application in the future that the Fire Department requests such a large structure, a representative of the Fire Department should be present.

M/S Harle, Sias, to approve V-9007 for Grizzly Hills Construction Company, to construct a garage within 0 feet of the west side yard property line at the end of Martha Lane, A/P 5-031-32, in an R-1 H zoning district, on the basis that the design of the driveway is dictated by the maximum slope acceptable for vehicular and fire truck access to this steeply sloping site as well as the need to minimize the cut into the natural grade to protect a 36-inch oak tree. Given these design parameters, the proposed location for the garage structure is as close to the residence as possible while minimizing the removal of large trees from the site. The proposed variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege since covered parking is required by the Zoning Ordinance and the optimum location for the garage, given complex site characteristics, is within the side yard area; the applicant requests this variance in order to comply with the Planning Commission and Town staff's recommendation that relocating the garage adjacent to the proposed residence will provide for the best site design; and the proposed garage location will not cause any health or safety hazards for residents of adjacent properties or the neighborhood. The garage will not be close to other nearby homes or structures and will be fairly unobtrusive visually due to the slope and vegetation of the site and area. This approval is based on drawings dated February 22, 1990.

Motion passed unanimously.

Audience was advised of the ten day appeal period.

5. <u>V-9002 - Gary Palmer, 173 The Alameda, A/P 5-101-25, 1) a 2' frontyard variance and a 5' south sideyard variance to construct a carport within 18' of the front property line and within 3' of the south side property line; and 2) a 4' south sideyard variance to construct a living addition within 4' of the south side property line, with an 18' roof overhang within the R-1 zoning district.</u>

Applicant present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

The Planning Commissioners generally stated that they are unable to make all the required findings. Discussion ensued as to whether the applicant could eliminate the need for a sideyard variance for the family room. Commissioner Kanis noted that the owner of No. 169 had advised him that she opposes the sideyard variance requests.

M/S Hayes, Kanis, to continue V-9002 for Gary Palmer to the meeting of April 16, 1990 for the purpose of the applicant to reconsider the parameters of the project and the design based on the discussion this evening.

Motion passed unanimously.

The next application was taken out of order.

7. A-8901 - Jacob Friedman, 54 Miwok Drive, A/P 177-263-01, amendment to the previously approved wood siding and exterior colors of a new single family dwelling in the R-1 C zoning district.

Commissioner Kanis, 45 Miwok Drive, stepped down and sat in the audience.

Applicant present.

Ms. Wight present the staff report, noting that since the report was prepared, the applicant has again changed his color selection to Weathered Barnboard.

Barrett Denton, Miwok Drive, prefers the medium brown color.

Mr. Friedman said the trim will not be the same color as the siding and he has not yet determined the color. Some Commissioners suggested this matter be postponed since the proposal is not complete. As a result, Mr. Friedman verbally withdrew the color portion of his application.

It was suggested that the neighbors, Mr. Kanis and Mr. Denton, meet with Mr. Friedman to agree on the exact tone of medium brown for the siding

M/S Hayes, Julin, to approve the change in materials from T 1-11 redwood to T-1 11 fir.

Motion passed unanimously.

Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

6. <u>V-9005 - Wallace McOuat, 100 Laurel Avenue</u>, A/P 7-115-04, 1) a 7'3" south sideyard variance to construct a garage within 9' of the south side property line; 2) a third story variance; and 3) a 4' south sideyard variance to construct first, second, and third story living additions within 4' of the south side property line, with a 1'6" roof overhang, within the R-1 zoning district.

Applicant present.

Mr. Anderson presented the staff report.

Mr. McOuat presented a detailed analysis of proposals and findings, and submitted a photo album of subject property and several neighboring properties, including letters of support.

Mrs. Urico, Hillside Avenue, stated there is an apartment and a tenant in the building, and she opposes a third story.

Mr. McOuat said the "tenant" is an exchange student who is leaving this week. There are 3 adults in the house living as one family.

Commissioner Harle questioned the location of the garage on the proposed side of lot.

Julin echoed the comments of Commissioner Harle and added that it will detract from the neighboring house.

Commissioner Hayes does not support the deck on the garage and the garage should be at least 2' from the side property line for maintenance purposes.

Chairman Yarish concurred with Commissioner Hayes.

The Commissioners generally felt that based on the quantity of material submitted by the applicant at this meeting that they are not able to make a decision. Commissioner Julin disagreed, stating the information presented is no different than that contained in the staff report.

M/S Julin, Kanis, to continue V-9005 for Wallace McOuat to the meeting of April 16, 1990.

Motion carried: Ayes: Kanis, Hayes, Julin, Sias, Yarish

Noes: Harle

# D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - MARCH 19, 1990

M/S Kanis, Harle, to approve the March 19, 1990 minutes as prepared.

Motion carried: Ayes: Sias, Kanis, Harle, Yarish Abstain: Hayes Julin

## E. DISCUSSION

1. With regard to the zoning workshops, staff noted that since the Commission has continued their discussion of R-1 C and R-1 H to the April 9 special meeting, they may wish to postpone discussion of the commercial zones (which were originally scheduled for April 9) to a future

zoning workshop. The Planning Commission agreed to this suggestion, adding that the current schedule is too intense. Staff said they will advise the Town Council.

2. The Planning Commission agreed that all their meetings should end at midnight.

## F. ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 1:07 a.m. to the Zoning Workshop scheduled for April 9, 1990.

LISA WIGHT PLANNER