

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991**

The special meeting of the Planning Commission was convened at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber by Chair Julin with Commissioner's Sias, Yarish and Kroot present. Staff present: Lisa Newman, Consultant; and Lisa Wight, Interim Planning Director.

B. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes:

- (a) January 14, 1991
- (b) January 24, 1991
- (c) January 28, 1991

2. Robert M. Yeakey, 80 South Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-50, request for extension of time to begin construction of a single family dwelling on property located within the R-1H zoning district (precise development plan and architectural review approved December, 1988).

Ms. Wight asked to remove Item 2 from the Consent Agenda and continuing it until the meeting of March 4, 1991.

M/S Kroot, Sias, to approve Item 1, Minutes as written.

All ayes.

M/S Julin, Sias, to continue Item 2, Robert M. Yeakey, 80 South Oak Avenue, to the meeting of March 4, 1991.

All ayes.

C. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS TO MARCH 4, 1991

1. V-9101/DR-9103 - Ongaro Brothers, 243 Ross Avenue, A/P 7-282-11, parking variance for the construction of a new commercial building; and design review of a new commercial building, on property located within the C-2 zoning district.

2. V-U-9102/DR-9104 - Ongaro Brothers, 243 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-284-13, use permit to allow living quarters; design review of a new commercial and residential building; and environmental review on property located within the C-2 zoning district.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

AR-9006/V-9039 - Jef Pedersen, 16 Ivy Lane, A/P 7-064-55, 1) architectural review of a new single family dwelling; 2) a 20' frontyard variance, a 16' rearyard variance, and a 5' sideyard variance to construct a single family dwelling within 0' of the front p[roperty line, within 4' of the rear property line, and within 3' of the side property line; 3) a third story variance to construct a single family dwelling; and 4) a 20' frontyard variance to construct retaining walls and a 14' frontyard variance to construct open stairs within 0' of the front property line (the wall and stairs encroach into the public right of way and will necessitate a revocable encroachment permit from the Public Works Director) on property located within the R-1C District.

The applicant was present.

Ms. Newman presented the staff report. She noted that in her conversations with the neighbors they commented that they favored pittosporum, while the Director of Public Works suggested myoporum. She also suggested adding vines to be planted to act as an additional screen for the retaining walls and additional ground covering. She has discussed both the on-site and off site drainage with the Director of Public Works and he feels the proposed plan is more than adequate for the site. She said the applicant would be willing to reduce the size of the house in the area of the familyroom. Although this will not affect the visual impact it will reduce the amount of grading into the hillside. Ms. Newman said she contacted the Open Space representative, Jonathan Braun because there was interest at the last meeting as to whether they would be interested in purchasing the property. Mr. Braun indicated that this parcel was not on their priority list.

Commissioner Sias asked what the impact would be if the house was moved further up slope. Ms. Newman stated that the current plan is to tuck the mass of the house into the hill, and by moving the house up slope, the house would look bulkier, and would loom over the other homes, and create a negative visual impact.

Jef Pedersen, stated that he has made minor changes to the access plan, thus creating six additional parking spaces. Also, the house will be sprinkled as well as meeting the Fire Department requirements for road access. He presented the exterior colors, stating that he took

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991**

the advise of the Commission and is now proposing a darker color for the horizontal siding to blend into the greenery around the house.

Jackie Harms, 8 Ivy Lane, stated she submitted a letter with her concerns prior to the Commission meeting but reiterated that she felt the house was out of character and scope with the rest of the neighborhood. She would prefer that the house be reduced and added that she will be losing one on-street parking space and a trash can enclosure because of the roadway improvements. She urged the Commission to consider not granting all the variances.

Rebecca Farber, 155 Allyn, stated that someone trespassed over her property to place stakes without permission. She also was concerned that the living space of 16 Ivy Lane will be directed towards her house, thus taking away her privacy and diminishing her property value. She would like to see additional screening on the property to allow her privacy.

Billie Magid, 49 Canyon, stated that currently Ivy Lane is a gravel road that is not Town maintained. She wondered who will maintain the asphalt road in the future, noting that a gravel road is easier, and less expensive to maintain than asphalt. She also felt the asphalt road might change drainage patterns and direct the flow onto her property and into her vegetable garden.

Clay Freeberg, 10 Ivy Lane, presented a rendering of his home and how the new dwelling would look next to it. He felt the scope of the project was quite large and out of character. He stated that the proposed project was about 80% larger than other homes. He said that if the house was pushed back from the street it would also create additional on street parking. He was concerned that the parking that will be created because of the roadway improvements will not be specifically allocated to him. He wondered if there was some means to protect his right to an on-street parking space. He stated that he did support staff's conditions of approval in the staff report that relate to his house. He added that he would like to see 4'x12"s used for the beams.

Roberta Freeberg, 10 Ivy Lane, did not want the Commission to approve any front variances or a third story variance. She would like to see the house pushed back further from the street. She said all the other homes in the area face east, while this house will not be in alignment with the rest of the homes. She wondered who would be maintaining the road in the future and indicated that there was pending litigation regarding this property.

Sandy Magid, 49 Canyon, stated that he submitted a lengthy letter to the Commission which details his concerns. He also submitted a petition signed by 34 neighbors that oppose the project as proposed. He summarized his objections as follows: He did not want Ivy Lane widened or paved. He did not feel that variances were necessary and that there are no special circumstances for the findings of approval, that the development should be subject to CEQA and yet staff states it is exempt. There will be a significant impact to both the environment and the roadway with the construction of the house. A study of the existing road conditions has not been made and that is a requirement of the General Plan. All neighbors closely affected with the development of the site are adamantly opposed to the project. This site is also used as an access to open space. He said there is currently a draught and yet there will be requirements to draught screen the property with extensive landscaping. What guarantee will there be to have it maintained. He stated the Soil Engineer's report indicated that if a third story were constructed, and new study would be required. He was concerned about the drainage runoff and the affect it would have on his property.

Ms. Newman stated that this project is exempt from CEQA because it is only one house proposed. She noted however, that the Planning Commission is addressing all the concerns that CEQA would address, such as drainage, grading, vegetation, removal, access, safety, and landscaping.

Commissioner Yarish asked if it was necessary to have a curb on the downhill side of Ivy Lane. He thought it might cause a sheeting affect. Ms. Newman stated the Director of Public Works was satisfied with the proposal and that it will not cause erosion to the down hill property.

Commissioner Kroot asked if the house was positioned farther uphill, would the roadway work still have to be done. Ms. Newman affirmed. Commissioner Kroot asked if the Fire Department placed the requirement for asphalt rather than gravel for the roadway. Ms. Newman affirmed.

Commissioner Sias wondered why the third story was necessary. Ms. Newman stated it was necessary to require adequate living space without the need to cut into the hill. Also, the topography of the neighborhood varies and not all houses were built at the same time, thus the setback variance could be approved.

Mr. Pedersen stated the house at 155 Allyn is approximately 200 to 300 feet away and through a cluster of redwoods, but would be willing to buffer with more trees if it really requires additional screening. He noted that he has carefully designed this project with Mr. Magid and the rest of the neighbors in mind so as not to negatively impact them. He also stated that he is not

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991**

developing on Mr. Magid's property at all. He said if the house were moved further up slope, it would be more imposing and the roadwork would still be required by the Fire Department.

Commissioner Kroot felt the variances were necessary because of the steep slope. He did not feel anything would be achieved by reducing the size of the familyroom. There would be lots of landscaping to screen this house from the neighbors, and the applicant is also willing to provide screening for the owner of 155 Allyn. He approved of the colors submitted for the architectural review, particularly the dark retaining walls.

Commissioner Yarish stated that if the home were located anywhere else on the lot it would be imposing. The special circumstances were that the location proposed is the least obtrusive, it would require less grading and the house would not loom over the neighbors as much as it would up slope. He felt the applicant has worked hard to build the house into the hillside with the use of substantial retaining walls. This is more expensive but less obtrusive. The roof line design has no overhangs or exceptionally high pitches, thereby keeping the visual impact to a minimum. The size of the house was not excessive and there was no need to reduce the size of the familyroom. He also supported all of staff's recommendations in the staff report except the reduction of the familyroom. He felt a good effort has been made to screen with the extensive amount of landscaping. He felt drainage has been adequately handled and the curbs and cuts of Ivy Lane will carry the water down Ivy, not across it.

Commissioner Sias wondered if the applicant would be willing to relocate the trash receptacle for the owner of 8 Ivy Lane. Mr. Pedersen affirmed. Ms. Wight noted that the trash receptacle should be removed from the present location regardless because it is in the public right of way. Commissioner Sias stated that the location of the house would create the least amount of impact. He generally favored the recommendations in the staff report, including the reduction of the familyroom because it would decrease the amount of grading for the site. He praised the effect of the applicant in trying to satisfy the needs of the neighbors. He supported the proposed colors, stating they are a vast improvement over the original white color. He was satisfied that the drainage had been adequately addressed by the Director of Public Works, in fact, it will probably improve the area. He thought the landscaping plan was excellent, that with the drip irrigation system, the plants would thrive in this area. He wanted to add to the conditions of approval that the applicant will relocate the trash storage for the owners of 8 Ivy Lane. He also would like some assurance that parking be expanded to accommodate the 2nd parking space lost by the owner of 8 Ivy Lane. With regard to the owners of 10 Ivy Lane, he would like assurance that the encroachment permit state that the Freebergs are guaranteed adequate on-street parking in front of their home. He would like to see this in place prior to the issuance of the Building Permit.

Chair Julin was in agreement with her colleagues. She also complimented the rational way the neighbors presented their views. She added that she did not feel there was a need to reduce the familyroom.

M/S Kroot, Yarish, to approve AR-9006/V-9039 - Jef Pedersen, 16 Ivy Lane, A/P 7-064-55, 1) architectural review of a new single family dwelling; 2) a 20' frontyard variance, a 16' rear yard variance, and a 5' sideyard variance to construct a single family dwelling within 0' of the front p[roperty line, within 4' of the rear property line, and within 3' of the side property line; 3) a third story variance to construct a single family dwelling; and 4) a 20' frontyard variance to construct retaining walls and a 14' frontyard variance to construct open stairs within 0' of the front property line (the wall and stairs encroach into the public right of way and will necessitate a revocable encroachment permit from the Public Works Director) on property located within the R-1C District on the basis:

Variance: 1) Due to special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, specifically, the steep slope which would create a much greater visual impact and more grading without variances, 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 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 situated; 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, specifically, the house built will be less visually obtrusive and there will be less disruption of the hillside and trees on this site. This approval is based on plans dated 8/29/90, and amendments to plans dated 1/23/91 and 1/29/91.

Commissioner Sias stated he will support this even though the size of the familyroom will not be reduced because it would not have a visual impact.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991**

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

Architectural Review

M/S Kroot, Yarish, to approve the architectural review on the basis: 1) It is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area; 2) provides for protection against noise, odors, and other factors which may make the environment less desirable; 3) 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; 4) 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 5) will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area; 6) is adequately screened; 7) contains a selection of architectural features that enable the structure to blend with its environment. Conditions of approval are staff's recommendations, excluding the reduction of the familyroom. They are:

1. The applicant shall label a color and material board "Exhibit A" which includes samples of the color palette and materials approved by the Planning Commission. Colors are: Antique slate composition shingle roof; downspouts, gutters and window frames, Final Bronze #2063(External); Window Sash Only,(Standard White #UC60361); Stained horizontal siding,- Back Pack Tan SW 2075; concrete retaining walls.
2. All necessary off-site improvements including drainage, road paving, and retaining wall construction shall be provided by the applicant, designed to Town standards and approved by the Director of Public Works prior to issuance of a building permit. All road widening shall be performed based upon the plan being reviewed and approved by the Commission.
3. The cement retaining wall walls shall be darkened with lampblack and textured with specially textured forms. The retaining wall adjacent to 10 Ivy Lane shall be stained a darker color than natural wood and the beams shall be 4'x12' in dimension. The stairway to 10 Ivy Lane shall be constructed with railroad ties.
4. The off-street parking area to the north of the residence at #10 Ivy Lane shall be paved asphalt instead of gravel over dirt.
5. The applicant shall strive to carpool site construction workers in order to reduce the number of vehicles driving on Ivy Lane and to park construction vehicles on or immediately adjacent to the site.
6. Construction activities shall be limited to Monday - Friday between the house of 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
7. A drip irrigation system shall be incorporated into the landscaping plan (Sheet L-1) and installed along with the landscape materials to better ensure their survival. In addition, the recommendation of Mr. Trees Tree Protection Plan (letter dated August 23, 1990) shall be explicitly followed. The Landscape Plan (L-1) dated 1-23-91 shall be revised and resubmitted prior to issuance of a Building Permit as follows: A) Additional Lavender Trumpet Vines shall be added at close intervals to the top of the retaining wall adjacent and to the south of 10 Ivy Lane; B) Replacement trees for the three 10-inch Bay Laurels to be removed near 53 Canyon shall be provided of a minimum 15-gallon size; C) Pitisporum shall be used in place of Myoporum; D) Pitisporum shall replace one or more Redwoods adjacent to the residence at 16 Ivy Lane; E) Include one or more trees on the east side of the residence next to drainage ditch to screen the view from downslope homes.;
8. The applicant shall secure all encroachment permits from the Director of Public Works prior to issuance of a building permit. Staff will investigate whether the encroachment permit can indicate that the improved parking area in the Ivy Lane right-of-way adjacent to 10 Ivy Lane shall be understood to provide parking for that residence.
9. When reviewing the improvement plans for Ivy Lane, the Director of Public Works shall delete the proposed curb if it is not deemed necessary in order to maintain downslope drainage in a manner as consistent with historical drainage as possible.
10. Staff shall confer with the applicant and the owners of 8 Ivy Lane regarding an appropriate site out of the Ivy Lane right-of-way for relocation of the trash enclosure.
11. Parking between Number 10 Ivy Lane and the proposed residence should be reviewed by the Director of Public Works to examine the possibility of the spot to be designated as that for use by Number 10 Ivy Lane.

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

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991**

As an aside, Ms. Newman suggested that the owners of 53 Canyon may be willing to negotiate with the owners of 8 Ivy Lane to provide them with additional parking.

Because of the lengthy item next on the agenda and the late hour, the consensus of the Commission was to continue Items 3 through 6 to the Special meeting of January 25, 1991.

M/S Sias, Yarish, to continue items 3 through 6 until the meeting of January 25, 1991 which will convene at 7:00 p.m..

All ayes.

2. AR-9005 - Th. F. Posthuma, 379 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-61, architectural review of first and second story living additions to the existing single family residential dwelling and a second garage on property located within the R-1C zoning district.

The applicant was present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report noting that the time limit is running out for this application and if a decision cannot be reached tonight, would Mr. Posthuma be willing to sign an agreement for a 90 day extension. Mr. Posthuma stated he would be agreeable to that.

Mr. Posthuma stated that he has reduced the size of the house to 3,735 square feet, which includes the foyer that is 432 square feet. He has moved the project further back on his property and reduced the height to twenty one feet. He wants to preserve the existing house and architecture. He presented aerial photographs, pointing out that other homes in the neighborhood are very visible and he wants to build behind the existing large trees to screen the addition. He stated that four out of the six affected neighbors are in support of his project and that he has discussed with his neighbors at 367 Oak the use of the easement and driveway. He was hopeful that something could be worked out. He stated that his property is 30,000 square feet and he is not asking for variances. He is requesting approval of a two story house, and he did not think the structure as proposed was monolithic. He stated that his intent is to excavate up to 6 feet from existing grade, so as to reduce the height of the house.

Commissioner Yarish stated that he would like to see some sectionals of the building prior to taking action on this.

Gay Kagy, 280 Redwood, asked that ground contours be included. She did not feel this proposal for an addition conforms to the General Plan or the Zoning Ordinance, specifically policies 9.3, 10.3 and 11.1, with respect to limiting the size of the house, minimizing the mass and is not in conformance with the general neighborhood. She said her calculations of the house and garages were 6,424 square feet. She would like to see the easement abandoned to the existing driveway and have permanent landscape planted so there would be no question of a second unit on the site.

Phyllis Wright, 367 Oak Avenue, presented a letter to the Commission regarding her concerns. She stated that there has always been a problem for vehicles backing out of the garage and onto her property from 369 Oak Avenue. She would like to see the upper driveway used and this one abandoned.

Michael Cone, 406 Oak Avenue, felt this proposal was an improvement over the initial design but it should be noted that the eucalyptus trees are bear at the base and the house would be visible.

Mark Curtis, Representative for the owner of 395 Oak Avenue, stated the plans did not reflect that the applicant was going to excavate 6' from the existing grade and wanted it noted for the record.

Cathy Sanders, 310 Redwood, stated that she calculated the square footage of the two garages, existing dwelling and additions be approximately 6,500 square feet. She said that represented at least twice the size of the largest house in the area. Also, the house will be 145 feet in length. She saw that story poles had been erected but wondered if they represented the actual heights because all the poles vary in height. She would like to see access restricted on the lower garage and did not feel a complete landscaping plan has been submitted.

David Basset, representative for the owner at 395 Oak Avenue, did not know how the house could be reduced six feet because it is on bedrock. He would like to see sections of the proposed addition. He stated that the house at 395 Oak Avenue was approximately 3,600 square feet with a 500 foot garage. The house looks larger than it really is.

Vance Barnett, 303 Oak Avenue, stated that he provided a letter to the Commission in their packets addressing his concerns. He felt certain that the intent of the applicant is to have a second unit and that is one of the reasons he does not want to give up the right to the easement.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991**

Also, he would like to see the applicant repave a portion of Oak Avenue as a condition of approval.

Richard Posthuma, 379 Oak Avenue, stated that his brother is seeking design review approval for the addition of his house. He is not asking for approval of a second unit. He did not feel it was proper to suspect him of something other than what he is applying for.

Dixie Ruden, 367 Oak Avenue, was only concerned about the safety of her house and the easement. She was also concerned about drainage because her property is on the downslope.

Mr. Posthuma said that he has no intention of adding a second unit. He did apply for one in the past but was told that the last second unit was taken by Mr. Barnett. He stated that he will provide cross sections for the Commission. He will also have further discussions with the owners of 367 Oak about the possibility of giving up the easements.

Commissioner Yarish stated he wanted more information. He was not convinced that this proposal was the best solution but felt it was a vast improvement over the original design. He wanted to see a more complete excavation plan. He wanted the amount of excavation to be formulated and calculated. He wanted cross sections that go through the master bedroom and any stairs and the topography of Oak Avenue down slope. He felt that limited access to the dwelling was a significant issue and one that needed further discussion. He would also like to see a thorough landscape plan that indicates the screening.

Commissioner Sias also would like to see a detailed landscape plan and sections of the house. He was also concerned about the project complying with the intent of the General Plan. He thought the house would be out of scale with the neighborhood and wondered why there was a need to have such a large foyer. He also stated that the second driveway was an issue that he would like to see resolved. He would like to have the lower driveway closed off and the area landscaped.

Commissioner Kroot agreed with the comments of his colleagues with the exception of the garage. He was not too concerned about the garage. He felt the size of the house was a little too imposing, and that the foyer was too large. He did not want to see the original look of the house lost because it was so attractive. He would like to see a longitudinal section to get a sense of the length of the house. He would also like to have staff reverify the square footage of the house/garages because there seems to be a discrepancy.

Chair Julin stated that although the house is nicely designed she felt it was out of character with the neighborhood. She also agreed that the house as proposed was against the intent of General Plan and therefore she would not be able to support the application. She did not think the project blended in with the environment and that she felt it should be more sensitive to the surrounding environment. She felt the angles of the house, the flat roof and the horizontal look were out of character for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Kroot stated that he liked the way the applicant has matched the addition to the original house and he did not feel the design was monolithic.

M/S Yarish, Sias, to continue AR-9005 - Th. F. Posthuma, 379 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-61, architectural review of first and second story living additions to the existing single family residential dwelling and a second garage on property located within the R-1C zoning district. This is continued to the meeting of March 4, 1991 to allow the applicant to: (1) reconsider the massing of the structure, not necessarily the square footage; (2) ensure that this project is in conformance with the intent of the General Plan; (3) provide additional needed exhibits that include details of the excavation plan, including the number of truck loads; (4) cross sections, both longitude and latitude; (5) reconsideration of access to the existing garage; (6) landscape plan; (7) accurate calculations of the square footage of the project; (8) Staff to recommend a plan for mitigations of road repair and amount of bond required, or plan to mitigate the impact of the construction.

Commissioner Sias stated that he would like to see the house reduced further in size. He was also not convinced that a flat roof with stucco siding would be compatible with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Yarish stated that this is a viable, interesting architecture and he vehemently disagrees that it is out of place. He did not think it was the Commission's job to design a project. Commissioner Kroot echoed Yarish.

Ms. Wight wanted assurance from the applicant that he was willing to a 90 day extension. If he was not agreeable, she stated the Commission should take action on the project tonight. Mr. Posthuma stated he was agreeable, and did sign a statement to the affect that he agreed to a 90 extension. Ms. Wight stated the deadline would be June 2, 1991.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991**

Ayes: Sias, Yarish, Kroot
Noes: Julin

Motion carried.

The following items are continued to the meeting of February 25, 1991

3. V-9036 - Jay and Linda Weill, 2 Raymond Avenue, A/P 7-172-16, a height variance for a fence to be 8' above grade (after the fact) located on the south side of the property, on property located within the R-1 zoning district.
4. V-9023/U-9013/DR-9005 - Jean Brunswick, 22 Magnolia Avenue, A/P 7-212-34, 1) a 5' east sideyard variance to construct a column and beam structure over a driveway within 0' of the east side property line; 2) use permit for one residential living unit; and 3) design review of a two story parking, residential, and office structure on property located within the P zoning district.
5. DR-9006/V-9043 - Michael Vishniakoff, Misha's Restaurant, 21 Tamalpais Avenue, A/P 7-212-19, 1) a parking variance to increase the intensity of use of the property by enclosing an existing outdoor dining area without the minimum required parking space; and 2) design review of enclosure of existing outdoor dining area, on property located within the C-2 zoning district.
6. U-9015/DR-9007 - Robert Erteman and Kathleen Dughi, 729 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-083-06 - use permit, design review, and environmental review to allow a veterinary clinic on property located within the C-L zoning district.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The special meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:45 p.m. to the special meeting on February 25, 1991.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991**

Also, he would like to see the applicant repave a portion of Oak Avenue as a condition of approval.

Richard Posthuma, 379 Oak Avenue, stated that his brother is seeking design review approval for the addition of his house. He is not asking for approval of a second unit. He did not feel it was proper to suspect him of something other than what he is applying for.

Dixie Ruden, 367 Oak Avenue, was only concerned about the safety of her house and the easement. She was also concerned about drainage because her property is on the downslope.

Mr. Posthuma said that he has no intention of adding a second unit. He did apply for one in the past but was told that the last second unit was taken by Mr. Barnett. He stated that he will provide cross sections for the Commission. He will also have further discussions with the owners of 367 Oak about the possibility of giving up the easements.

Commissioner Yarish stated he wanted more information. He was not convinced that this proposal was the best solution but felt it was a vast improvement over the original design. He wanted to see a more complete excavation plan. He wanted the amount of excavation to be formulated and calculated. He wanted cross sections that go through the master bedroom and any stairs and the topography of Oak Avenue down slope. He felt that limited access to the dwelling was a significant issue and one that needed further discussion. He would also like to see a thorough landscape plan that indicates the screening.

Commissioner Sias also would like to see a detailed landscape plan and sections of the house. He was also concerned about the project complying with the intent of the General Plan. He thought the house would be out of scale with the neighborhood and wondered why there was a need to have such a large foyer. He also stated that the second driveway was an issue that he would like to see resolved. He would like to have the lower driveway closed off and the area landscaped.

Commisisoner Kroot agreed with the comments of his colleagues with the exception of the garage. He was not too concerned about the garage. He felt the size of the house was a little too imposing, and that the foyer was too large. He did not want to see the original look of the house lost because it was so attractive. He would like to see a longitudinal section to get a sense of the length of the house. He would also like to have staff reverify the square footage of the house/garages because there seems to be a discrepancy.

Chair Julin stated that although the house is nicely designed she felt it was out of character with the neighborhood. She also agreed that the house as proposed was against the intent of General Plan and therefore she would not be able to support the application. She did not think the project blended in with the environment and that she felt it should be more sensitive to the surrounding environment. She felt the angles of the house, the flat roof and the horizontal look were out of character for the neighborhood.

Commisisoner Kroot stated that he liked the way the applicant has matched the addition to the original house and he did not feel the design was monolithic.

M/S Yarish, Sias, to continue AR-9005 - Th. F. Posthuma, 379 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-241-61, architectural review of first and second story living additions to the existing single family residential dwelling and a second garage on property located within the R-1C zoning district. This is continued to the meeting of March 4, 1991 to allow the applicant to: (1) reconsider the massing of the structure, not necessarily the square footage; (2) ensure that this project is in conformance with the intent of the General Plan; (3) provide additional needed exhibits that include details of the excavation plan, including the number of truck loads; (4) cross sections, both longitude and latitude; (5) reconsideration of access to the existing garage; (6) landscape plan; (7) accurate calculations of the square footage of the project; (8) Staff to recommend a plan for mitigations of road repair and amount of bond required, or plan to mitigate the impact of the construction.

Commissioner Sias stated that he would like to see the house reduced further in size. He was also not convinced that a flat roof with stucco siding would be compatible with the surrounding area.

Commisisoner Yarish stated that this is a viable, interesting architecture and he vehemently disagrees that it is out of place. He did not think it was the Commission's job to design a project. Commissioner Kroot echoed Yarish.

Ms. Wight wanted assurance from the applicant that he was willing to a 90 day extension. If he was not agreeable, she stated the Commission should take action on the project tonight. Mr. Posthuma stated he was agreeable, and did sign a statement to the affect that he agreed to a 90 extension. Ms. Wight stated the deadline would be June 2, 1991.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1991**

Ayes: Sias, Yarish, Kroot
Noes: Julin

Motion carried.

The following items are continued to the meeting of February 25, 1991

3. V-9036 - Jay and Linda Weill, 2 Raymond Avenue, A/P 7-172-16, a height variance for a fence to be 8' above grade (after the fact) located on the south side of the property, on property located within the R-1 zoning district.
4. V-9023/U-9013/DR-9005 - Jean Brunswick, 22 Magnolia Avenue, A/P 7-212-34, 1) a 5' east sideyard variance to construct a column and beam structure over a driveway within 0' of the east side property line; 2) use permit for one residential living unit; and 3) design review of a two story parking, residential, and office structure on property located within the P zoning district.
5. DR-9006/V-9043 - Michael Vishniakoff, Misha's Restaurant, 21 Tamalpais Avenue, A/P 7-212-19, 1) a parking variance to increase the intensity of use of the property by enclosing an existing outdoor dining area without the minimum required parking space; and 2) design review of enclosure of existing outdoor dining area, on property located within the C-2 zoning district.
6. U-9015/DR-9007 - Robert Erteman and Kathleen Dughi, 729 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-083-06 - use permit, design review, and environmental review to allow a veterinary clinic on property located within the C-L zoning district.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The special meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:45 p.m. to the special meeting on February 25, 1991.