

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JUNE 29, 1992

The San Anselmo Planning Commission was convened at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber by Chairman Kroot. Commissioners present were Julin Harle and Sias with Commissioner Mihaly arriving at 9:00 p.m. and Commissioner Hayes absent. Staff present were Planning Director Ann Chaney, Planning Consultant Delvin Washington and Planner Lisa Wight.

B. CONSENT

1. Minutes - June 15, 1992

Commissioner Sias asked that the Minutes be removed from consent and placed at the end of the meeting for discussion.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS - CONTINUED

1. **Water Well Ordinance - Town of San Anselmo** - A General Plan Amendment and Ordinance Code Amendment to allow private domestic water systems and the adoption of a well ordinance relative to their construction, reconstruction, maintenance, removal and monitoring. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 6, 1992

2. **U-9203 - Jean Brunswick and LaMonte Cochran, 22 Magnolia**, A/P 7-212-34, a use permit to allow for a residential duplex, on property located within the P (Professional) Zoning District. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 6, 1992

3. **DR-9208 - Robert and Vicki Gerstenkorn, 241 Oak Springs**, A/P 5-293-16, Design Review to construct an addition, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet mean sea level). CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 6, 1992.

4. **V-9215 - Robert Mitchell, 20 Olive**, A/P 7-083-28, 1) A 6' front yard variance and 7'3" side yard variance to construct a garage 14' from the front property line and 9" from the side property line; 2) a 2' front yard variance and 4' side yard variance to construct a second story addition within 18' of the front property line and 4' of the side property line; and 3) a parking variance to allow the two (2) required parking spaces to encroach into the front and side yard setback areas and to allow the parking space outside the enclosed garage to be substandard in length, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 6, 1992

5. **V-9213 - Harry Kraft, 214 The Alameda**, A/P 5-054-07, a 20' front yard and 8' side yard variance to allow a 7'3" existing fence and trellis structure to remain within 0' of the front and side property line, on property located in the R-1 Zoning District. AFTER-THE-FACT. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 6, 1992

6. **DR-9210/PDP-9201/ LLR-9202 - Michael Gill, 663 Oak Avenue**, A/P 7-154-07, 1) Design review and Precise Development Plan for the construction of a new 4,994 square foot single family dwelling with detached garage/guest quarters on a 3.25 acre parcel and demolition of existing single family home and illegal second unit. The project also includes the construction of a 40,450 gallon water tank; and 2) Lot Line Relocation to exchange an equivalent amount of land between 7-201-10 (neighboring parcel) and 7-154-07 (subject parcel) on property located within the R-1H Zoning District. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JULY 27, 1992

7. **V-9208 - John Oldfather and Holly Ford, 158 Pine Street**, A/P 7-251-31, 1) a 4'8" side yard variance; and 2) a 1' front yard variance to construct a second floor addition; and 3) a two car parking variance to locate parking within the front and side yards, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF AUGUST 17, 1992

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **V-9210 - Dean and Diana Randle, 13-A Smith Lane**, A/P 6-251-20, a 10' street sideyard variance, a 2' east sideyard variance, and a 2' rear yard variance to construct a second story living addition within 2' of the street side property line, within 6' of the east side property line, and within 18' of the rear property line, with a 2' roof overhang; and 2) a 2' street sideyard variance to construct a new enlarged covered front porch within 10' of the street side property line; and 3) a parking variance to allow substandard parking to remain, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.

The applicants were present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Mr. Randle stated that he tried to revise his plans to comply with the concerns of his neighbors and the Commission. One of his neighbors stated that the height of the roof would block their current view of Bald Hill. In further discussions with this neighbor they realized that the view would not be blocked and they are withdrawing their objection. He stated that with the second

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JUNE 29, 1992

story addition, the overall height will increase by 10 feet. He did not think that by varying the height pitch would solve the concerns of the other neighbors and it would not be aesthetically pleasing. He did not think that a two story house of this design should have a flat roof and he also noted that the front porch will break up the mass. The attic will be used for storage. With regard to the second story windows, they have eliminated half of the windows as requested from the neighbors to allow for their continued privacy. There are large existing trees on all four corners of the property that will block the windows that will remain. The small windows that are shown on the plan are necessary both for light and per the Uniform Building Code, a certain amount of windows are required for emergency egress. With regard to landscaping, they have recently planted several trees around the perimeter of their property to soften the impact between the neighbors. He tried unsuccessfully to get in touch with his neighbors at #19 Bank Street to review the changes. The owner of #24 Bank Street does not live on the property although he spoke with him about the revised plans. He was ambivalent although he stated that the addition might shade his yard somewhat although he did not think it was a significant negative impact. Mr. Randle also stated that he understood from the tenant of #24 that the owner is looking to put the house on the market and perhaps that is why there is not much interest in his project. With regard to the 2 foot east sideyard setback, he felt it was necessary for the addition because of the interior circulation. The interior stairway leading to the second story would have to be moved into the dining room and would reduce the already small room. The addition is really not very large and they need all the space they can get. He felt the reduction of two feet would compromise the aesthetics of the addition. There is adequate landscaping both already planted and proposed that would adequately screen the addition. Also, the sideyard in question abuts a wide open space and therefore would not negatively impact anyone.

Eric Rosenquist, 18 Lincoln, stated that he no longer opposed the project.

Martin Dodd, 15 Bank Street, stated that the trees that have been planted are only 6 feet and will take quite some time before they will provide privacy. He suggested that the Commission require the applicant to hire a landscape architect who is well versed in the field. He stated that his rear yard privacy will be violated by this addition and that all other roofs in the neighborhood are either flat or 4 in 12 pitch. He stated that when he built his addition last year he took into consideration the other homes in the neighborhood and the concerns of his neighbors. He did not feel the lot should have been split years ago because it is so substandard and that the Commission should not compound the issue by allowing the applicant to add to an already too small lot. He felt that the future owners of #24 should be protected and that the variances should not be granted.

Tony Barbara, 19 Bank Street, was against the addition, in that they are directly behind it and their view and privacy will be negatively impacted.

Mariana Barbara, 19 Bank Street echoed his husbands concerns and added that it would be like living in a well if the addition was built.

Commissioner Julin was in support of this application as stated in the staff report with the exception of the 2 foot east sideyard variance. She felt that height was not an issue except for the sideyard variance because the height restrictions for this neighborhood are 30'. She felt that because of the architectural integrity of the roof for this addition, the variance was necessary. Also there were no houses close by that would be affected by the sideyard variance and the lot size was very small and the addition not very large. She noted that it looked like #15 and #19 Bank Streets were also substandard lots.

Commissioner Harle agreed with Commissioner Julin's findings and added that any interference with the interior circulation for this very small addition should be considered a significant finding for granting the variance for the 2 foot sideyard setback. He noted that any second story would create the same problem with the neighbors and did not think it is fair to deny because the house and addition were small.

Commissioner Sias stated that because of the problem with interior circulation it would not be possible to maintain the effectiveness of the living area without the sideyard variance and therefore he supported the variance. He felt the applicants have compromised a great deal by removing windows and adding landscaping and have made an earnest attempt to comply with the neighbors concerns. He would like to see the roof reduced a little more but did not think his colleagues would concur.

Chairman Kroot favored the proposed project. He said it was a small house and the addition will look very nice and will not decrease the property values of the neighborhood. The east side was the most affected and there is no objection that the neighbor of #24 and there will also be lots of screening to soften the addition. He noted that if the roof were lowered the character of the addition would be compromised. He also noted that the owner has given up several windows to comply with the concerns of the neighbors.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JUNE 29, 1992

M/S Harle, Julin, to approve V- 9210 - Dean and Diana Randle, 13-A Smith Lane, A/P 6-251-20, a 10' street sideyard variance, a 2' east sideyard variance, and a 2' rearyard variance to construct a second story living addition within 2' of the street side property line, within 6' of the east side property line, and within 18' of the rear property line, with a 2' roof overhang; and 2) a 2' street sideyard variance to construct a new enlarged covered front porch within 10' of the street side property line; and 3) a parking variance to allow substandard parking to remain, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.

Approval is based on the following findings:

1. Due to the 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 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.

Second Story Addition:

Due to the small size and shape of the lot, it is only possible to add a 12' wide by 13' wide addition on the second floor without setback variances. The applicant proposes to vertically extend all the existing building walls. 1. Staff is able to make the special circumstance finding for the 2' rearyard setback encroachment, which is for a 44 square foot portion of the second story bedroom. To require adherence to the 20' rearyard setback, the proposed master bedroom width would be reduced from 9'5.5" to 7'5.5". The Commission is able to make the special circumstance finding for the east sideyard encroachment of 2' into the minimum 8' setback because the loss of 2' on the second floor would both unbalance the building and disrupt interior traffic and would force the interior staircase into another portion of the house and limit conditioned space and would be a hardship. Also the 2' east sideyard setback was not a substantial detriment to the neighbor. 3. Staff is able to make the special circumstance finding for the west street side setback for the addition to encroach 10' into the 12' minimum setback. due to the size and shape of the lot, the second story addition would have to be setback to half the proposed width to conform to the 12' west side setback, which is unreasonable on the grounds that given the small size of the house and shape of the lot.]

Font Porch

Staff is able to make the special circumstance finding to allow the existing covered porch to be extended in length and encroach 2' into the 12' minimum setback. The existing porch is very narrow and is only used as a passage into the home. The proposed porch will be 7' wide and provide additional outdoor area at floor level.

Parking Variance

Staff is able to make the finding of special circumstance for the existing parking to remain. Two legal sized parking spaces can be accommodated with the relocation of the fence, widening of the gate, and removal of the existing wood planters. The existing dimensions of the Smith Lane pavement will remain unchanged. The Building Inspector has advised that a permit to relocate the fence and widen the driveway gate will not be required.

2. The granting of the 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.

Second Story Addition

The second story addition is proposed to have windows on all four elevations.

1. The front elevation (facing Smith Lane) will have no impact on the Tamalpais Theater and parking lot, which are extremely close to this property.

2. The rear wall is located 18' from the rear property line and the rear neighboring homes at Nos. 15 and 19 Bank Street, and 24 Lincoln Avenue are setback from the rear property line. For these reasons, privacy and sunlight for the neighboring homes should not be affected.

3. Both the west and east side walls are in close proximity to the rearyard open areas of the neighboring properties at Nos. 15 Bank Street and 24 Lincoln Avenue, and views of the neighboring pool and yards will be possible. Staff has previously suggested to the applicant that the windows on the west and east sides be raised to eliminate yard views.

The addition will be aesthetically more pleasing if it is a vertical extension of the existing east side building line. There is also considerable tree foliage between the two properties. Staff's policy is typically to discourage vertical extensions of existing building lines and to encourage stepping the second story in to conform to the 8' minimum setback. In this case, however, the house would appear unbalanced to set the east side wall back to the 8' Code required setback.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JUNE 29, 1992

Front Porch

The first story enclosed front porch will not have a detrimental impact on the neighboring property at No. 15 Bank Street due to the existing bush and tree foliage between the two properties.

Parking Variance

The applicant will provide two legal size parking spaces behind the fence line, which will not be a detriment to the neighboring properties.

Conditions of Approval are that: 1. The driveway and access gate be widened to 24". 2. The access gate be relocated 6" to the north to provide a legal length for Parking Space No. 1. 3. An encroachment permit be obtained from the Department of Public Works in order to have parking space No. 2 encroach over the Smith Lane right of way; and 4. The five existing planters along the front fence be relocated to provide adequate width and length for the two parking spaces. 5. The addition be built according to approved plans dated June 2, 1992.

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

Commissioner Mihaly arrived at 9:00 p.m.

2. DR-9211 - Rick and Magda Wesslund, 51 Tomahawk, A/P 177-220-67, Design Review for construction of a new in ground pool, wood deck, 5' security fence, new landscaping and to convert the understorey of their house into an additional room, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District.

The applicants and their landscape architect Chris Bloodwell were present.

Mr. Washington presented the staff report.

Commissioner Sias stated he remembered there was great controversy regarding development within the building envelope only during development of the homes on Quarry Mountain. Mr. Washington stated that the project is all within the envelope with the exception of a few feet of patio which is under 30" in height and considered exempt from the Uniform Building Code and from Planning.

Chris Bloodwell stated that they made every attempt to remain within the envelope and to comply with the CC & R's of the Quarry Mountain Subdivision. Their intent was to keep a low profile and yet allow the owners to have some usable backyard area. He stated that no retaining walls were to exceed 3'6" in height. There is a 5' wrought iron security fence around most of the pool and landscaping that is proposed is from the approved landscaping plan for the Subdivision. He explained that the portions that are outside of the envelope are less than 30" and no permit is required. This would be for patios.

Commissioner Mihaly stated that although there is an automatic cover for the pool he suggested that a fence be placed all the way around the pool for the safety of small children. Mr. Bloodwell stated that he could do that by adding a locked gate where the stairway from the second floor joins the deck.

Commissioner Sias asked how much earth was to be removed. Mr. Bloodwell responded that typically it takes only a half day to excavate for a pool and that the dirt will be trucked out.

Commissioner Julin asked about the means to drain the pool if necessary. Mr. Bloodwell stated that has yet to be worked out during the building construction drawings but foresaw no problems.

Property Owner, 40 Indian Rock Court, had no objection to the proposal as long as it is geotechnically engineered and safe. He was concerned that there have been slides in the area and a pool could cause more slides.

Virgil Hoffman, 47 Indian Rock Road, was in support of the pool and felt this would enhance the neighborhood. He said that the engineer would address the safety issues regarding the pool.

Paul Sarkis, 53 Tomahawk, supported the project and stated that there have been geotechnical reports already done on the site prior to construction of the homes. The intent of the property owners is to achieve the goals of the Planning Commission when the development was built.

Micki Sarkis, 53 Tomahawk, said the houses are built on solid bedrock.

Chris Bloodwell assured the Commission that a structural engineer will design the pool for safety.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JUNE 29, 1992

Commissioner Mihaly asked staff again about their recommendation regarding building within the building envelope. Director Chaney stated that she felt comfortable about the project being within the building envelope and that because the patios are under 30° they would be exempt.

Mr. Washington stated that the 1991 UBC requires security fences to be built around a pool, where currently the 1988 Code states the fence has to be around the perimeter of the property. He felt this applicant would fall under the 1991 Code which will be adopted by Council shortly.

Commissioner Mihaly asked staff what their comments were on the letter from Mr. Stack et. al. Staff could not respond because they were never given a copy of the letter.

Commissioner Mihaly supported the application. He agreed that the landscaping around the pool would soften the transaction. He would like to see the approval conditioned that an engineer's report be presented at time of building plan check. He felt strongly that a fence should be required around the pool, not the perimeter of the house, and that a road bond should be required. It seemed reasonable to him that the project was within the building envelope and added that there should be a consistent and clear policy for all the homeowners in Quarry Mountain.

Commissioner Harle supported the project and the comments in the staff report.

Commissioner Sias appreciated the effort on the part of the applicants to stay within the building envelope and comply with the CC & R's. He agreed there should be a fence around the pool and felt there should be a drawing showing that which could be reviewed with staff as well as the agricultural fence which could be reviewed at the staff level. He wanted to see a requirement of a soils report and a road bond.

Commissioner Julin had nothing further to add.

Chairman Kroot stated that the landscaping and pool design were excellent and agreed with the comments of his fellow Commissioners as to the conditions of approval.

M/S Mihaly, Sias, to approve DR-9211 - Rick and Magda Wesslund, 51 Tomahawk, A/P 177-220-671, Design Review for construction of a new in ground pool, wood deck, 5' security fence, new landscaping and to convert the understory of their house into an additional room, on property located within the R-1H Zoning District. Approval is granted based on the following findings: 1. Is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding area. The proposed new swimming pool, deck and landscaping have been designed in such a manner that they will not significantly alter the appearance of the hillside. The additional landscaping will further compliment the area providing additional foliage and somewhat reducing the barren portions of this hillside. 2. Provides for protection against noise, odors, and other factors which may make the environment less desirable. The addition of this room, deck and pool will not create or significantly alter any existing environment conditions in this area. The pool will conform with all of the established development standards associated with this site. Some additional noise and dust may occur during construction however, these will only be temporary and minor inconveniences associated with constructing 3. Will not tend to cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy. The proposed installation of a new swimming pool, deck, and landscaping will result in the appreciation of this and neighboring properties. 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. No additional vehicular trips should result from this proposed addition. 5. Will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area. The proposed dwelling will conform with all established codes controlling building and grading associated with the construction of a swimming pool and deck. These standards have been adopted to insure that all new development will not create any adverse or hazardous conditions during construction and after completion. 6. Conformance to the approved precise development plans. This property is zoned R-1H and a precise development plan is not required. 7. Adequacy of Screening. All of the existing mature trees on this site will be maintained an extensive landscape plan has been included. The proposed location of the addition will not be highly visible nor will it severely change the appearance of the structure. The introduction of additional plants will significantly increase the amount of screening on the property and provide additional foliage on the hillside. The neighboring properties also have an extensive amount of landscaping. 8. Selection of architectural features that enable the structure to blend with its environment. The proposed deck and pool will be consistent with the existing character of the house. It also will not contrast significantly from neighboring houses in this sector of Town. It is important to note that the building envelope has been respected and that the places where it has exceeded the envelope, in the area of the two patios, the structures are low and really not decks. Conditions of approval are: 1. That a soils and structural report be submitted to the Building Department at the Plan Check stage. 2. That a roadway bond be required for the swimming pool. 3. The fence in all locations is either inside of the building envelope, but certainly inside of the private area rather than the private open space. 4. The

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JUNE 29, 1992

design of the agricultural type fence to be submitted to staff for approval. 5. The design review be granted in accordance with the plans stamped received by the Town of San Anselmo dated 6/10/92.

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

3. A-8903-Fani and Gary Hansen, 27 Indian Rock Road, A/P No 177-250-21, Design Review amendment to modify previously approved elevations by increasing the number and size of windows for property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet elevation).

The applicants were present.

Ms. Chaney stated that the applicants are in the process of constructing the house and have made some modifications to the approved plans. They are adding additional windows in places where walls currently exist. The Minutes of approval for the project state that any major changes should be brought back to the Planning Commission for review.

Gary Hansen explained that they have reduced the original scope of the project by the elimination of two bedrooms and a bath and they realized during construction that if they were able to have a window in the south elevation rather than a wall, they would have a wonderful view of Mt. Tam. Also, they are relocating the kitchen and wish to increase the size of the dining room window. He has therefore asked his structural engineer to reconsider the sheer walls on the second floor to maximize the view.

Darlene Housman, 19 Indian Rock Road, was opposed to the window changes, stating that she already feels like she lives in a fish bowl. Her solarium is in the rear of the house and she looks right into the addition. She has been encountering problems during construction such as falling boulders and rocks, noisy dogs and feels the additional windows will only expose her more. She also asked at a previous meeting that landscape be planted to help screen and she still feels more is necessary.

David Israel, 47 Indian Rock Road, did not have any objection to the additional windows but because this project has come before a public hearing again, he stated that the condition of approval for the driveway was that it should not rise more than 1'. He stated that it now has a 3' to 4' drop to the garage and wondered if the Commission was aware of that. He also noted that in the lower area which should be used for planting, has concrete.

Mr. Hansen stated that the rocks at the bottom of the retaining wall that Mr. Israel is talking about will be removed and it was not his intention to keep them there when the project was finished. With regard to the driveway, he said the top of driveway and garage slab is as much as 4' and probably no more than 2'. He has placed a fence and planted landscaping at the property line so the head lights will not shine into the Israel's House.

Chairman Kroot noted that those items are not on the agenda and therefore not open for discussion but suggested that Mr. Israel direct his comments to staff during office hours.

Fani Hansen stated that she received a letter from the Planning Department that allowed them to proceed with the modifications to the lower windows and therefore she felt the only windows that should be discussed were the two on the second story at the south elevation.

Commissioner Harle supported the modification as presented.

Commissioner Sias did not support the additional windows because of the opposition of the lower window although landscaping might be a good solution to screen. He did not object to the 2 south windows on the second floor.

Commissioner Julin did not consider this to be a significant change and therefore supports the modifications to the windows.

Commissioner Mihaly supported the modifications and thought that the only window that was intrusive to the owner of #19 was the lower bathroom window. It stated that it should either be obscured or removed.

Chairman Kroot concurred with Mihaly but added that landscaping could screen the window.

Commissioner Sias agreed that additional landscaping in the area of the bathroom would allow screening.

Commissioner Harle noted that shrubbery will protect people from looking in but does not restrict view to those looking out.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JUNE 29, 1992

M/S Sias/Mihaly, to approve A-8903-Fani and Gary Hansen, 27 Indian Rock Road, A/P No 177-250-21, Design Review amendment to modify previously approved elevations by increasing the number and size of windows for property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150 feet elevation). Condition of approval is: 1. That the applicant and the neighbor of 19 Indian Rock Road meet to mutually agree upon a method of screening for the window, either by frosted glass or concealing with window by landscaping or deletion of the window. The decision should be presented to staff at the building plan check stage for the modified elevations. 2. The building shall be constructed in accordance with the amended plans dated Received June 20, 1992.

Motion unanimously approved. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

4. Town of San Anselmo, Discussion on Town Owned Real Estate Policy, in order to make a recommendation to the Town Council.

Director Chaney led the discussion.

Commissioner Sias commented that he did not feel the expense to appraise Town property was warranted unless the property was to be sold but did not have an objection to a windshield survey if it was inexpensive. He was strongly opposed to the sale of Town owned property to be used for the purchase of non-fixed assets for the Town. As far as prioritizing for the sale/trade of the parcels it should go for road repair or library retrofitting although his preference would be for open space acquisition. He would rather see precedence for the acquisition of open space, parklands and automobile/bicycle parking areas over the acquisition for development of senior and low-income housing because he felt they were long term benefits to the Town.

Chairman Kroot felt that open space, parkland acquisition and the acquisition of automobile/bicycle parking areas were synonymous. He felt it was more realistic to expect that parking might be higher on the priority list for the Town rather than open space because open space parcels are so large and expensive. Parking parcels are much smaller and may be within range. He also wondered if the Town would consider trading parcels for liability reasons. He also stated that the sale of any parcel should be looked at from the standpoint on the impact on the neighborhood and contiguous properties.

Commissioner Mihaly suggested that the wording of "other private or public uses" or any other catch-all should be eliminated. The funds raised for the sale of open spaces uses are never to be used for General Fund subsidy. Also, in the event of sale of a parcel, that the Town Attorney and the Planning Staff have to review the lot sold and make sure there are appropriate disclosure documents to protect the Town from any implied claim as to developability and that in fact we have checked on the zoning and development capability of the land and perhaps rezone if necessary prior to sale of the parcel.

Commissioner Julin felt that trade for open space would be a great idea.

The consensus of the Commission was to pass these comments along to the Town Council.

5. Minutes - June 15, 1992.

M/S Sias/Julin, to approve minutes with the following amendments: page, 7, first paragraph, added the following sentence. "That he supported the requirement for an open space easement through the Gill property". and delete" He was sympathetic with the Open Space Committee to provide access to public lands although he did not want to jeopardize the privacy of the homeowners".

Motion unanimously passed.

E. ADJOURN

The special meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:30 p.m. to the next regular meeting on July 6, 1992.

BARBARA CHAMBERS