

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 1992**

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Kroot. Staff present was Planner Lisa Wight and Planning Consultant Delvin Washington.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioners present: Harle, Julin, Israel, Mihaly, Kroot
Commissioners absent: Sias, Hayes

B. CONSENT

1. Minutes - November 16, 1992

Staff recommended putting Item E7 on the Consent Agenda. Chairman Kroot asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak on the item. No one responded from the audience but Commissioner Julin stated she wanted to discuss the item. Chairman Kroot stated that it will stay on as a Public Hearing but asked if it could be heard out of order after Item E2 so the Planning Consultant could leave after his last item. The Commission affirmed.

M/S Julin/Harle, to approve Consent Agenda.

Motion carried, with Mihaly to abstain.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS - CONTINUED

1. PDP-9203 - Ben O'Hare, Redwood Road (near 269 Redwood Road), A/P 7-141-04, 7-097-05 and 7-097-02, Preliminary Development Plan for the creation of two parcels from three existing parcels and the ultimate development of two homes and the extension of a private driveway. The 2.6 acre site is located along Redwood Road near 269 Redwood Road. The property is located within the R-1H Zoning District. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JANUARY 4, 1993
2. V-9244 - Lenore Mathews, 72 Foothill, A/P 7-033-12, a 17' front yard variance and an 8' side yard variance for an addition and a 2 car garage, within 3' of the front property line and 0' of the side property, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JANUARY 4, 1993

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. C-221 - Tom Ayers, 805 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. A/P 6-082-14, Design Review Amendment to change the exterior color of an existing commercial structure, on property located within the CL (Commercial-Limited) Zoning District.

The applicant and his color consultant, Bob Buckter, were present.

Mr. Washington presented the staff report.

Mr. Buckter stated that he has been in business for over twenty years. He stated that an example of his work can be seen on the building at 203 San Anselmo Avenue. He said that the building at 805 Sir Francis Drake is only about two years old and really does not need painting although he understood that the current colors were over bearing to the community. He presented three proposals to the Commission, and stated that he preferred Scheme B. He said if the building really needed a paint job he would recommend the gray/green combination but he also has considered cost on behalf of the property owner. To repaint the entire building the cost would be approximately \$8,000 however Scheme A would be about \$800 and B would be in the range of \$1,500. He said the roof is tan and he would like to have that remain.

Mr. Ayers stated that he would like the Commission to take into affect the cost. If the building was in need of painting he would be happy to paint it gray/green or what ever color the Commission wanted. He stated that if it was possible to make minor changes at this time, and yet make the building look better, he hoped the Commission would approve Scheme A or B.

Commissioner Israel agreed that the current color was overly strong for the size of the building and favored Scheme B as a short term solution. He agreed that the roof did not need to be painted.

Commissioner Julin concurred with Commissioner Israel but added that she would like to see the triangle blend in with the background.

Commissioner Harle suggested either Alternative A or B but was against repainting the entire building at this time.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 1992**

Commissioner Mihaly appreciated the voluntary gesture of the applicant to try to satisfy the community and suggested Alternative B as a solution. He would like to see less contrast between the triangle and the background.

Mr. Buckter stated that he did not recommend Commissioner Julin's idea because it would take away from the design of the building and would also make the current color of the building stand out more. He presented color chips of the background. He stated the favorable color would be "Sorwood and".

Chairman Kroot preferred Scheme B, with a high contrast on the triangle and background.

M/S Mihaly/Harle, to give staff direction on C-221 - Tom Ayers, 805 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. A/P 6-082-14, Design Review Amendment to change the exterior color of an existing commercial structure, on property located within the CL (Commercial-Limited) Zoning District. Preferred colors are Scheme B with the gray background. The color preferred is Sorwood and. The desire of the Commission is to soften the contrast. This should be brought back at the next meeting and placed on the consent agenda. Motion unanimously passed.

2. V-9241 - Bernie Arreaga, 31 Carlson Court, A/P 5-062-35, a 15'7" variance to construct a 6' retaining wall within 4'3" of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.

The applicant was not present.

Mr. Washington presented the staff report. He stated that his primary contact person has been the contractor and the contractor has just recently removed himself from the project. He noted that the Public Works Director has placed a Stop Work Order on the project and that is what triggered the variance.

Commissioner Harle was not willing to hear this application any further until either the applicant or a representative was present.

Chairman Kroot asked if there was any danger in delaying the hearing until the meeting of January 4, 1993. Mr. Washington stated that the area has been tarped and the Public Works Director has the authority of take additional measures for safety if necessary.

M/S Julin/Israel to continue V-9241 - Bernie Arreaga, 31 Carlson Court, A/P 5-062-35, a 15'7" variance to construct a 6' retaining wall within 4'3" of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. This was continued until the meeting of January 4, 1993 to allow the applicant time to be present. Motion unanimously passed.

Item E7 taken out of order.

7. U-9206/DR-9219 - David Hatch, Cellular One, 640 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., A/P 6-092-08, a design review and use permit to establish a cellular site facility within an existing commercial building; and installation of three, 9' tall omni directional antennas on the roof of the building, on property located within the C-3 Zoning District.

Mitch Lang, the applicant's representative was present.

Mr. Washington presented the staff report.

Commissioner Julin asked if there would be a need for guy wires. She also wondered if any of the General Plan guidelines regarding visual impacts would be violated. She said that there was a telecommunication facility at the County and wondered if they had been contacted. Mr. Washington responded that the County had not been contacted and that he felt this proposal was in conformance with the General Plan.

Mr. Lang stated that no guy wires will be needed for this site. The antennas is approximately 3" in diameter. They currently have one on a building in Mill Valley and it is not viewed by most people. He stated that they avoid using the towers and lean more towards the antennas because they are smaller.

Commissioner Julin asked if there would be a need for expansion once the facility was in.

Mr. Lang explained that technology is always changing but the systems usually get smaller. He explained that this site was similar to the Pacific Bell facilities that are unmanned on a daily basis. He said the antennas could be painted any color but the preference has been gray because it will blend in. The preference was to install the antennas to the front of buildings because they will not gain adequate power if placed to the rear.

Patrick McGreggor, 100 Humboldt, asked about the safety of the antennas.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 1992**

Mr. Lang stated that they were licensed by the FCC and the antennas were very safe, with the power being very low.

Commissioner Julin wondered if staff viewed the antennas at other sites. Mr. Washington stated that he had not.

Commissioner Julin was concerned about the visual impact of the antennas and would like to see photographs of other site. She also wondered if staff could check to see if this was in conflict with the County. She did however agree with this application in concept.

Commissioner Harle supported the application.

Commissioner Mihaly supported the staff recommendation of approval.

Commissioner Israel did not like the mirror glazing on the windows, and preferred panels or another kind of window covering. He also would like to see some sprucing up of the site although he did not know if it was appropriate to discuss at this time.

Chairman Kroot supported the application, noting that this was a very innocuous and won't be viewed by many people. He agreed with Commissioner about the mirrored glazing.

Mr. Lang stated that there was no problem replacing the mirrored glazing with a tinted glass, blinds or even remove the windows. The idea is so that people will not be able to view the computer equipment in the building.

M/S Harle/Mihaly, to approve U-9206/DR-9219 - David Hatch, Cellular One, 640 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., A/P 6-092-08, a design review and use permit to establish a cellular site facility within an existing commercial building; and installation of three, 9' tall omni directional antennas on the roof of the building, on property located within the C-3 Zoning District. Findings for approval are as follows:

Design Review:

1. Is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the surrounding areas. The installation of this facility will not contrast with the existing improvements on this site or with other activities in the area. 2. Provides for protection against noise, odors, and other factors which may make the environment less desirable. The mechanical equipment will primarily be housed inside the structure and the equipment that is to be installed outside will not cause any significant impacts on the surrounding environment. 3. Will not tend to cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy. The mechanical facility is of such a minor nature that it will not have any depreciatory affects on 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. The traffic that will be generated by this activity will be miniscule (2 to 4 vehicular trips per month) and will not impact the existing traffic levels for this portion of town. 5. Will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvements of endanger property located in the surrounding area. The equipment will be isolated from surrounding uses. The applicant has taken initial steps to safeguard the operation of this facility to insure that no dangerous or hazardous conditions will be created by it. Such mitigations include a fire extinguishing system to be located inside of the building. 6. Conformance to the approved precise development plans. This property is in the CL zoning district and a precise development plan is not required. 7. Adequacy of screening. The mechanical portion of this installation will be located inside an enclosed building and will not be visible to the street. The exterior of the building will not be changed in order to accommodate the mechanical equipment. The antenna can be painted so as to blend into the landscape that abuts the site. 8. Selection of architectural features that enable the structure to blend with its environment. The antennas will be located on the roof of the building and painted a color that will allow them to blend into the background environment.

Use Permit

The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood or the proposed use or be detrimental or injurious to property or improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the Town. The introduction of this activity will not have any detrimental impacts on the continued commercial use of this specific property. Nor will it detract from surrounding properties of the Town at large. This use will not change the intensity of activity on this site and the applicants will include mitigations which will further reduce any potential negative impacts that could possibly result from the installation of this cell site. Conditions of approval: 1. The project is approved subject to the plans date stamped received by the Town of San Anselmo September 22, 1992. 2. The tree antenna shall be painted grey so as to better blend with the backdrop of the site. 3.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 1992**

The mirrored glazing on the windows is to be removed and the applicant is to consult with staff for alternative solutions for covering the windows.

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

3. V-9242 - Robert Schultz, 130 Madrone, A/P 7-114-16, a 10' front yard and 3'6" side yard variance to enclose a portion of an open porch which will then be 10' from the front and 4'6" from the side property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. and Mrs. Schultz were present..

Ms. Wight presented the staff on behalf of Ms. Chaney. She also provided photographs of the property.

Mrs. Schultz stated that the enclosure will not change the footprint and she has support from her neighbors. She stated that the house was built in 1910 and does not have central heating. They are attempting to enclose the front porch to prevent the cold air from getting into the house. She felt the special circumstances for the variance is the location of the house on the lot and the age of the house and that it would not be reasonable to enclose any other portion of the house because the porch is creating the situation.

Ed Farey, 126 Madrone, stated that his house is exactly a mirror image of 130 Madrone and they enclosed their porch twenty five years ago. He stated that he was pleased that his neighbors are upgrading the house and was in support of the variance.

Mrs. Schultz stated that she was led to believe that the porch enclosure would be a simple approval.

Commissioner Israel stated that if the stairs was placed on the other side of the house he would be more sympathetic because it would be screened.

Mr. Schultz stated that eventually that want to remove the hedge.

Commissioner Mihaly asked about the interior configuration of the house. He wondered if the door can be placed to the left side on the front.

Commissioner Harle suggested enclosing the porch with glass, similar to a sun porch.

Patrick Mc Gregg, 100 Humboldt, felt that it was unusual to be so strict on remodels and additions but is open to new development.

Commissioner Harle stated that the enclosure presented no objectionable features but he was unable to make the special circumstances. He questioned Mrs. Schulz's comment regarding the placement of the house dictating the need for a variance.

Ms. Wight explained the legal findings again for the benefit of the public and the Commission. She stated that placement of a house on the lot is not a legal finding.

Commissioner Harle stated that the house was built under nonexistent rules. The front enclosure would serve as the function for heat. If glass is used to enclose the porch the character of the porch could be retained.

Commissioner Mihaly supported staff's recommendation of denial based on what has been proposed. He felt there would be damage to the streetscape if the porch was enclosed. He felt the air lock function could be accomplished by central heating and therefore the enclosure is not a necessity and would be a grant of special privilege. He thought that Commissioner Harle's idea of a glass enclosure was interesting but did not think it would achieve the owner's goal.

Commissioner Israel wanted to see the applicants revise their plan rather than deny the project. He would also like to see a floor plan of at least the first floor. He also was receptive to the idea of placing the door to the left front of the house because the addition would be on the wider part of the street. He felt the porch should be larger than the enclosure and he would like the windows to be installed in a more classic way to keep with the look and design of the original house.

Commissioner Julin would go along with a continuance but she was in support of the project. The addition was not changing the footprint of the house, the house is very hold and she liked the idea of Commissioner Harle to enclose the porch with glass and locate the door to the left.

Chairman Kroot had nothing further to add.

M/S Harle/Julin, to continue V-9242 - Robert Schultz, 130 Madrone, A/P 7-114-16, a 10' front

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 1992**

yard and 3'6" side yard variance to enclose a portion of an open porch which will then be 10' from the front and 4'6" from the side property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. Continuance is to the meeting of January 4, 1993 to allow the applicants time to reconsideration. Motion unanimously passed.

4. V-9213 - Harry Kraft, 214 The Alameda, A/P 5-054-07, a 20' front yard variance to allow a 7'3" existing trellis structure to remain within 0' of the front and side property line; and an appeal of the Public Works Department administrative decision to deny the 6' fence within 5.5' of the front property line and within 0' of the south side property line, on property located in the R-1 Zoning District. (AFTER-THE-FACT).

The applicant was not present so the item was placed at the end of the agenda.

5. PS-9201 - Tony Richards for Viking Leon, Between Forest Avenue and Vista Lane, south of Landsdale Station Park, A/P Nos. 7-021-07, 7-021-23, and 7-021-24, 1) environmental review; 2) parcel split to legalize the 1954 creation of three separate building sites, each of which is currently undeveloped.

The applicant's representative was present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Commissioner Israel wondered how a determination could be made on the environmental check list without a soils report. He stated that the lot was very steep with a lot of vegetation.

Ms. Wight stated that a detailed soils report will be required at the time of construction on the lot but that the environmental checklist is related to the parcel split, not the construction of a house. Under CEQA guidelines a single family dwelling is exempt.

Commissioner Julin stated that she viewed the parcel split and the construction of the house as one project and wanted to hear each as one application. She also felt that the environmental report should encompass the construction of the house.

Commissioner Harle was concerned about the process of legalizing the lot. He stated that the shape of the lot really only dictates variances and he did not think the Commission should be forced in variances because the lot was created illegally.

Commissioner Mihaly asked for guidance from the Town Attorney regarding the lot. Ms. Wight stated that she has been in contact with the Town Attorney and has been acting on his recommendations however she will get something in writing from him for the next meeting.

The consensus of the Commission was that Item E6 should be heard in conjunction with the parcel split because they seem so inter connected.

6. V-9240/DR-9218 - Tony Richards for Viking Leon, 5 Vista Lane, A/P 7-021-24, 1) design review of a single family dwelling; 2) a 17' frontyard variance to construct a dwelling within 3' of the front property line; 3) a 3' rear yard variance to construct bay windows within 17' of the rear property line; 4) a 20' frontyard variance for driveway retaining walls to be within 0' of the front property line; and 5) a 13' frontyard variance to construct an uncovered deck within 1' of the front property line.

The applicant's representative was present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report and photographs of the site.

Mr. Richards stated that he has done several houses within southern Marin and he was not intimidated by this site. If the Commission does not grant variances for the development of this lot then a house cannot be built. He felt the bay windows were necessary to break up the facade. With regard to the condition about water hook up, it is a catch 22 because to get in line for water, the lot has to be legal and the building permit obtained. He stated that the height of the garage is dictated by the placement of the garage on the slope. He admitted that it might be possible to create a third parking with a redesign. Consideration of placing the garage to the left was ruled out because the existing fire hydrant would have to be moved as well as additional trees.

Patrick Mc Greggor, 100 Humboldt, stated that Vista Lane was very narrow and any additional traffic would be impossible. He questioned staff's findings on the environmental checklist. He felt that almost all items should be checked "Yes". He questioned staff's authority to fill out the check list. He strongly felt a soils report should be required prior to executing the environmental review. He stated that parking is a real problem and the lot is in the location of a hair pin curve and only adds to the problem. He was against the approval of any variances.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 1992**

Guy Esberg, 12 Humboldt, stated that the tree to be removed was quoted as being dead and he did not feel that was correct. He would like to see an arborist report on any vegetation that was to be removed. He stated that there is current movement on the hill and the development of the site could add to the slippage by the removal of so much root systems. He stated that the building of a house would create a tunnel and could not be built without blocking his house. Safety issues should be carefully looked into. Drainage was also of concern.

Elaine Schlinger, 98 Humboldt, concurred that the area was very unstable, in fact she is having to do major foundation work because of the earth movement. She would like to have a soils report be required as well as a discussion on the impact of surrounding properties. Adding to the traffic problem was also a concern.

Bill Lehrke, concurred with the comments of his neighbors. He stated that he would not allow egress across his property. He stated that parking is a serious problem and the fire hydrant was not adequate to handle another house. He did not feel the residents in the neighborhood should be penalized because the lot is illegal.

Robin Mc Donald, 10 Humboldt, stated parking was very bad, the hill is not stable. She questioned the boundary lines for this property and stated that he felt that 2 1/2 feet belongs to her. If variances are granted she would prefer a rear or side yard variance to a front yard variance.

Bruce Linderman, 8 Vista Lane, had concerns about soil stability, parking and traffic. He said the only parking was on Deer Park Lane. He did not understand how the lot could be allowed to be legal if variances were required to build. He thought that variances were only allowed for special circumstances. It was his understanding that the lot could never be built on. If there were two lots, not three, the placement of the house on the lot could be reconfigured.

Ms. Wight responded to the comments of the neighbors. She explained that items on the environmental check list indicate "significant adverse impact". Any items that are checked "maybe" or "yes" will have to have mitigation measures. She also noted that it was staff's responsibility to prepare the report as the lead agency. She stated that an arborist's report should be required for the property. She verified in the Town files that Vista Lane is a Town accepted street. With regard to restrictions placed on the project during construction, the Commission can impose conditions as they have in other areas. She stated that staff very strongly feels that off-street parking for three cars should be required and that has been confirmed by the testimony of the neighbors. She stated that for variances to be approved for any application, special circumstances must be associated with the site, such as size, shape, topography, or the location or surroundings of the property.

Mr. Richards stated that in the past a house at 11 Forest slid but a building permit was recently approved for the construction of a new home for that lot. He explained that houses are now designed to withstand slides and earthquakes, in fact, he believed that the lot would be more stable.

Commissioner Mihaly stated that more information is necessary prior to action on this lot, both in terms of the parcel split and variances. He was not sure if conditions should be placed on the final map, design review or the building permit. It appeared that there were some title problems. He wanted documentation on the ownership and maintenance of Vista Lane, information of whether or not additional loads could be placed on Vista Lane, an arborist report identifying trees that were to be removed, a landscape plan identifying the location of the trees. He asked if the Town Attorney could confirm if the 1966 Code had a catch all that talked about geotechnical information or requirements. He was also interested in finding out the status on the Town owned lot. He strongly advocated three on-site parking spaces and would trade off sliding the structure down hill for adequate parking.

Commissioner Israel supported Commissioner Mihaly's comments. He was concerned about the massive root structure on the lot and also wondered if there would be adequate back up room onto Vista Lane. He wanted staff to view the new driveway relative to the driveway across the street. He suggested that perhaps street improvements could be included in the mitigated negative declaration. He stated that he would only favor a rear yard variance. Also, it might work very favorably if a 4th parking space could be created because of the parking problems. He commented on the nice design of the house.

Commissioner Julin stated that she viewed this as a minor subdivision and that it had to be viewed as a whole because all aspects of the project are inter related including the EIR. With regard to parking, she did not think land should be compromised for the storage of vehicles. She felt that the future will bring a reduction of vehicular traffic. Therefore, she supported only the necessity for two on site parking.

Commissioner Harle concurred with the comments of Israel and Mihaly.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 1992**

Chairman Kroot agreed with Commissioners Israel and Mihaly. He would like the Town Attorney's advise on the legal issues. He wondered if borings could be taken on the lot. He required a minimum of two off street parking and commented that the house, although not so large, was out of scale for the small size of the lot. He also suggested marking the trees that would need to be removed.

Commissioner Mihaly suggested that the applicant and the neighbors get together to discuss the project. Many times problems can be solved prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Richards stated that based on past history, he has not liked to talk with the neighbors prior to the first public hearing.

Lois Linderman, 8 Vista Lane, stated that she felt the project will be a significant adverse impact. She stated that she looked through the building file on this project and found a page of a letter dated 8/3/84 from Rod Williams that indicated that the house should be placed on Forest. Ms. Wight stated she has no knowledge of what address it belongs to but she will look into it. Mr. Richards indicated that it pertained to 11 Forest Avenue.

M/S Mihaly/Israel, to continue PS-9201 - Tony Richards for Viking Leon, Between Forest Avenue and Vista Lane, south of Landsdale Station Park, A/P Nos. 7-021-07, 7-021-23, and 7-021-24, 1) environmental review; 2) parcel split to legalize the 1954 creation of three separate building sites, each of which is currently undeveloped; and V-9240/DR-9218 - Tony Richards for Viking Leon, 5 Vista Lane, A/P 7-021-24, 1) design review of a single family dwelling; 2) a 17' frontyard variance to construct a dwelling within 3' of the front property line; 3) a 3' rearyard variance to construct bay windows within 17' of the rear property line; 4) a 20' frontyard variance for driveway retaining walls to be within 0' of the front property line; and 5) a 13' frontyard variance to construct an uncovered deck within 1' of the front property line. This is continued to the meeting of January 19, 1993. Motion unanimously passed.

8. V-9243 - Harry J. Levine, 405 Scenic Avenue, A/P 7-032-02, 1) a parking variance for the property to remain without on-site parking; 2) a 5' rear yard variance to reconstruct an uncovered deck within 9' of the rear property line; and 3) a 8'4" front yard variance to reconstruct an uncovered deck within 5'8" of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District

The applicant was present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report. She stated that staff received additional letters of support from the neighbors at 30 Spruce, 64 and 67 Spruce after the Planning Commission packets were distributed on Friday.

Mr. Levine stated that his house is only 560 square feet and the deck is really needed for outdoor living space. He stated that when he purchased the property it was not disclosed that the car deck was required to be reconstructed. The Resale Report indicated that the car deck was in need of serious repair but when he looked at the property the car deck has already been removed. He stated that he has received estimates of \$30,000 to replace the car deck. He currently has to find on street parking and although that is a hardship he thought it would be more of a hardship for him to replace the car deck in conjunction with the deck. He agreed that the car deck should be replaced at some point. He stated that he researched the Municipal Code and Section 10-3.206 states that a non conforming use can be built if a variance is approved.

Commissioner Mihaly asked how Mr. Levine would feel about a lien being placed on his property that required the parking deck to be replaced prior to the sale of his property. Mr. Levine stated he wasn't really happy with the idea but he did know that it would have to be disclosed prior to the sale of his property.

Commissioner Mihaly stated that he would like to see a compromise. A demolition was granted by the Town to allow removal of the parking deck without adequate means to enforce the rebuilding of a new car deck.

Commissioner Israel stated that he would like to see Mr. Levine reconstruct his deck because the deck is a hazard. He also wanted to see on-site parking.

Commissioner Julin did not think he should be forced to live in this situation. He should be allowed to rebuild his deck and waive the variance for parking until some time in the future. She asked staff for clarification/documentation from the Town Attorney on this issue. She felt it was discrimination against this applicant if the variance is not granted. Other people are allowed to park on the street.

Commissioner Harle was in favor of the variance for the deck. He also felt that the parking deck should be rebuilt but not necessarily in conjunction with the deck.

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 1992**

Chairman Kroot agreed with Commissioner Mihaly's comments.

M/S Mihaly/ Harle to continue V-9243 - Harry J. LeVine, 405 Scenic Avenue, A/P 7-032-02, 1) a parking variance for the property to remain without on-site parking; 2) a 5' rear yard variance to reconstruct an uncovered deck within 9' of the rear property line; and 3) a 8'4" front yard variance to reconstruct an uncovered deck within 5'8" of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. This is continued to the meeting of January 4, 1993. Motion unanimously passed.

4. V-9213 - Harry Kraft, 214 The Alameda, A/P 5-054-07, a 20' front yard variance to allow a 7'3" existing trellis structure to remain within 0' of the front and side property line; and an appeal of the Public Works Department administrative decision to deny the 6' fence within 5.5' of the front property line and within 0' of the south side property line, on property located in the R-1 Zoning District. (AFTER-THE-FACT).

The applicant was not present so the item was continued.

M/S Israel/Julin to continue V-9213 - Harry Kraft, 214 The Alameda, A/P 5-054-07, a 20' front yard variance to allow a 7'3" existing trellis structure to remain within 0' of the front and side property line; and an appeal of the Public Works Department administrative decision to deny the 6' fence within 5.5' of the front property line and within 0' of the south side property line, on property located in the R-1 Zoning District. (AFTER-THE-FACT). This was continued to the meeting of January 4, 1993. Motion unanimously passed.

F. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Discussion of alternate Planning Commission hearing in lieu of January 19th (Martin Luther King Day).

G. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION

H. REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL

I. ADJOURN

The regular Planning Commission was adjourned at 1:00 a.m. to the next meeting of January 4, 1993.

BARBARA CHAMBERS, ASA II