

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1993

The regular Planning Commission was convened at 8:00 p.m. by Vic-Chairman Harle in the Council Chamber. Staff present: Planning Director Ann Chaney, Planning Consultant Delvin Washington.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Julin, Israel, Kroot, Harle, Sias
Commissioners Absent: Hayes, Mihaly,

B. CONSENT

1. **Minutes - March 15, 1993, April 19, 1993**
2. **DR-9308 - Eric Shaplo, 21 Timothy Avenue, A/P 5-252-02**, design review for construction of an addition: a two-car garage and crawl space at ground level; a middle floor living addition; a top floor family room; and a connecting stairwell between the floors, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (Above 150' Elevation).
3. **V-9316 - Bob and Pat Davlsson, 7 Brookmead Place, A/P 5-111-39**, a rear and side yard variance to locate a spa within 2'6" of the rear and side property lines where 8' is required and to locate the motorized mechanical equipment 2' from the side yard where 8' is required, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.
4. **V-9317 - Charles and Rosemary Kunst, 27 Bella Vista, A/P 6-082-36**, variances to construct the following: a 15' tall steel and wood retaining wall within 9' of the rear property line; and a rebar and concrete erosion mat within 0' of the rear and west side property lines, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.

A member of the audience asked to have Item B3 removed from the Consent.

M/S Israel/Kroot to removed Item B3 from the Consent and place it on the Public Hearing. Motion unanimously passed.

M/S Israel/Kroot to approve Item B1 - Minutes. Motion unanimously passed. Audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

M/S Kroot/Sias, to approve Items B2 with the following conditions:

B2. - 21 Timothy Avenue

1. That the applicant enter into a deed restriction agreement with the Town stating that:
 - a) separate cooking facilities shall not be installed in the proposed bedrooms and bath addition to be located above the proposed garage; and b) this area shall not be used nor rented as a separate living unit. This agreement shall be notarized and recorded by the County Recorder.
2. That the additions be built per the plans received by the Town on March 22, 1993.
3. That if this development, which has received discretionary approval, has not begun within one year from the date of the final action, the permit shall become null and void. However, this discretionary action may be renewed by the Planning Director for a maximum of one year provided the applicant places such request, showing good cause, in writing to the Director prior to the expiration of the discretionary action.

B4. - 27 Bella Vista

1. That rosemary (or another species with a similar growth habit) be planted and maintained along the driveway in order to grow over the wall and provide some softening to the wall.

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

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS - CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF MAY 17, 1993

1. **V-9315 - Laurent Recollon - 36 Canyon Road, A/P 7-062-09**, a variance to construct an 8'6" retaining wall along Canyon Road beyond the front property line (within the right-of-way) in order to help stabilize the slope supporting the house; and 2) a retaining wall within 4' of the east side property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' mean sea level).
2. **PS-9201 - Tony Richards for Viking Leon, Between Forest Avenue and Vista Lane**, south of Lansdale Station Park, A/P Nos. 7-021-07, 7-

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1993

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.

3. **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.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 7, 1993

1. **PS-9301/LLR-9301/ER (Environmental Review; Parcel Split, and Lot Line Relocation, - Andrea Sandvig and Stuart Jacobson, 500 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-191-06 and 07,** 1) environmental review; 2) a parcel split to legalize the 1946 creation of two separate parcels, one which is currently developed; and 3) a lot line relocation for an approximately 5 acre piece of property located within the R-1-H Zoning District. No development is proposed as part of this request.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Taken out of Order.

- B3. **V-9316 - Bob and Pat Davisson, 7 Brookmead Place, A/P 5-111-39,** a rear and side yard variance to locate a spa within 2'6" of the rear and side property lines where 8' is required and to locate the motorized mechanical equipment 2' from the side yard where 8' is required, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.

The applicants were present.

Ms. Chaney presented the staff report.

Robert Haeger, 63 Brookmead Place, objected to the motor for the hot tub. Their bedroom is about 35 feet from the tub and was concerned about the noise level.

Mr. Davisson stated that his neighbors bedroom was approximately 70 feet away from his house. All the adjacent neighbors that would be most affected are in support of the project. He presented letters of support from those neighbors. Mr. Davisson indicated that the spa is gas powered. He spoke with the manufacturer, and the pump for the tub runs approximately 30 minutes a day. The timer can be set at such a time that would not disturb his neighbor at 63 Brookmead.

Ms. Chaney presented a site plan and showed the location of the neighbor that has expressed concern. She stated that she did a visual check where the spa was to be located. The house on Brookmead Place would be approximately 50 feet away from the spa. Ms. Chaney noted that staff recommended approval because she did not think there was any objection from the neighbors. She stated that she also contacted a spa company and was told that new technology has produced spas with quieter motors and that it is just a matter of preference between a permanent spa and a portable spa.

Mr. Davisson stated that the spa will be surfaced on the deck and the spa equipment will be placed on a cement pad, within an insulated metal box, and will not exceed 30 inches in height. He stated that plants will be planted around the box.

Mr. Haeger stated that he was concerned about the noise and he was not satisfied that the motor and the jets issue has been satisfied.

Commissioner Sias stated that he was inclined to go with the staff recommendation. He stated that there is a history of many hot tubs in San Anselmo that are in closer proximity than the spa proposed and there have been no complaints. He therefore was reasonably confident that this will work. He felt that the owner might be able to work with the neighbor in making the spa additionally soundproof if necessary but did not think it would be necessary.

Commissioner Israel stated that although it might not be a problem he was inclined to ask the owners to relocate the motor outside of the setbacks, although relocating it 6 feet would not make much of a difference with regard to noise.

Commissioner Julin was inclined to support the variance. She stated that it could be installed in

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1993

a closer proximity to the neighbor without a variance.

Commissioner Kroot stated that he supported the proposal. He said his neighbor has a spa approximately 30 feet away from his property and he has never been bothered by the noise.

Commissioner Harle stated that he supported the proposal. All the houses that are most affected are in support and relocating the spa out of the setbacks, by approximately six feet would not make any difference in terms of sound reduction for the neighbor at 63 Brookmead Place.

M/S Sias/Kroot, to approve V-9316 - Bob and Pat Davisson, 7 Brookmead Place, A/P 5-111-39, a rear and side yard variance to locate a spa within 2'6" of the rear and side property lines where 8' is required and to locate the motorized mechanical equipment 2' from the side yard where 8' is required, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. *1. Due to 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.* Because there is nothing truly unique about the property from a physical standpoint, it is difficult for staff to make the required findings for a variance. There are areas within the rear yard and certainly the large side (main) yard that could accommodate this spa. However, because there appears to be ample distance separating the proposed spa from the surrounding residences, and because a spa does not affect light and air an addition to a home would, staff is able to support this variance request. In addition, staff recommends that the Planning Commission revisit the issue of spas relative to the zoning Ordinance. *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 or the applicant and will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in such neighborhood.* Because the spa and equipment are located such that they are relatively far from adjoining houses, and given the presence of a 6 foot high redwood fence, staff is able to make the non-detriment finding. It is not expected that the spa will materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons in the neighborhood. **Conditions of approval are: 1. That the spa shall be installed per plans date stamp received by the Town of San Anselmo on March 12, 1993. 2. That if this development which has received discretionary approval has not begun within one year from the date of the final action, the permit shall become null and void. However, this discretionary action may be renewed by the Planning Director for a maximum period of one year provided the applicant places such request in writing to the Director showing good cause prior to the expiration of the discretionary action.**

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

1. **V-9244 - Lenore Mathews, 72 Foothill, A/P 7-033-12, a front yard variance to raise the existing house 3' in height to be located 2' from the front property line; 2) a 7'6" side yard variance along the south side property line; 3) a 4'6" side yard variance on the north side property line to construct a new garage and garden storage house, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District.**

The applicant and her daughter Louise Mathews, were present.

Mr. Washington presented the staff report. He noted that if the Commission approved this project, there is another condition that states: "The applicant shall revise the site plans and floor plans to ensure that the garage is no more than 3'6" from the side property line and that the interior dimension of the garage have a clear space measuring 18 feet in width and 19 feet deep to accommodate two vehicles."

Ms. Chaney noted that the applicant has made some revisions to the original plans and therefore some of the dimension are not as precise and clear as they should be.

Ms. Louise Mathews stated that the public lane leads into a private drive for a ten acre parcel. She explained the water flow. She was under the impression from staff that the deck did not require a variance. If it does, then she will remove her request for that. She stated that she will have to do something about the 3' 7" height. She stated that she currently uses the three room garden house. The requirement for the 8' setback for the garage, places her in a disadvantage. She felt that by removing the shed she would be able to provide some planting which would provide some screening the neighbors. She wanted to make sure that there was no planting at the drain swale because it fills up during the rains. It is difficult at this time to provide planting information.

Commissioner Israel wondered if she considered excavating rather than going up. The applicant stated that her engineer did not want her to excavate. Another engineer stated that the house sits in zone 4 and is a very difficult site to excavate. Therefore raising the house

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1993

would be the most safe condition. She stated that there are large roots from the bay trees from 220 Scenic which will make it difficult to construct the garage.

Larry Santucci, a neighbor, stated that he has no objection to raising the house but was concerned about the turn around and the failures that occur because of the inadequacy of the turn around. There are upwards of 30 to 40 turns per day, many by large vehicles. The failures are not caused by the drainage but by the power turns and moisture. He also felt the Sanitary District had some part in this failure in years past.

Dr. Robert Gelber, 220 Scenic, purchased his property 22 years ago. He is concerned about the addition without any plans for screening. He had a survey done in 1976 and the survey indicates that a portion of this project will be on his property. He stated that Foothill is a very narrow street and he was concerned that the applicant's driveway will become a parking lot. He wondered if the house being proposed was too large for the lot, and if the turn around will every meet code. He was most concerned about the impact visually, and the drainage potentials. He did not understand why there is a need to build right up to the property line. He stated that his property value might be in jeopardy. Dr. Gelber distributed a copy of his survey.

Ms. Chaney stated that both the neighbor and the owner had independent surveys done which conflict. Staff stated that perhaps the Commission could direct the applicant to have another survey drawn up.

Maryann Miata, 220 Scenic, shares the same concerns as her husbands. She was also concerned about the cutting into the hillside and the building of a retaining wall as well as the drainage problems. She stated that she appreciates the attempt to pull the addition back from the original submittal but wondered if there could be more modifications that would be less obtrusive. She showed photographs of the gardening shed and noted that it is in a state of disrepair and is not a real hardship to be demolished. She stated that her porch windows face the house in question and therefore their view area will be affected.

Stephen Burdick 55 Foothill, stated that his concerns are also about the turn around.

Dr. Gelber stated that everyone is concerned about the turn around and would like to see some engineering plans that show what is being proposed.

The applicant said that she would go with the advise of the Public Works Director and that of Mr. Santucci, who is also an engineer. She stated that she will plant vegetation that is acceptable with MMWD and the Fire District. It is a very difficult area to plant because it is very hot in the summer and very dark and damp in the winter.

Commissioner Kroot stated that the latest survey indicates that there are two other surveys of which Dr. Gelbers is not part of.

Lenora Mathews stated that they have tried to get along with the neighbors. They have also had trouble with the bay leaves that fall onto their cars and that is one reason they want a garage. They have spend a lot of money cutting, trimming and pruning trees that belong to him. She also stated that Dr. Gelber's car is parked in the turn around. She stated that she would like to plant screening on the side of the garden house that would provide screening.

Ms. Miata stated that the parking pad is not in the turn around.

Commissioner Israel stated that the plans are very difficult to read and are not completed accurately. He appreciated the staff time spent on this. He stated that he was leery about raising the house when it is so close to the front property line but in this case, if it is required from the soils engineer then he has no objection. He stated that some screening would help soften the view for the neighbor. He stated that the garage could be relocated to another area and not be such a detriment. He would like to see some screening at the edge of the garage which would provide privacy to the neighbor. He stated the removal of the potting shed will be an advantage to the neighbor, not a disadvantage.

Commissioner Julin stated that are too many uncertainties to vote on this proposal tonight. The design of the house, and the angle of the addition should not impact the view of the residents on Scenic. The addition of 440 square feet of living space is not large, but what is an issue is the garage. The plan does not seem detailed enough, and the turn around is a major issue. She wondered what the recommended radius was, what about the drainage, who will incur the costs of the turn around. Because of the time deadline, she is inclined to deny the application.

Ms. Chaney noted that the applicant could sign a three month extension.

Commissioner Kroot stated that the drawings were sketchy. Also, there is the issue of the side yard setbacks but both surveys show that the shed is on, or very close, to the property line. With regard to the variances, he had no objection and agree with the staff report. The garage

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1993

would provide parking under cover, allow for guest parking, and he had no objection to raising the house, or the addition to the closet.

Commissioner Sias concurred with the other Commissioners. He agreed with all the conditions of approval. He would like to see some mutually acceptable screening by both neighbors. With regard to drainage, he wondered if a better drainage situation could not be achieved. With regard to repairs in the turn around, he was not sure why the applicant had to upgrade the turn around when it was in the public right of way. With regard to the deadline, he also would have to vote denial unless there could be an extension signed by the applicant.

Commissioner Harle supported the staff report, but concerned about the structure by the property line. On the other hand, it was the owner's responsibility to adhere to the approved setbacks and if the project, therefore the likability is placed on the owner. He too was bothered by the sketchy drawings. He felt the greenhouse was in an obtrusive place and very much agreed with staff recommendation of removing it.

Ms. Chaney asked the Commission if they wanted to ask the owner to provide another survey or if what has been presented is acceptable. Commissioner Harle stated that the setback stated is the responsibility of the applicant. Commissioner Israel agreed with Harle in this case. Ann stated that perhaps that should be a condition of approval. Israel stated that it is the obligation of the surveyor to make the survey accurate, and the applicant is accountable for accurate placement of the structure. Commissioner Kroot stated that perhaps if the surveyor review the other two surveyors and report back on the findings. Commissioner Israel suggested that the edge of the property in the area of the garage be staked by the engineer.

Ms. Mathews stated that she will go back to her surveyor and discuss the other surveys.

Ms. Chaney asked if the applicant should return with an engineering drawing of the driveway and garage area. Commissioner Sias stated that he would have no problem having it reviewed by the Public Works Director outside of the Commission.

Commissioner Israel stated that final drawings do not have to come back to the Commission but more precise drawings will have to be presented for the working drawings. Commissioner's Sias and Kroot could go along with that.

The applicant presented some photographs.

Commissioner Sias wanted to see a landscape plan. Commissioner Israel stated that a trellis would be the only thing that would help screen the Gelbers but it would have to be very large. In fact, after looking at the photographs, he was not sure that landscaping would screen because the Gelbers were so very high above this project. He agreed with the 14' high wall but would not be objectionable to planting wisteria.

Commissioner Kroot asked about the road repair. Perhaps the applicant should be required to at least to fill the potholes. Commissioner Israel stated that the restoration of the circle should be at the expense of the applicant, but the street is public and that burden should not be placed on the applicant. Commissioner Sias wondered if the Town could share in the cost of the public right of way.

Commissioner Israel stated that he felt very strongly that trees are very important and that every measure should be taken to protect trees. And that the property owner should not look at the trees of her neighbor as a nuisance, but rather for their beauty.

M/S Kroot/Sias, to approve V-9244 - Lenore Mathews, 72 Foothill, A/P 7-033-12, a front yard variance to raise the existing house 3' in height to be located 2' from the front property line; 2) a 7'6" side yard variance along the south side property line; 3) a 4'6" side yard variance on the north side property line to construct a new garage and garden storage house, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. Approval is conditioned by the following:

Conditions of approval in staff report Numbers 2,2,3,5,and 7 are to remain.

Delete Condition #4 in the staff report and add wording that states: "The applicant shall repave the road if any damage occurs from construction. A video tape of the road way is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Replace wording as follows for Condition #6: "The applicant shall revise the site plans and floor plans to ensure that the garage is no more than 3'6" from the side property line and that the interior dimension of the garage have a clear space measuring 18 feet in width and 19 feet deep to accommodate two vehicles."

Add the following conditions: (8) The side yard shall be staked by a licensed surveyor to ensure that it does not encroach closer than 3'6" into the side property line. (9) The driveway, garage

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1993

and drainage shall be designed and reviewed by a licensed engineer. (10) Excavation of the 20' turnaround be completed by a licensed engineer. And, if a retaining wall is required that also be designed by a licensed engineer. (11) The excavated area is to be paved.

Commissioner Julin stated that she would like the Commission to vote for a continuance with a 90 day extension because there are too many unknowns. She said it leaves too much to the imagination and is unfair to the neighbors.

Ms. Mathews stated that there is a question of the placement of the garage based on some variables. She stated that it might take some time to have the surveyor review the site. She would like the Public Works Director to come out and pave Foothill.

Commissioner Sias withdrawn his second.
Motion died for lack of a second.

M/S Kroot, Sias to continue V-9244 - Lenore Mathews, 72 Foothill, A/P 7-033-12, a front yard variance to raise the existing house 3' in height to be located 2' from the front property line; 2) a 7'6" side yard variance along the south side property line; 3) a 4'6" side yard variance on the north side property line to construct a new garage and garden storage house, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. The project is continued to the meeting of June 7, 1993 to allow the applicant time to submit engineered drawings of the driveway, garage and conformation on the survey.

Motion unanimously passed.

Dr. Gelber asked why there was a need to have this variance. Is it really a hardship. Commissioner Sias stated that the applicant was offering two car parking off the street and there is no other location for a garage in his opinion. With regard to privacy, he felt there was a lot of existing vegetation and the addition is lower than the neighbor that is objectionable.

2. Z-9301/PS-9302/ER/DR-9309/U-9303 - Bill and Sharon Asbell, directly to the south of 47 Cedar St, A/P 7-222-58, 1) a request to rezone a parcel from PPD (Preliminary Planned Development)-multi unit to SPD (Specific Plan Development) multi unit; 2) a tentative parcel map to subdivide an existing 12,000 square foot parcel into two 6,000 square foot parcels; and 3) a use permit and design review application to construct one unit on each of the new parcels. (the total number of new units on this parcel will be two), on property located within the PPD Zoning District.

The applicant and his designer Nick Haskell, were present.

Mr. Washington presented the staff report. He stated that due to a noticing error no motion can be made on this application tonight. However, if the Commission was receptive, there can be a discussion on the item with final action to take place at the meeting of May 17, 1993.

Commissioner Sias stated that he was inclined to hear the public testimony because people in the audience have been waiting for so long. The consensus of the Commission was to hear testimony.

Nick Haskell, Project Designer, explained the project. The site is very steep, stating there is as much as a 40 percent grade at some point. There was a slide in 1986. They are trying to step the houses into the hill and use the existing retaining walls as necessary. He gave a presentation of the floor plan.

Commissioner Harle wondered what would happen if one owner wants to tear down one house and they are attached.

Commissioner Israel stated that the owner might want to consider the building code requirements versus the condominium air rights.

Maggie Moore, 49 Cedar, wanted to know how the trees would be protected during, and after the project has been finished. Ms. Chaney stated that it could be made a condition of approval.

Joanne Bodies, 47 Cedar, stated that the staff report references her house at 47 as the parcel which this project was split off from. For the record she wanted to state that the original property was 49, not 47 Cedar. She said that although the building would be nice it will be a detriment to her. She is proposing to rebuild her side deck and these houses will look right into the project. The slide in 1986 robbed her of the vegetation and now this addition will be more of a detriment. She opposes the 32 feet height.

Sandy White, 196 Tunstead, stated that her house is directly across Cedar from the property.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1993

The height of the property would be looming but she was happy that the outdoor living area is in the back of the property. She stated that traffic is very noisy in the area and Wade Thomas Grammar School is just one and a half blocks from this project. She was wondering if the developer would pay to put a stop sign. She wanted the Commission to take the responsibility to have the sign put in. Commissioner Sias suggested that it be a condition of approval. The owner of 49 Cedar wanted to see if trees could be planted. The Commissioners thought that would be a good idea.

Mr. Asbell was not against the CC&R's for the project. He also had no objection to putting in the stop sign. He did not understand why the street had to be repaved at his expense. The consensus of the Commission was that it was an undue burden to the applicant to incur the cost of paving the Town right of way. Mr. Asbell stated that he had no objection to planting trees.

M/S Sias/Kroot, to continue Z-9301/PS-9302/ER/DR-9309/U-9303 - Bill and Sharon Asbell, directly to the south of 47 Cedar St, A/P 7-222-58, 1) a request to rezone a parcel from PPD (Preliminary Planned Development)-multi unit to SPD (Specific Plan Development) multi unit; 2) a tentative parcel map to subdivide an existing 12,000 square foot parcel into two 6,000 square foot parcels; and 3) a use permit and design review application to construct one unit on each of the new parcels. (the total number of new units on this parcel will be two), on property located within the PPD Zoning District. This is continued to May 17th at which time the item can be placed on consent. conditions of approval to be placed on the project for the next meeting are as follows: Conditions 1,2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 in the staff report and the following: Item 7 should read: "The applicant shall repave the road if any damage occurs from construction. A video tape of the road way is required prior to the issuance of a building permit". (9) No existing mature trees as shown on plans approved by the Planning Commission and on file with the Planning Department shall be removed without the approval of the Public Works Director. such condition shall be recorded as part of the CC & R. (10) CC&R's shall be prepared by the applicant and recorded subject to review by the Planning Director which addresses future maintenance of the structure and landscaping. (11). Additional landscaping shall be placed along neighbor on north side acceptable to both parties, to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director. (12). Exterior colors are to be identified. (13) A stop sign to be installed on Cedar Street and Magnolia Avenue and Tunstead, subject to review and approval by the Public Works Director.

Motion unanimously passed.

3. **Town of San Anselmo - Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment** to Article 4 Development Standards, Table 4A-Development Standards Table and Section 10-3.710-Design Review Procedures which could permit administrative design review to occur on R-1 and R-1-C zoned properties above 150' mean sea level elevation depending upon the proposed structures size and visibility. The amendment would also exempt "in-kind" replacement of pre-existing development from design review provided there is no material change in visual effect.

M/S Sias/Kroot, to continue Item D3 to the meeting of May 17, 1993.
Motion unanimously passed.

E. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Commissioner Sias will not be present the meeting of May 17, 1993.

Commissioner Kroot will not be present the meeting of June 21, 1993.

F. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION

There was no discussion.

G. REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL

There was no discussion.

H. ADJOURNMENT TO THE MEETING OF May 17, 1993

The regular Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:50 p.m. to the next regular meeting on May 17, 1993.

BARBARA CHAMBERS