

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 1994

The Regular meeting of the Planning Commission was convened at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Mihaly in the Council Chamber. Staff present was Associate Planner Lisa Wight and Planning Consultant Delvin Washington.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioners present: Harle, Sargent, Ollinger, Julin Mihaly
Commissioners absent: Hayes, Israel

B. CONSENT

1. Minutes - May 23, 1994, and June 6, 1994
2. **DR-9411 - Peter Chan, 42 Tomahawk Drive, A/P 177-250-64, design review of a gazebo and hot tub - After The Fact - on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District.**

M/S Harle/Julin, to approve consent agenda. Motion unanimously passed. The audience was advised of the ten day appeal period.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS-CONTINUED

1. **Oak Avenue Master Plan and Development Agreement - David Hansen APN's 7-154-02, 7-154-05; Michael and Linda Gill APN's 7-154-08 and 09, 7-154-11, William Broderick APN's 7-154-10, 7-201-02, 7-201-12; The project site is located on the northeastern slope of Bald Mountain. It is bordered by Oak Avenue and scattered residential housing to the north and east, and by open space to the south and west. The subject property is comprised of 8 parcels of land totaling an estimated 16.2+ acres. The proposed project, which includes a master plan and development agreement, focuses on buildout of some, but not all, of the properties at the end of Oak Avenue. The proposed master plan and development agreement seek entitlement to construct four (4) new homes, appurtenant structures, and infrastructure improvements. The documents do not include the design level information required by the Town to approve specific homes or any of the other entitlements needed before construction can begin. **CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JUNE 27, 1994****

D. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Resident, 48 Foothill, wondered if he could use the adjacent stairway to carry wood off of his property. Chairman Mihaly suggested he contact the Building Department.

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **V-9406 - Michelle Chouinnard, 208 Sequoia, A/P 6-114-01, a variance request to: 1) allow the applicant to relocate a spa off the neighbors property to within 1' of the side property line (8' is required); 2) to relocate a trellis and arbor off the neighboring property and be within 0' of the side property line (3' is required); and 3) to allow portions of a fence and trellis to be 9' in height (6' is permitted); 4) to relocate an existing 192 square foot arbor that encroaches 4" on the neighbors property and will be within 0' of the side property line (8' is required) on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (After-the-Fact) Note: **The spa and portions of the fence trellis and arbor currently encroach into the adjoining property.****

The applicant was present.

Mr. Washington presented the staff report.

Ms. Chouinnard said that she and her neighbor have had a good relationship most of the 23 years she has lived there. The neighbor had no objection to the hot tub and fence. She was misinformed that the hot tub did not require a permit and did not know a permit was required to replace the arbor. The main area of dispute is where it extends onto her neighbors property. It will be a major undertaking to remove it off his land. She is not sure about the property lines; the fence is in exactly the same place as when Mr. Bell constructed it. The spa was placed in this location because it is sheltered and her property is in a canyon and other homes would look into her property except for this location. The other reason she put the spa there is because of the close proximity to the kitchen door. She stated that she has a muscular condition and the spa was placed in this location for easy access. The trellis over the hot tub provides privacy and keeps the branches from the redwood trees

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 1994**

falling over the tub. Regarding the height of the grade - she originally intended to excavate but the roots of the trees and the water main were a factor. She said the height of the fence baffles the noise and provides privacy.

Mr. Bell, 47 Cypress Avenue, was born in his house and will remain there for the rest of his life. He has no objections to relocating the hot tub. The property line is indicated on the plan and has been confirmed by a land surveyor. He has no objection to 0' of the property line for the arbor as long as it is on the neighbor's property line. He objects to the 9' fence because it will loom. He is against railroad ties and rocks on his land. The arbor should be cut back and modified to conform to the applicant's property line. He wants all structures removed that are now on his property line. He would like to see this resolved. He did concede that he allowed her to place the hot tub on his property in the past but the tub was portable. All these structures were constructed over a period of time more than one contractor.

Commissioner Sargent did not see any problem with the hot tub at the 0' setback as long as it was not objectionable to the neighbor.

Commissioner Harle supported the staff report on the arbor and fence and the 0' setback for the spa.

Commissioner Julin concurred with the staff report including the relocation of the hot tub because of the noise. The variance will run with the land and be a nuisance in the future. The fence should be a good neighbor fence so that Mr. Bell will not have to look at the back of a fence.

Commissioner Ollinger will approve the arbor as long as it does not exceed 9' and approves a 6' fence. If the tub is portable it could be moved again and therefore he agrees with the location of the hot tub by the applicant.

Chairman Mihaly was somewhat divided in that a spa could be noisy however he will go along with the Commission on the location of the spa.

M/S Sargent/Ollinger to approve **V-9406 - Michelle Chouinnard, 208 Sequoia, A/P 6-114-01**, a variance request to: 1) allow the applicant to relocate a spa off the neighbors property to within 1' of the side property line (8' is required); 2) to relocate a trellis and arbor off the neighboring property and be within 0' of the side property line (3' is required); and 3) to allow portions of a fence and trellis to be 9' in height (6' is permitted); 4) to relocate an existing 192 square foot arbor that encroaches 4' on the neighbors property and will be within 0' of the side property line (8' is required) on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (After-the-Fact) **Note: The spa and portions of the fence trellis and arbor currently encroach into the adjoining property. 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. The subject property has an unusual configuration and topography which limits the available yard area.** Because of this the area for her to construct various amenities on her property is limited. If the applicant can conform with the standards adopted for Administrative Variance requests the potential impacts of her request should be minimal. The special circumstances for the location of the spa is the topography of the lot in that a hot tub has to be located on a flat slab and this is the flat surface and the uniqueness of the lot. Also, the applicant and the neighbor view the proposed location as a appropriate location. *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.* If the structures are modified in accordance with the following conditions of approval this project should not have any detrimental impacts on the adjacent property. **Conditions of Approval: 1. The fence and trellis when relocated shall not exceed 6 feet in height when measured from the neighbor's (47 cypress Avenue) side of the property. 2. The arbor shall be detached from the fence and at no point shall it ever exceed nine feet in height when measured from the neighbor's side a 47 Cypress Avenue. 3. The fence shall be of a good neighbor type so that the side that faces the owner of 47 Cypress will not be a back side.**

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed.

2. **V-9415/DR-9410 - Roger and Mary Hedin, 176 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-231-44**, a design review and variance to construct a new single family residence that will include 1) a two car garage 7' from the front property line (20' required); and parking deck 0' from the front property line (20' required); and 2) to exceed the 35' height limit by 2'6" on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' mean sea level). **NOTE: This hearing will be reviewed as a study session with the Planning Commission.**

The applicants and their Architect Jeff Kroot were present.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 1994

Mr. Washington presented the staff report, noting that this hearing is for discussion only because staff did not properly notice for a variance. Staff noted that it was very difficult to see the story poles because of the denseness of the vegetation. He suggests that a different color of story pole be used.

Mr. Hedin said the project has been in the works for about 9 years. They have lived in their current home for 38 years and love the area. The elevations seemed to be in keeping with other homes in the neighborhood. In 1985 they had to deed over some of their land to the Town. Regarding the height variance, he felt that aesthetics are very important, and the 2.6' can only be seen from the road. Regarding the soils report, they are somewhat surprised that they now have to have an analysis again with the Town. He stated that if the house was dropped down two feet the garage would still be the same height.

Mrs. Hedin said they would not do anything detrimental to the aesthetics of the neighborhood. She noted that the house is on the down slope.

Commissioner Harle asked if the unfinished floor area was to be floored in, to which Mr. Hedin affirmed.

Tom Guerin, 30 Echo Court, is concerned about the view lines from Echo Court. The house would frame his view from his deck and pool. He presented photographs. The lot is very steep but the trees surrounding the house will not shield the house because of the steep topography. The other concern is that the creek is dry now but it is a major drainage area during the winter. Any excavation or soil removal could be a change in the creek bed and be a problem for his property.

Resident 177 Oak and 173 Oak, stated that and they live directly across from the proposed lot. From 177 Oak they have almost no view of the lot but from 173 Oak they have a direct view of the property. Every foot of height reduces the view of his property. They appreciate the materials and the facade but questions the logic of how the reduction of 2.6' could not be achieved. He also wondered if the house could be pushed back on the lot. Also, regarding the garage and the carport, he does not understand the location and he would like a walk through if possible.

Resident, 177 Oak, said they bought the property for the privacy and would invite the Commission to their property to observe how the project will impact their privacy. They would like to see the house pushed back.

Chairman Mihaly said that the staff might consider the necessary story poles in light of the photographs presented and suggested that the Architect will meet with the neighbors.

Commissioner Harle said a good view of the lot could be achieved by standing at the top of Geneva Hall at the Seminary.

Commissioner Ollinger suggested that the project be viewed from the neighbors house to get the sense of how they may be affected. Also, he asked if there are any restrictions that prohibit the unfinished floor space from being used as a second unit. He suggested that a deed restriction be required. He does have some concerns about exceeding the height on this property.

Commissioner Julin thought the design was very handsome and the materials are very nice.

The study secession was closed and the item will have to be renoticed.

3. **V-9416/DR-9412 - John Schreck, 137 Humboldt, A/P 7-033-20 and 7-033-21,**
1) a rear yard variance to construct a dwelling within 2' of the rear property line (20' is required); and 2) a rear yard variance to construct stairs and landings within 0' of the rear property line, and over the Humboldt right-of-way (20' is required); and 3) design review of a single family dwelling, on property located within the (R-1) Zoning District. Humboldt Avenue is considered the rear street frontage.

Luis Huetro Royo, Architect and Norman Charles, part owner, were present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Mr. Huerto Royo said that when the Council rejected the proposal it was because they did not feel there was enough research done in evaluating the parking off of Foothill. In order to back out of the garage and have the appropriate setbacks, because of the garage, the neighbors bedroom is about 10 to 12' away and the retaining wall would be about 22 to 23' in depth. From that standpoint they have disregarded the Foothill access. He presented a plan of how the house would look with the variance and they determined it would be too close to the neighbors house. Since the appeal they have met with the neighbors. Based on the discussion they came up with the current design. It pushed the house away from the neighbor, pushed the house closer to Humboldt, and saved a bay cluster. The neighbors also wanted additional parking off site which they were able to do to create approximately three cars. They could not reduce the size of the garage but was able to step the house down to

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 1994**

minimize the profile of the building. The neighbors on Foothill asked for changes in the landscape which they have accommodated. They will also maintain the roses that are already on the site.

Norman Charles, said they met with the neighbors twice and the majority of the concerns were parking and bulk. They have reduced the bulk. The Harts were concerned about the garage window and they will move the windows. They will also put a partition over the deck to allow them more privacy. The siding is a rough sawn cedar, stained light oak.

Ron Backer, 106 Humboldt, agrees that the bulk has been reduced and has improved although he disagrees to some of the reasoning about the parking on Foothill. He takes issue with the creation of the parking area along the southern half of Humboldt, the proposal was to remove all the bay trees that adjoin Humboldt Avenue. He said he has measured the bays in proximity of the street and disputes the need to cut down the trees for parking. The other standards for parking in the area is much narrower.

(10:00 p.m. Chairman Mihaly took his leave.)

Laurent Boucher, 48 Foothill Road, are opposed to having the garage off of Foothill as well as the house towards Foothill. Parking is congested on Foothill at the present time and they do not want more.

Michael Grasny, 133 Humboldt, said the Architect has gone to a great deal of trouble to make changes but he still has concerns about parking. Also, access is a problem because of fire. He has lingering concerns about ecology and the look of the neighborhood with the addition of the house.

Don Hart, 135 Humboldt, echoes the concerns of his neighbors about parking, and the removal of bay trees. He would prefer cedar or redwood shingles. Also, he is concerned about the proximity of the house to theirs. It appears that from the master bedroom and deck they can view into their bedroom. He felt it was imperative to erect story poles. The deck should be screened for privacy.

Ron akayama, 124 Humboldt, is concerned about traffic and requested that they provide additional on-street parking for the neighborhood.

Veronica Basker, 106 Humboldt, questions the need for a retaining wall, and is against removing the bay trees. She also would like to see additional parking and likes cedar shingles. She presented a letter from her neighbor at 112 Humboldt who also is against removing bay trees.

Mr. Charles felt there should be a balance. Legal parking is 8' but he will provide substandard parking if the Commission will allow it. They have provided as much parking as they can fronting the property as possible. Beveled cedar siding is what is proposed. They are creating six parking spaces. The owners of Humboldt might want to get together to repave Humboldt which could maybe create more parking spaces.

Mr. Huerto Royo said the neighbor across the street would like the trees topped and see a different type of tree.

Commissioner Ollinger said that given the two alternatives for parking, Humboldt was the best solution because if the house was off of Foothill it would be a greater obstruction to the neighbors. The Architect has done a lot to reduce the house and is not out of line with other houses in the neighborhood and below the maximum size of the neighborhood. The parking issue on Humboldt is always difficult but the applicant is providing two off site parking spaces for the neighborhood. Additional off-site parking cannot be obtained on Foothill. The Town requires 8' parking. There may be some disagreement about the location of the trees and how wide the parking is, and he wondered if this could be determined during construction. If the applicant is amenable to putting a wall on the deck he has no problem with that. Perhaps make the low part solid for privacy. The cedar siding has a lasting finish and he is in agreement with this, and the horizontal siding will add appeal to the house. The approval should include the landscape change and the window in the garage. The bay window on the plans look like it does go to the ground. Ms. Wight said the Architect has indicated that it will not increase floor space.

Commissioner Julin supported the access from Humboldt at the last approval because parking on Foothill would require steps and a lot of grading. If there are steps to the house it would require a resident to walk a distance from the garage to the house. She agrees that cedar siding would be appropriate. She talked about the 15' roadway width as used for Gill and Fraser applications. It is her understanding that the 15' should now be used as a standard. If in fact 15' is a standard, the off-site parking would be eliminated. Otherwise, she supported staff recommendations.

Commissioner Sargent agreed with Commissioner Ollinger. He felt they would have to go with the 8' parking because it is the ordinance. His biggest problem is with the garage door because it looks like a big solid mass. Mr. Huerto Royo said they could put windows in which would break up the mass. Commissioner Sargent preferred two double garage doors.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 1994

Commissioner Ollinger felt that a pyramid roof for the garage would soften the bulk.. He thought the trim should blend in more with the oak finish. Mr. Charles said that he would be amenable to using the same color trim as the oak finish.

Commisisoner Harle supported the staff report with the additional comments about the garage and hip roof.

M/S Ollinger/Julin, to approve V-9416/DR-9412 - John Schreck, 137 Humboldt, A/P 7-033-20 and 7-033-21, 1) a rear yard variance to construct a dwelling within 2' of the rear property line (20' is required); and 2) a rear yard variance to construct stairs and landings within 0' of the rear property line, and over the Humboldt right-of-way (20' is required); and 3) design review of a single family dwelling, on property located within the (R-1) Zoning District. Humboldt Avenue is considered the rear street frontage.

Variance:

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. The subject property has an unusual configuration and topography which limits the available yard area. The special circumstances are the steep topography, the location of the rear property line to the road pavement, and the surrounding neighborhood development in relation to this property. The dwelling falls within the maximum dwelling size permitted. Were this house to be placed further down the slope, it would result in a longer driveway, and a taller structure. As designed, the rear wall of the dwelling ends before the front wall of the neighboring house at No. 135 begins. 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. The architect has been sensitive to neighboring properties in the area. The building height has been reduced 2', the dwelling size has been reduced 200 square feet, there will be 2 formal street parking spaces, the only trees to be removed are in the Humboldt right of way and they will be replaced, the decks are smaller, and, for the most part, the setbacks are greater. The dwelling will not be visible from surrounding hillside properties and will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property or improvements in the neighborhood.

Design Review:

I. Is functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements of the surrounding area; There are different architectural styles of development in this neighborhood. This development will be functionally and aesthetically compatible with the existing improvements and the natural elements in the area and the exterior natural wood siding will blend. 2. Provides for protection against noise, odors, and other factors which may make the environment less desirable; This development will not impact noise nor odors, and it will not make the environment less desirable. 3. Will not tend to cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy, investment, or orderly development in the area. This development will not cause the surrounding area to depreciate materially in appearance or value or otherwise discourage occupancy, investment, or orderly development in the area. 4. Will not create unnecessary traffic hazards due to congestion, distraction of motorists, or other factors and provides for satisfactory access by emergency vehicles and personnel; and This development will not create unnecessary traffic hazards and will provide for satisfactory access by emergency vehicles and personnel. 5. Will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area. The development will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons using the improvement or endanger property located in the surrounding area. Conditions of approval are: 1. The horizontal rough cedar siding shall be 909 Olympic Stain (light oak), with the trim and garage doors to match. 2. The soils report, submitted with the building permit application, shall specifically address the following issues: drainage, and the bay cluster on the Humboldt frontage. Should the report determine that the bay cluster cannot be removed and replaced with 3 new bay trees without impacting the soils nor drainage conditions on the property, a redesign will be necessary. 3. The applicant shall be responsible to make improvements as required by the Public Works Director. 4. The garage shall have two doors. 5. A partition shall be placed on the lower deck for screening purposes from the neighboring dwelling. 6. The garage window on the north side shall be moved closer to the Humboldt frontage. 7. The proposed removal and replacement of the bay trees in order to install the two parking spaces on Humboldt shall be addressed on site by the Public Works Director. These trees shall not be removed unless there is no other alternative, i.e. if the removal is necessary to provide adequate parking space width and minimum road width clearance. Should the trees be removed, an equitable replacement of the tree ratio shall be determined by the Planning Director. 8. A deed restriction listing the above 7 conditions shall be signed, notarized and recorded at the County by the applicant.

All ayes. Motion unanimously passed. audience advised of the ten day appeal period.

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 1994

4. **V-9417/USE AMEND. - Carolyn Handelin, 176 Tunstead, A/P 7-213-45, 1) a 16' rear yard and 3' side yard variance to reconstruct and add to an accessory building to be used for day care in conjunction with ABC Academy within 4' of the rear property line and 5' of the side property line; 2) a use permit amendment to allow day care for children in grades K-3 sponsored by ABC Academy; and 3) a parking variance to maintain existing on-site parking when expanding the use, on property located within the (R-3) Zoning District.**

The applicant was present.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Ms. Handelin said there is a need to expand and there has been a passionate plea from the parents to expand. She is also sympathetic to parking in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Sargent asked about the escape in the event of a fire. She said that they do have an escape for fire but do not have a panic button on the door. She said that she would be willing to have her employees park off of Tunstead.

Commissioner Ollinger asked to what extent will the building be reconstructed.

Commissioner Julin asked about the recess and play time for the different age children. She said that the children will share play time although she is going to extend the play time for the older children by about 30 minutes.

Mr. Handelin stated that he is a contractor and is willing to take the building in the rear down as much as possible to have a minimal impact on the rear neighbors. In fact the building may have to be completely demolished. Perhaps lower the roof and lower the building. He thought the Commission should view the project from the rear. There is a large tree and several privets which shelter the apartments from the project and a 20' tree in the yard of the apartment building. He felt the impact would be minimal. He also wanted to stress that they want to be good neighbors and want to hear any problems that their school is causing to resolve the issues.

A parent, was concerned about the great need for after school care. It is important to have the after school facilities near Wade Thomas. Children really need to be accommodated in San Anselmo.

Resident, 75 The Alameda, is in support of the ABC after school program.

Chaus Spence, 190 Tunstead, have been good neighbors and want to remain good neighbors. However, on some occasions the parents have parked on his property. If there are additional children and longer hours, there will be additional cars. Parking on Tunstead is difficult. When the building is being restored will there be restrooms added?

Betty Kelly, 190 Tunstead, Apartment 8, never thought to complain about the noise but children do make noise. She objects to the parents to park in the driveway of the apartment complex. Parking is very bad on Tunstead and should be looked into.

Kevin Ensel, 190 Tunstead, said she would like tenants to be notified in the future as well as property owners. Parking is a problem and the noise is a real issue. She is concerned about the expansion because it is a qualitative difference in the ages of the children as well as being there longer. She felt that after school programs belong on school property.

Resident, 190 Tunstead, felt the yard is fine for the younger kids, but is concerned about the parking. She felt it should remain as a pre school.

Commissioner Julin asked if the Building Inspector or Public Works Director has looked at this project. She has questions about specific requirements that might be enforced. She also questions the fire safety of the building. She felt points were well raised about traffic, noise and parking and that this might be a too intense a use of the site.

Commissioner Sargent agreed with Commissioner Julin. He has fire safety questions. He would like to see more details of what the building will look like. He felt parking can be solved but sending letters out to parents, have the school put out signage, and change the parking requirements in front of the school. The need is very great in this Town for after school care.

Ms. Wight said that the area next to the house be cleared for parking.

Commissioner Ollinger did not think the Commission was here to enforce Code requirements which is the responsibility of the Building Department. Regarding the building in the rear, it should be lowered and have a flat roof. It is an imposing structure even with the trees on the property to the rear. He did not think that noise has been an issue and there has not been a history of it being a

**TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 1994**

problem. Perhaps some of the programs can be changed to lower the noise. He would like to see the day care end at 5:30, not 6:00 p.m. The side yard should be kept clean. He agrees about signage by the school as well as sending flyers to the parents. There could also be a six month review if necessary on the property.

Commissioner Julin is not asking for a greater level of detail on the building, but she would like a feasibility concept of the plan.

Commissioner Harle is in favor of the project but has serious doubts. 35 kids on a small school unit is probably over use, added by the fact that 10 or 11 older children have higher energy than the smaller ones. He agrees with the Commissioners that there should be more detailed plans. He felt if parking is disciplined by the staff it could be taken care of. Also, the storage area by the house should be cleared.

Harle wondered if there was a survey of other school that are similar to see if this is other intensity of use.

m/S Ollinger/Julin to continue V-9417/USE AMEND. - Carolyn Handelin, 176 Tunstead, A/P 7-213-45, 1) a 16' rear yard and 3' side yard variance to reconstruct and add to an accessory building to be used for day care in conjunction with ABC Academy within 4' of the rear property line and 5' of the side property line; 2) a use permit amendment to allow day care for children in grades K-3 sponsored by ABC Academy; and 3) a parking variance to maintain existing on-site parking when expanding the use, on property located within the (R-3) Zoning District. This is continued to the meeting of July 11, 1994.

Parent, said that the Kreuzer School has increased their enrollment across the street.

F. GENERAL DISCUSSION

There was none.

G. REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL

There was none.

H. ADJOURNMENT TO THE SPECIAL MEETING OF June 27, 1994

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 12:00 a.m. to the special meeting of June 27, 1992

BARBARA CHAMBERS