

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1998**

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioners Present: Chair Zwick, Commissioners Wittenkeller, Harle, Dowd, and Cronk
Commissioners absent: Commissioners Israel and House
Staff Present: Planning Director Chaney, Senior Planner Wight and Associate Planner Griffin, Planning Consultant Newman and Town Attorney Roth

OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION

No one spoke during this time.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes – November 2, 1998 - CONTINUED
2. V-9855 – Ed Heavey, 25 Sequoia Drive, A/P 6-163-08, a front setback variance to replace an existing one-car garage with a two-car garage and storage area above with a maximum height of 16'-6" above average grade, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight)
3. Z-9801 David Boesel, near 259 Redwood Road, A/P 7-097-02 and 7-141-04; and William Hildebrand, 269 Redwood Road, A/P 7-097-04, Recommend adoption of an Ordinance to rezone approximately .36 acres of land from R-1-H to R-1. This transfer of land from Boesel to Hildebrand was approved by the Town Council as part of the Boesel project. However, a Change of Zone requires the adoption of an Ordinance rather than a resolution. (Staff person: Chaney)

M/s Cronk/Wittenkeller, and unanimously passed (5-0), to approve the consent agenda. Chair Zwick advised all parties of interest of the ten-day appeal period.

Conditions of approval:

25 Sequoia

1. The second story of the garage shall not be used for living quarters; 2. The approval is based on the plans date stamped received by the Town on October 27, 1998; 3. Applicant shall apply for and pay all appropriate fees for building permits, plan checks and inspections for the approved project; 4. This permit and each condition contained herein shall be binding upon applicant and any transferor, or successor in interest; and 5. Should construction not commence within one year from the date of this action, the variance becomes 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 a request in writing to the Planning Director showing good cause prior to the expiration of the discretionary action.

Near 259 Redwood Road

Resolution 9804.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO - Review of Town Hall Plaza – presentation by George Girvin to receive comments on design for the area in front of Town Hall.

George Girvin, landscape architect, presented the proposed design for the front of Town Hall. This area is being brought to the Commission as a pilot project in advance of the downtown overall project. He explained the proposal and presented drawings on the plaza area. He explained that the Rotary Club is interested in taking this on as a pilot program.

The Commission was delighted with the proposal and encouraged the Town Council to go forward with the project.

2. ER-9701/PDP-9803 - Curtis Eisenberger, A/P Nos. 5-031-35, 5-081-07, and 5-081-19, Review of Negative Declaration regarding Environmental Impact to subdivide a 21.66-acre parcel of land into four home sites on 5.95 acres and dedication of 15.71 acres for public open space. The project site is located at the end of Traxler and Valley Roads and covers the steeply sloping hillsides on either side of the drainage course, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight)

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1998**

Town Attorney Roth stated that a letter has been received from Mary Currie. He stated that Ms. Currie was informed of the meeting a week ago and she understands that the Town is going to go forward with the meeting.

Ms. Wight added that Ms. Currie was in the office a week ago and she also spoke with staff today regarding the meeting.

Ms. Wight presented the staff report, noting that this public hearing is only for review of the Draft Initial Study Report and Negative Declaration. She distributed a letter that was received today from Ted Stevens, of Landels, Ripley and Diamond, Attorney representing Curtis Eisenberger.

Mr. Roth stated that the initial study prepared by Ms. Newman is adequate and speaks for itself.

Curtis Eisenberger, applicant, stated that he is not asking for a density determination, Tentative Map approval or Specific Plan approval for the houses. The only thing he is asking for is approval of the Negative Declaration that was prepared by Town Staff. They are trying to separate and address the concerns and have come to conclusion on some of the issues that seem to be brought before the public. The issues of traffic, drainage, landslides and biological resources have been addressed in the Negative Declaration and are stated as minimal and can be mitigated.

In response to Chair Zwick, Mr. Eisenberger stated that it is his hope that the Town will purchase the property and that the negotiations will be completed by January 1999. In the unlikely event that escrow has not closed, he wants the Negative Declaration approved so they can go forward.

Chair Zwick commented that absent any compelling reason he does not see why the application should be heard if it will be a moot point. It is a waste of staff time and Commission time and there are other applications that can be heard. Mr. Eisenberger responded that they also want closure on this prior to the Planning Director leaving.

Chair Zwick wondered if it was a violation of the General Plan to proceed with this application if there is no density determination.

Ms. Newman responded that Lot 4 is partially in the ridge zone and the General Plan acknowledges this but also provides options. It instructs the community to try to relocate development out of the ridge zone if possible; if not possible, there must be a design criteria. The building envelopes for the 4 lots are in the optimum location because of geological constraints. From a CEQA standpoint, it does not prevent the Commission from continuing the process. There have already been several meetings but the Commission has benefited itself with the additional environmental information.

Irving Schwartz, civil engineer representing the applicant, stated there is a creek on the property that comes from the culvert of 91 Valley Road. The Town expanded funds to build a culvert. In order for the water to get into the pipe it must have a head to build up the pressure. The original concept before the drainage system was just to install a culvert under the driveway. The Department of Fish and Game was interested in the riparian habitat. They have decided to do both. If a bridge were to be built instead of a driveway, they would still have to create some type of dam.

Melissa Samet, 83 Valley Road, stated that it is important to understand what the Town would be approving. Without the approval of a Specific Plan the Town would be approving a document that is inaccurate and incomplete. For example: the aesthetic analysis is not updated and is based at one story pole, not with the four story poles. It also states only two driveways are to be graded and there is a contradiction with Irv Schwartz's report. There is a discrepancy about wildlife and an evaluation is completely lacking. The environmental review states there is no noticeable change in water runoff but it does not evaluate or take into account impervious surface (driveways, etc). The geological report states problems with Lots 3 and 4. The Commission would be approving a Negative Declaration with no significant drainage alterations but there is discussion about adding a culvert and a dam. Also, there is no connection between owner and the project because owner will not be the developer. There are significant negative impacts on the project and wanted the Commission to vote it down.

Resident, 166 Camino de Herrera, does not feel the objections brought up have been adequately addressed to approve the project.

Bill Rothman, co-applicant, stated they have submitted a letter addressed to the Commission dated November 16, 1998, which responds to all the issues and they are asking for approval tonight.

Charles Masten, 5 Traxler Road, did not understand that there would be a decision tonight on the Negative Declaration. Also, the letter received tonight has not been made available to the residents.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1998**

Chair Zwick stated he was convinced that 4 parcels could be supported by the past information received but a 6' dam makes him somewhat uneasy and one parcel is in a ridgeline and it is hard to support the Negative Declaration.

In response to Commissioner Cronk, Ms. Newman said the aesthetics were analyzed in the staff report and the conclusion was that there were impacts, but as described, they are not deemed significant. The Initial Study points out ways the impacts could be lessened even further. Any future homes would be required to comply with the Bald Hill guidelines, and the Commission has stated they wanted flexibility on a lot by lot basis. With regard to the Initial Study and Wildlife, it does talk about them and concludes that because there are 4 proposed homes, 5 acres per home, corridors are maintained and there is ample opportunity for wildlife to travel unimpeded. With regard to the geotechnical analysis and undermining if cutting between lots 3 and 4, there is no proposal for the development plan to do that. With regard to the creek culvert having a significant impact, the conclusion is that there will be no significant impact. There would be two pipes, one the length of the driveway to convey the low flows to drainage channels. The other one would convey the high flows and lead off to Valley and the Towns' drainage system.

Commissioner Wittenkeller wondered why the upper pipe has to be elevated if there is a low flow pipe. Ms. Newman responded that this was an alternative proposal from the Public Works Director and the applicant. This information is conceptual, with the diameter of the pipe to be left up to the discretion of the Public Works Director.

With regard to the statement that the mitigation measures are moot if the developer no longer is the owner, the mitigation measures must be fulfilled no matter if it states the developer or applicant.

Commissioner Wittenkeller stated that approving a Negative Declaration means the project will have insignificant adverse impacts can be mitigated. It should be recognized there would be "some" visual impacts when the houses are built. He is unable to say that there are no significant impacts. He believes that the mitigated Negative Declaration has been stretched and he is concerned about approving the Negative Declaration.

Commissioner Cronk felt that the applicant's request is reasonable and the Town Attorney and staff also feel the proposal is adequate.

Commissioner Harle said he could support the staff report.

Commissioner Dowd said he echoed the concerns of the Chair about the process but he agrees with Commissioner Cronk that the information is adequate and supports the staff report.

Ms. Chaney noted that CEQA requires that the project be acted upon within 60 days unless the applicant requests an extension.

For the record, Mr. Eisenberger stated he would grant a waiver of time beyond the 60 days if necessary however they have been working on the project for a very long time. He understands the concern of the Commission and the neighbors, and hoped that he would live in one of the homes. But now he is hopping to sell the land to the Town. He has made a good faith effort to answer the questions and concerns. He would be happy to bridge the creek but the Town engineer feels the dam would be beneficial to the Town. With respect to the ridgelines, he would donate 16 acres to open space. He also expressed his appreciation to the Commission for their time spent on the project.

Ms. Newman stated that there should be a wording change on page 5, first paragraph under Analysis to read: "...Policies 7.2 and 7.5 must...be best implemented..." of the Draft Initial Study.

M/s Cronk/Harle, and passed (3-2 Noes: Zwick and Wittenkeller) to approve the Negative Declaration with wording change on page 5 from "may" to "must".

Chair Zwick advised all parties of interest of the ten-day appeal period.

3. **SR-9802 – Beacon Gas, 750 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-091-40**, sign review of two internally-illuminated signs (channel lettering) on both the East and West facing sides of the canopy over the fuel pumps (Staff person: Wight)

Ms. Chaney explained that staff recommends denial without prejudice because the applicant or their representatives have not been present for several public hearings to discuss this matter.

M/s Wittenkeller/ Harle, and unanimously passed (5-0), to deny the project without prejudice.

Chair Zwick advised all parties of interest of the ten-day appeal period.

4. **V-9801 Hank and Jane Cunningham, 15 Medway Road, A/P 5-154-15**, Variance to rebuild the existing storage building (located behind the garage) within 2'6" of the west side property line (8' required) and 2' from the rear property line (20' required) on property located

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1998**

within the R-1 Zoning District. This is an appeal of an administrative decision. (Staff person: Chaney) After-the-fact.

Ms. Chaney presented the staff report.

Jim McDonald, architect representing the applicant, provided a chronology of the project. He did not think there was any discussion during the previous Planning Commission hearing regarding the storage shed but they have always intended to renovate the shed to use as storage, never a second unit. A building permit was issued for improvement of the shed and several building inspections took place. They replaced the foundation and braced it because Staff would not allow the replacement of the building because of the setbacks. During the framing of the building the roof sagged. They then received informal approval from Staff to replace the roof and they also replaced the studs. There were several inspections by the Building Department and then when most of the work was completed, they were told that the replacement was more than 50% and would require a variance.

Chair Zwick questioned the placement of the new window two feet from the property line without a one-hour fire wall.

Mr. McDonald said if there was an error, it was that they did not state that they were going to replace the foundation. Also, during the working drawing, the plans indicate the replacement of the shed foundation.

Chair Zwick commented that he felt it was incumbent upon the applicant to come forward with the intent at the beginning and he did not feel that was done. As an architect, he stated that Mr. McDonald knew that the approved Planning Commission application did not include the shed replacement and that the working drawings should never have included the shed replacement.

Mr. Griffin stated that he recalled that the rear shed was not to be included in the original scope of work and it was clear that the shed should not be touched.

Commissioner Cronk stated that perhaps the architect viewed this as a repair or replacement of an existing structure.

Hank Hollowell, owner, explained that the shed was the original garage and it had a concrete slab and a window in the back that was rotted out. There have been several building inspections throughout the construction of his project and the discrepancy was noticed when Keith Angerman, the Town Plan Checker, did an inspection. He would like to have known there was a problem in the beginning if there were problems. He apologized if they did not follow the right procedures.

Jeff Pryer, contractor for the applicant, explained that there was no malice. The roof was less than 60% salvageable. The shed roof was badly bowed and it could not be saved, and Staff told him that replacement of the roof would only be considered a roof repair.

Mr. Griffin noted for the record that he made a mistake in not recognizing the difference between planning approval and the building permit plan check.

Commissioner Wittenkeller stated that there was a good faith effort made under the procedure that the applicant and architect were given. The building was in worse shape than they realized and they came to the Town and discussed the changes with Staff. He viewed this as a repair of a dilapidated structure and felt that it was unfortunate the situation has gotten this far.

Commissioner Cronk was sympathetic to costs and with the efforts of good faith but there is a difference between a rebuild and a replacement and this is a replacement. She was not sure that she would have approved the replacement of the shed if this came to her as new construction because it is very close to the property line and very large.

Commissioner Harle stated that he would like to let this go on to completion now that it is in the state it is in because it does not substantially change the situation that pre-existed. There seems to be good faith on both sides but mistakes in the paperwork. He noted however, that it would be difficult to make the findings for a variance and would probably not approve the project if it came before him as a new application.

Commissioner Dowd stated he does not see any point in tearing it down and the reconstruction would make the structure safer. He added that he did not support a double fee being charged for after-the-fact processing.

Mr. McDonald added that if the roof were left in tack the repairs would probably be less than 50%.

Commissioner Wittenkeller stated that if this is a rebuild in good faith he does not see a need for a variance. He felt that this project was de minimus because the shed has not increased and is only an upgrade to an existing building.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1998**

In response to Commissioner Cronk, Ms. Chaney stated that the three people who objected were concerned about the potential for a second unit.

Chair Zwick stated that it was very clear at the last public hearing that there was no intention of doing work on the shed. If he were going to vote for this, the building would have to be built in accordance with the UBC.

M/s Wittenkeller/Harle, and unanimously passed (5-0), to approve the application based on the fact that this is a de minimus variance and the conditions that the building be constructed in accordance with the UBC and other applicable codes and that the applicant not be assessed double fees.

Chair Zwick advised all parties of interest of the ten day appeal period.

5. PDP-9802/DR-9838/V-9850 – Pacific Coast Ventures, 565 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-201-02, Precise Development Plan, Design Review, and Variance to construct a new 4,538 square foot, two-story single family house and 741 square foot garage on a 2.3 acre lot. Variance required to allow a 9' tall retaining wall within 0' of side property line on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District. (Staff person: Griffin)

Mr. Griffin presented the staff report.

Scott Hochstrasser, Consultant representing the applicant, made the following comments:

- The Oak Avenue Development Agreement states that the roadway access was required to be 15' wide if possible. The Agreement set design parameters and was only intended as a guideline, not a requirement.
- With regard to the location of structures being restricted to the existing building pad area and with a height limit of 24', this proposal only exceeds the height limit by 1' and will be built without adverse visual impacts. The contractor has stated that the chimney can be reduced by 1' so they can meet the height limit but they would like to keep it at the proposed height because it would not have a significant adverse impact.
- The November 10th Town Council decision regarding the road widening and drainage should be reflected as part of the conditions of approval.
- Fire trucks can access the site but cannot get there in one turning direction; therefore they are going to build a pathway to bring the fire apparatus to the site.

Jonathan Braun, 479 Scenic Avenue, complimented the applicant on a very thorough and complete development application. Although he has no problem with some of the excess fill being exported to the Worn Springs Fire Road, he wondered what the specifics were for landscaping or hydroseeding the area.

Lewis Epstein, Oak Avenue, had no objection to the house design or chimney height but the traffic to and from the site will pass over Oak Avenue and Oak Avenue is not constructed according to the Oak Avenue Development Agreement. The Salem Howes Geotechnical report indicates the critical width of the road should be 12', but the plan does not show it. It also calls for a vertical AC drainage ditch and shoulder and they are not on the plan. The Oak Avenue Maintenance was recently removed so the maintenance of upper Oak is out of control.

Ms. Chaney explained that at their November 10th meeting, the Town Council discussed this and the Public Works Director inspected the road. Based on that inspection, Condition #2 has been included to state the road would be widened to 15' and drainage should be corrected. The house cannot be built until the Condition is met.

Commissioner Wittenkeller stated that the house is a nice addition to San Anselmo and he does want the condition added that specifies the road will be safe. He felt that the extra 1' chimney was de minimus.

Commissioner's Cronk and Dowd and Chair Zwick had nothing further to add.

Commissioner Harle was in support of the project but wondered if there is a conflict with the development requirement for some sections of the road not needing to be 15'.

Ms. Chaney responded that the Fire Marshall has waived the 15' requirement in certain locations closer to the top of the hill because there are fewer houses, but there are also some areas that should be 15' and are not, and need to be brought up to that standard.

Ms. Griffin noted that the plan should be changed to reflect Condition #4

M/s Wittenkeller/Harle, and unanimously passed (5-0), to approve the application based on findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report and amended as follows: Reduce the chimney by 1 foot in height; Condition #2 shall be modified in accordance to the Town Council action of November 10th; and Condition #4 shall include the conditions set forth in the grading plan.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1998**

Chair Zwick advised all parties of interest of the ten day appeal period.

6. PDP-9801/DR-9839 – Pacific Coast Ventures, 610 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-154-02, 1) Precise Development Plan to develop a vacant, 2 acre parcel with a single family dwelling and accessory structures. 2) Design Review to build a 4,686 square foot, three-story house and a 683 square foot attached garage, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District. (Staff person: Griffin)

Mr. Griffin presented the staff report.

Scott Hochstrasser, Consultant representing the applicant, provided the following information:

- There is on site parking for up to 6 cars (4 in the garage and 2 in tandem).
- He cited 31B of the Bald Hill Guidelines and said that it was important to realize that the building envelopes were conceptual and the placement of this house can be built without adverse visual impacts. The original guiding envelope was shortened to retain the trees and saving the trees it provides screening for the house.
- The deck extends 36 square feet outside the building envelope and provides no removal of trees.
- The other issue is the turnaround outside of the building envelope but it is a retaining wall, and should not be considered a structure.
- They moved the house as far away from the Worn Springs access trail to provide privacy and more yard space for the homeowner.
- The chimneys do exceed the allowed building height and can lowered to meet the UBC.
- Condition #2 should be modified to include the decision made by the Town Council on November 10th.

Michael Gill, 663Oak Avenue, stated that he was part of the Bald Hill Committee and said the intent of the Bald Hill Plan allows for construction of accessory structures outside of the building envelope. They have not deviated from the spirit of the building envelope location. He also noted that tandem parking is permissible within the Bald Hill Plan.

Lewis Epstein, Oak Avenue, stated that the house will be served by Oak Avenue and the plan said the house will be sloped in the opposite direction.

Jonathan Braun, 479 Scenic Avenue, supported the concept of the plan but he proposal was to remove two temporary gates (which are not indicated on the plan) and construct a new one 75' back to the top of Worn Springs Road. He wanted it stated in the conditions of approval. He recognized that the Town would maintain the gate but asked that the applicant pay for it. He also stated that there was an offer of dedication for a 10' easement from Redwood Road to open space to the Marin Municipal Water District but this has not been verified on the ground by the engineer and would like that done.

Mr. Gill stated that he would agree to contribute \$1,000 to purchase and install a typical open space gate. With regard to the trail easement, he could mark a point on the map and change the description that best suits the purpose.

Commissioner Dowd stated that he does not have any issues with the project proposed. He did however, wonder about the slope of the road.

Ms. Chaney responded that staff did not want to discuss that issue because there is litigation pending.

Commissioners' Cronk, Wittenkeller and Harle also could support the proposal.

M/s Wittenkeller/Harle, and unanimously passed (5-0), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report with the following changes: Amend Condition #2 as follows: Prior to issuance of building permits, the property owners shall widen those sections of Oak Avenue to 15' and correct the drainage at South Oak Avenue as approved by the Town Council at a regularly scheduled meeting of November 10, 1998. The following conditions shall be added: 1) An exterior lighting plan shall be submitted which eliminates off-site spread of light through the use of hooded, low-level, low wattage light fixtures casting light in a downward direction. Such lighting should be permitted for safety and security purposes only and must be unobtrusive to maintain privacy; 2) Two existing gates located on Oak Avenue shall be removed. The first gate is located at the transition of the paved surface and the unpaved surface of upper Oak Avenue. This is where the proposed emergency vehicle turnaround is located. The second gate is at the intersection of unimproved upper Oak Avenue and the Worn Springs road. These gates shall be removed from the site to a proper offsite landfill or storage location; 3) A revised legal description and easement for the Steep trail access, such as a corridor described within a certain distance from the northwesterly property line(s) of the subject property shall be recorded and approved by and provided to the Town Planning Director. Document shall be submitted prior to issuance of building permits; and 4) The Town shall receive \$1,000 to design

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1998**

and build a new gate on upper Oak Avenue beyond the proposed driveway for a submit project. This payment shall be received prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

Chair Zwick advised all parties of interest of the ten day appeal period.

7. V-9854/DR-9841 – Peter and Cherie Welch, 111 Broadmoor Avenue, A/P 5-112-06, Design Review for a 626 square foot second story addition. Variances to: 1) rebuild the previously burned first story within 9'-11" of the rear property line (20' required); 2) build a second story addition within 9'-11" of the rear property line (20' required); 3) build a new raised entrance ramp, landing and overhead arbor within 16'-6" of the front property line (20' required); and 4) rebuild a 500 square foot garage within 17' of the front property line (20' required), on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff person: Griffin)

Mr. Griffin presented the staff report.

Morgan Hall, architect representing the applicants, explained that the house was damaged by fire two years ago and they have had problems with the insurance company. Staff has indicated that they cannot use the basement as conditioned space, which they did previously, and that their lot has been deemed a corner lot, which changes the setbacks. They want to create a second story bedroom to take advantage of the views. If the addition was placed on top of the garage it would have a view facing south and would negatively affect the owners of 147 Broadmoor. It could not be moved over because it would qualify as a third story. The proposed placement of the second story was the least impacting of anyone's southerly view. The owners of 41 Berkeley Avenue face a southerly direction and their floor level is approximately 8' higher than his clients. They would lose light and their easterly view. The applicants are amenable to eliminating the three top windows facing the neighbors. The property line and the space between 41 Berkeley is really a side yard situation and he wanted to design the second story to get southerly views. The restoration of the house would be an enhancement to the neighborhood.

In response to Chair Zwick, Mr. Hall stated that he did consider stepping the second story back or moving it over a little but it was not aesthetically pleasing and secondly as it moves, it affects the southern view of 147 Broadmoor.

Alma Tomlinson, 41 Berkeley Avenue, said they are charmed by the view that they have as well as the light, air and privacy. They were shocked to hear of the second story bedroom. They have three windows facing the addition and the second story addition would impact their privacy and market value. The structure would be very close to their property line. During the summer time they have to open the side windows to get light from the east side.

Elaine Tope, 299 Brookside Drive, stated she was happy that the applicants are going forward, but she cannot support the second story as proposed because the addition will negatively affect the neighbors at 41 Berkeley Avenue. Additionally, the project seems out of scale, this home would be quite large in a neighborhood of small homes.

Peter Welch, applicant, stated he is sensitive to the needs of the neighborhood and showed the plans to the neighbors, but candidly, because of the need of his family, they require more space. There are two story homes going up on Broadmoor and the homes do get larger going up Broadmoor and onto Indian Rock Road.

In response to Commissioner Harle, Mr. Welch said that the carport was there when they bought the house but they have no need to keep it.

In response to Chair Zwick, Mr. Hall said that they need more concrete to support a second story; the west end of the house was the least damaged and they are hoping to preserve it. The house was built probably in the 1950's.

Debra Brown, 69 Broadmoor, said she supports the privacy issues of the owners at 41 Berkeley Avenue.

Cherie Welch, owner, said any rear second story windows would be raised to allow privacy for the owners of 41 Berkeley Avenue.

In response to Commissioner Harle, Mr. Griffin explained that the basement is just 6" short of being considered habitable space.

Chair Zwick stated that the building might have to be demolished to provide a second story. He suggested they perform an engineering analysis and look at the design, and try to getting the family room back where it is. This may also satisfy neighbors. Try to work with the approved setbacks first and see if you can work with that. He noted that the current design is lovely however.

Mr. Hall stated that they would be willing to reexamine some of the issues.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said he would allow the first story to have the same setbacks as what currently exists today.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 1998**

Commissioner Cronk stated that she has more sensitivity to the view of Mt. Tam.

Chair Zwick commented that an alternative might be to move the building in 10' to preserve the neighbor's view of Mt. Tam.

Commissioner Wittenkeller added that the landscaping should be addressed either in a statement or a drawing.

M/s Wittenkeller/Harle, and unanimously passed (5-0), to continue the application to the meeting of 12/7/98.

CONTINUED ITEMS

1. PDP-9505/Parcel Split-9503/V-9549/DR-9525 - **Carlos Castro, 444 Redwood Road, A/P 7-191-10**, 1) Land Division, Precise Development Plan, Density Determination, and Design Review to split an existing property currently developed with a single family residence in order to construct a new house; 2) a Variance to construct a retaining wall a total of 60' long along the uphill side of Redwood Road (within 0' of the property line) in order to widen Redwood Road to 15' of paving for fire safety reasons; and 4) remove one heritage tree (30" bay) on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' mean sea level) (Staff person: Chaney)
CONTINUED TO 12/21/98

DISCUSSION

The regular January 4, 1999 meeting will be rescheduled to January 5, 1999 so Ms. Chaney would be available to present the San Francisco Theological Seminary Master Plan revision to the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1998

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 a.m. to the next meeting on December 7, 1998.

BARBARA CHAMBERS