

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 1999**

The San Anselmo Planning Commission was convened in the Council Chamber at 7:30 p.m. by Chair Zwick.

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioners present: Chair Zwick, Commissioners Cronk, Israel, Dowd and Wittenkeller
Commissioners absent: Commissioner House

Staff Present: Planning Director Feagans and Senior Planner Wight

OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION

No one spoke during this time.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. **Minutes – May 17, 1999 and June 3, 1999**
2. **ER-9901 - San Francisco Theological Seminary Master Plan Amendment, 2 Kensington Court, A/P Nos. 7-291-01 and 7-292-02, Negative Declaration of environmental impact, proposed reconfiguration of the existing parking lot at Scott and Montgomery Halls, which includes the reduction of 3 parking spaces and new landscaping.**
3. **DR-9842/PDP-9805/V-9904 – Chris Albrick, 370 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-05, (Lot A) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment, Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, and a variance for the height of the roof peak to be 37' above average grade; on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight)**
4. **DR-9843/PDP-9806 – Chris Albrick, 376 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-06, (Lot B) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight)**
5. **DR-9844/PDP-9807 – Chris Albrick, 398 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-07, (Lot C) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight)**
6. **DR-9845/PDP-9808/V-9805 – Chris Albrick, 392 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-01, (Lot 1) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling; and 2) a 5' tall retaining wall extension within 4' of the east side property line on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight)**
7. **DR-9846/PDP-9809 – Chris Albrick, 394 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-02, (Lot 2) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight)**
8. **DR-9847/PDP-9810 – Chris Albrick, 396 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-03, (Lot 3) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment and Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight)**
9. **UP-9903 Amendment – Nick Fara for Redwood Gas Station, 98 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-191-36, Use Permit to allow 24 hour pump service seven days per week without an attendant on duty, on property located within the C-3 Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight)**

Ms. Wight advised the Commission that Items 7 and 8 (lots 2 and 3) should be removed from Consent and continued to the meeting of July 6, 1999 because the peer review is still pending.

M/s Israel/Cronk and unanimously passed (5-0), to continue Consent Items 7 and 8 to the meeting of July 7, 1999.

Ms Wittenkeller/Dowd and passed (4-1 Zwick to abstain), to approve Item 2 based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report.

M/s Israel/Wittenkeller and unanimously passed (4-0), to approve Items 3,4,5, 6 and 9 based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report.

370,376,392 and 398 Redwood Road conditions of approval are based on the findings and conditions as set forth in Resolution Number 9905.

San Francisco Theological Seminary conditions of approval are based on on the findings and conditions as set forth in Resolution Number 9906.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **SR-9901 - Charles Schwab, 201 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-284-39**, Sign review variances to permit: 4 awning signs measuring a total of 48 square feet and internally illuminated, on property located within the C-3 Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight)

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Ervin Jones, applicant, stated that he did not know there was a limit to the number of characters permitted on a sign. If illumination is a problem and provides too much light, they could black out the bottom of the awning so the light will not shine down to the sidewalk. The florescent tubes only come in 7900 lumens, but if used as a neon sign it would be 8300 lumens. The illuminated awning, if done tastefully, would be better and create less glare and light.

Terry Jerkin, Charles Schwab, stated that they take aesthetics into consideration when they go into a community and they feel the awning will enhance the building. They did a survey of surrounding signs and the block leaves a lot to be desired. He presented photographs of illuminated signs in the area and said their sign would be every bit as aesthetically pleasing.

In response to Commissioner Wittenkeller, Mr. Jones explained that they are proposing two, 8' florescent tubes that would be set back 6" from the face of the awning. A neon sign would be right at the front, probably 1/2" from the glass front or sign cabinet face.

Jake O'Sullivan, property owner, stated that he would welcome some light at that corner because it would help light up the cross walks and it would help illuminate the sidewalk during winter evenings.

Commissioner Dowd stated that in some ways it will improve the safety but it is modern for San Anselmo and generic to Charles Schwab. He would only be able to support the project if there were fewer letters. He would prefer gooseneck lighting and would piggyback on the Wells Fargo discussion from a previous meeting.

Commissioner Wittenkeller stated that he would be willing to consider it on a temporary basis. If it did not work, he would want it to be a non-internally lit sign and perhaps have a gooseneck light. It is hard to access without seeing it.

Commissioner Cronk stated that internal illumination is not in keeping with the downtown and she wanted the awning to have painted lettering.

Commissioner Israel stated that he would like to see an additional sign that is consistent with the downtown vision. They discussed flag signs when talking with Michael Friedman for the downtown vision. He sees the signage as a single sign element. He opposes internally illuminated signs as well as gooseneck lighting on the signs. If additional illumination is necessary, he would agree with it being on the building. He supports a sign in the existing configuration but not internally illuminated.

Chair Zwick concurred with his colleagues.

This item was continued to the end of the meeting to allow the applicants time to discuss the Commissions comments.

2. **V-9920/DR-9920 - Hassan Afrookteh, 20 Lincoln Park, A/P 6-251-16**, Design Review to build a 1,208 square foot addition to an existing two-story home and front and side yard setback variances and a fence height variance. The variance request is to: 1) construct a box window within 11'-3" of the front property line (20' setback required); 2) construct a trellis-covered deck within 5' of the west side property line (8' required); and 3) build a 10' high fence in the rear yard (6' maximum allowed), on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff person: Feagans)

Ms. Feagans presented the staff report. She noted that the lot coverage is not 38%, it is really 34.9%.

Ms. Peterson and Mr. Afrookteh, applicants, stated they want to add to their house and then add to their family.

Debbie Rosenquist, 18 Lincoln Park, stated that they will be boxed in and the addition will take away from their light because most of the light comes from the west. She presented pictures of the site. She also wondered where the three pine trees are to be removed and asked if story poles could be erected.

Eric Rosenquist, 18 Lincoln Park, stated that the storm drain is not really a special circumstance because everyone on the street has the drain running under their property. He objects to the blockage of his view, light and privacy. He does not object to the fence height.

Mr. Afrookteh, applicant, stated he has no option but to go up with a second story. Because of the drainage situation on his property this is the third redesign. He applied in December with the addition on the west side but was informed by the Public Works Director that he would reject the proposal because the addition was being proposed over the storm drain. He thought that he now has satisfied Public Works concerns.

SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 1999

3

They have made their plans available but the Rosenquists chose not to see the plans. With regard to the trees, two of the trees to be removed are privets and one is a 4" pine. He noted that the Town of San Anselmo classifies privets as a junk tree and a permit is not necessary.

Commissioner Israel stated that generally he is in support of the project. At first he was concerned about the design review and east elevation because it is a big wall. It should be noted that it intrudes into the setback only a very minimal amount. However, the house is a little severe on one side. He can accept the variances, even though the limitation is shared by others, but he is not sure he can support the design review on the east side and would like to see it stepped back. He would like to see the house more balanced on both sides. The applicant is asking for the maximum lot coverage and he therefore wants the most sensitivity as possible. It is critically important to have story poles, which will help delineate the roofline.

Commissioner Cronk stated that she concurred with Commissioner Israel and had nothing further to add.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said that because the neighbor is concerned about light and air the project design should be revisited. It appears that there is no need to have the tremendous height. He agreed that story poles are necessary. Because it is a variance, the neighbors have to be satisfied.

Commissioner Dowd stated that he may support the project once the story poles are up but will reserve his opinion until they are erected.

Chair Zwick stated that the upstairs has a shared closet and perhaps it could be move over a bit and out of the variance request. Maybe the roof form stretching back can get articulation. He supports the second story. The open porch was disturbing. As an aside, he would like glass in the entry, similar to the neighbor up the street.

Mr. Afrookteh stated that they are after the interior space, not the exterior space. The house is a double barrel design. They have no way to go westward that is why they went out from the family room. This is really the only place for the addition. He has carefully designed this addition. His primary reason was to respect the street and do the addition in the rear. Anything he does to the west would mean a variance. If he stepped back on the east it would get into a variance. It is also not certain that the storm drain would be diverted.

In response to a question by the neighbor, Chair Zwick explained that the Commission is trying to strike a balance between your right and your neighbor's rights.

Mr. Rosenquist stated that he would have no objection if they wanted to build to the rear of the property line on the first floor over the storm drain.

Mr. Afrookteh stated that he will erect story poles but if height is a problem, there is nothing he can do about it.

Commissioner Israel reiterated that his concern was the one blank wall, which could be articulated by adding a trellis, a break in the roof, stepping back.

Chair Zwick said that in addition to the possibility of a trellis, the roofline should be changed and the second story stepped back.

M/s Cronk/Wittenkeller, and unanimously passed (5-0) to continue the application to 7/19/99 to allow the applicant time to erect story poles and redesign.

1) 201 San Anselmo Avenue

The Commission reconvened the public hearing.

Mr. Jones stated that they would like adjustable lighting and if it was not pleasing they would remove the lighting and they would like to use the proposed awning material.

The consensus of the Commission was that they did not want any illumination and also did not want the shiny blue awning.

M/s Israel/ Cronk and unanimously passed (5-0), to deny the project based on the staff concerns. Given that the fabric would not be required on a non illuminated awning it would be the Commission's preference that it should be canvas looking, with a matte finish.

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

CONTINUED ITEMS

1. **DR-9912V-9912 - Dan Kelly, 580 Redwood Road, A/P 7-181-10**, design review of a single family dwelling and front and west side yard variances to construct a driveway retaining wall up to 9.75' high within 9' of the front property line and within 2' of the west side property line (20' front and 8' Code required) on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight) **CONTINUED TO 7/6/99**

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 1999**

4

ADJOURNMENT

The San Anselmo Planning Commission was adjourned at 8:40 p.m. to the next meeting on July 6, 1999.

BARBARA CHAMBERS