

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 1999**

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

Staff present: Senior Planner Wight, Associate Planner Griffin and Public Works Director Bush

**OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION**

No one spoke during this time.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Minutes – February 2, 1999 - CONTINUED

**PUBLIC HEARING**

1. DR-9842/PDP-9805/V-9904 – Chris Albrick, 370 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-05, (Old Lot A) Precise Development Plan building envelope amendment, Design Review of a single family residential dwelling, and Variances for: 1) height of chimney to be 41.25' above grade and the roof peak to be 39.75' above grade (35' Code maximum); and 2) dwelling size to be 4,488 square feet (4,045 square feet Code maximum) on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight)
2. DR-9843/PDP-9806 – Chris Albrick, 376 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-06, (Old 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)
3. DR-9844/PDP-9807 – Chris Albrick, 398 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-07, (Old 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)
4. DR-9845/PDP-9808 – Chris Albrick, 392 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-01, (Old Lot 1) 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-9846/PDP-9809 – Chris Albrick, 394 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-02, (Old 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)
6. DR-9847/PDP-9810 – Chris Albrick, 396 Redwood Road, A/P 7-360-03, (Old 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)

Ms. Wight presented the staff report for the above six projects.

Chair Zwick asked for clarification on the following questions:

- If there is no recommendation of approval from staff, does staff feel there is enough information to approve the project?
- What was the difference between flatland and the 150-foot elevation with regard to the FAR?
- Why was the geo-grid approved without the benefit of review by the Planning Commission?
- Was there an understanding that when Mr. Fraser owned the lots, there would be maximum house sizes on the lots in exchange for open space?
- A lot of area has been clear-cut on site and now they are removing more vegetation. Is the area of the geo-grid the only area where landscaping cannot be done according to the subdivision agreement?
- Explain the comment about negligible effect on the water runoff, the neighbors feel the runoff is worse since the subdivision improvements have been in place.

With regard to the question about the lots being allowed the maximum size houses up to 5,000 square feet, Ms. Wight responded that it was discussed in the draft resolution but that language was not included in the final resolution and there are no notes as to why it was removed.

Mr. Bush responded to the Chair Zwick as follows:

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 1999**

- The original improvement plans had retaining walls on either side of the road, creating a tunnel effect. The change was that the hillside would be graded back but some sloughing was to be expected.
- The only area that planting could not be done was where the geo-grid is because of the recommendations of the geotechnical engineer.
- There was a negligible increase in runoff when the Fraser project drainage study was done. It was based on an estimated impervious surface area. When Albrick came in, the actual impervious surface area was less than what was originally anticipated from the Fraser project.
- There have only been two years that the subdivision has been in place, and one year was El Nino, but he would not dispute the neighbors. There could be other factors such as storm intensity or maintenance.
- Thought the workshops went well with the applicant and the neighbors. Most of the concerns were maintenance issues, and Mr. Albrick is willing to make improvements such as extending a pipe into a catch basin, creating a lined swale, and several erosion control measures.

Mr. Steve Arago, CSW Stuber Stroeh, responded to questions by the Commission as follows:

- Although they have not provided a map that includes the area where planting cannot occur because of the geo-grid, they know where the area is.
- Have had about 4-5 public workshop with the neighbors.
- Have looked at the landscape plans and have modified any structure from outside the building envelopes and placed them in the envelope.
- Based on their calculations, the spa is inside the building envelope.
- Will plant hydroseed on the slope that will cascade down by the geo grid area.
- The original proposal by Fraser was to have more trees removed than what they are now proposing.
- The geo-grid area was the location where trees were to be planted but upon recommendation from the geotechnical engineer, they were unable to plant them there. The trade off was the planting of hydroseed and shrubs. They have also tried to plant additional trees along the top of the bank. They did not plant on the cut slope because it was too rocky.

Paul Hartman, architect representing the applicant, provided the following comments:

- The variance for lot A is for height because of the chimney and the way the building height was calculated.
- With regard to the size of the houses, they were under the impression they were allowed 5,000 square foot houses but have since found out that it was not so and they have adjusted the house sizes.
- Lot C was stepped back somewhat but the difficulty with keeping the house corners inside the building envelope is because it is hard to step up the hill and stay within the envelope.

Chris Albrick, applicant, provided the following comments:

He has met all the neighbors and they have done their best to adjust the project based on the comments of the neighbors and the Commission. There are some areas, specifically the façade on lot 1, where they could not find a way to make a change. He asked for a decision by the Commission tonight.

Chairman Zwick stated that he was looking at this project like a gift was given to the Town by means of open space; because the lots are smaller, the houses could be large. Now that it does not appear to be the case, he has concerns about the house sizes. He would look at allowing the maximum size houses only under the ideal circumstances when evaluating the FAR, slope and character of the sites.

Mr. Albrick responded that he thought that because there is a lot of open space, and there was a reduction in the number of houses, he thought they could have the maximum size houses. He thought he heard from the neighbors and the Commissioners that the houses were nice.

The hearing was open to public testimony.

Leonard Charles, Roble Court, Open Space Committee, provided the following comments:

- When the Fraser project started in 1991, there were many, many meetings. Resolution 3263 was adopted by the Town Council in 1994. The Resolution states the importance of preserving the trees, so that any expansion of the building envelope is being countered by the Planning Commission and the Town Council actions.
- There was a contribution from the Town for the infrastructure and the Marin County Open Space and Marin Community Foundation contributed money for the open space. The Town was supposed to get lots A, B and C, but that fell through when Fraser lost his financing.

Barbara Geisler, 405 Redwood Road, made the following comments:

- Her property has been in the family for about 40 years and she has seen the runoff problems and they should not be minimized. The runoff has caused slides and houses to go down the hill. In 1983, 356 Redwood Road slid and was demolished. There is speculation that it was caused by White Way being put in. She is concerned for the residents on Allyn Avenue

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 1999**

because they are the down hill neighbors from this proposed project. There was also a huge slide on Oak Avenue, just above this site.

- She has a deep concern about the proposed house sizes and that trees are being cut down to build the houses.

Gay Kagy, 280 Redwood Road, read from her letter of February 15, 1999, addressed to the Planning Commission. Her concerns were:

- The development must adhere to the General Plan, specifically Policy 11.1 that relates to the scale of proposed projects must be of a scale, intensity and design that integrates with the existing character of the surrounding neighborhoods. Based on data from the Marin County Assessor's Office, the average house in the neighborhood is 1,673 square feet, and the proposed houses are between 4,602 square feet and 5,481 square feet.
- After the removal of 195 trees, the homes will be more visible than the story poles indicate.
- The houses will impact the overall runoff patterns and the elimination of absorbable surface area will reduce the overall amount of project area's ability to absorb runoff.
- There was concern about the adequacy of the dispersal pits and re-absorption areas after the ground is saturated.

Kathy Sanders, 310 Redwood Road, provided the following information and made the following comments:

- Provided a copy of the San Anselmo Open Space Newsletter from 1994 that talked about the purchase of the open space land. She explained that \$150,000 came from Buck Fund, \$300,000 from Marin County Open Space and provided an overview of how the Town of San Anselmo took part in the purchase.
- Provided a copy of Resolution 3263 that was approved by the Town Council
- Provided a copy of her letter dated February 16, 1999 that was addressed to the San Anselmo Planning Commission, which contained quotes from the approved Resolution. Specific concerns were to minimize the amount of tree removal, the preservation of trees to be retained on site should be carefully considered and careful consideration should be taken with regard to minimize the visual building mass.
- The proposed dwellings violate the conditions of approval regarding to tree protection and careful siting of the houses.
- The total for the six dwellings is 30,144 square feet or the equivalent of 18 houses, with the average square footage of the neighborhood, which is just under 1,700 square feet.
- The development will negatively impact the quality of life of the residents that currently live in the neighborhood.

Mr. Bush explained that the Town went into partnership with Mr. Fraser, who had no money but had land. The premise was that the Town would front the startup costs and would recoup our costs when the lots were sold. With regard to who made the decision about the geo-grid, it seemed to be the best solution when the geotechnical engineer came to him and stated that there would be some sloughing.

Commissioner Israel added that based on his discussions with the former Planning Director, because of the reduction in the amount of wall, staff felt it could be done on an administrative basis and Ms. Chaney was not aware of the amount of trees to be removed.

Dana Leigh, 290 Redwood Road, made the following statements:

- Is appalled by the plans for such large homes that are out of proportion to the neighborhood and the amount of trees that will have to be removed. This development will have a negative impact on future generations. Wants the houses scaled down and wants the Commission to re-consider the number of trees to be removed.

Stephanie Fine, 249 Redwood Road, made the following comments:

- Was concerned about drainage, traffic on Redwood Road, size of the houses and removal of trees.
- Questioned the name of the development, noting that they would not enter the site by way of the Seminary.
- Is concerned on how her views would be impinged. She stated that there is a new house on Scenic that is being built and it really has made an impact on their view and the impact just one house can have.

Mary Cone, 249 Redwood, provided the following comments:

- Is concerned about the house sizes, noting that many other property owners that proposed new houses had to reduce their house sizes in order to build.
- Do not think there should be anymore discussion about Fraser, because that was the past.
- These homes would be a little enclave with people who have different social and economic backgrounds than the rest of the people in the area.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 1999**

Susan Murray, 76 Allyn Avenue, made the following comments and presented a letter to the Commission and expressed her concerns about drainage:

- She wondered what additional drainage would run through Allyn Avenue behind her house.

Mr. Bush responded that at 107 Allyn, there is a pipe that empties at the top of a catch basin - Albrick is proposing to correct that by extending the pipe into the catch basin to avoid water bypassing the box. This plus the lined swale on Allyn Ave should remedy the problem.

Commissioner Israel stated that the EIR states there will be 6% runoff due to the impermeable surface from this project and he wondered if the engineering solution being proposed has been evaluated. Mr. Bush responded that the study in 1982 was evaluated with the idea of 12 houses, and found to be minor but still had mitigation measures, therefore 6-7 drainage pipes were put in by Fraser.

In response to Commissioner Israel's question relating to the safety factors used in the analysis of the improvements made, Mr. Bush responded that a typical factor of safety is 1.5 or 1.3. The engineers used a 25-year design storm. The Town only uses a ten-year storm.

Matt Owens, 12 Allyn Avenue, made the following comments:

- Engineering data is very frustrating, especially when the residents have seen the erosion that has taken place. The hills have very unstructured soil. After the roads were cut in, there were some radical changes to the soil.
- On the positive side, Albrick has been good in meeting with neighbors and will help make repairs.
- He can only hope they have seen the worse of the runoff. But if this is only the beginning of a trend he is worried what could happen.
- He has seen little help from the Town.
- The scale of houses are too large in a very narrow and intimate neighborhood.

Resident, 15 Allyn, made the following comments:

- If trees are removed and the impervious area is increased, there would be additional runoff.
- It seems clear that there is confusion about the approval of the lots and the Commission is not fully aware of the entire project; further research is necessary.

David Lakes, 249 Redwood Road, stated that they want their area to be as safe as it has been.

Paul Bailiff, 75 Allyn Avenue, outlined his letter of January 16, 1999, that was addressed to the Commission:

- He is concerned about drainage and the cumulative effect of water runoff onto Allyn Avenue from the Hansen property and Fraser's lot 4 which have already been approved, in addition to those that are now being proposed.
- Is concerned about the size of the homes and that they would be visible.
- Traffic is an issue.

Mr. Albrick responded to comments by the public as follows:

- At the entry of Mr. Hems driveway, there is a build up of the curve. Given where the water flows, it would be impossible to have the water raise to that area because of the curb.
- There was also further discussion to have everyone look at the debris removal. The swale is a driveable swale.
- It is important to look at what has brought us to where we are now. It seems like a clear decision was made to have fewer houses that were bigger, rather than many houses. The number of houses were from 30 or so houses down to 6. Open space was created and there were a number of houses created. They are willing to adjust lot A. There were trade offs for these lots based on the purchase of open space. If there were 18 houses, the traffic would be exacerbated, the actual footprints would be significantly greater and the removal of significantly more trees and significantly more runoff.

The hearing was closed to public testimony.

Commissioner Israel made the following comments:

- There was an incredible amount of time and effort spent on this project by the Town Council, the public and the Commission.
- He only concern about limiting the house sizes is if a house is big and visible, otherwise, other than the fact of how it contributes to drainage problems. The General Plan has an overlay that affects this area as well as the Design Guidelines for Bald hill. At the last meeting he did not have a problem with the house sizes, because he thought they could be large; but wanted to know which trees were to be removed.
- Lot C is the most visible site and should step down the hill because it will loom over the development.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 1999**

- When he went to the sites he was not able to see many of the trees taped, and there were no corners staked for lots A and B. He was really trying to place the houses but had a difficult time orienting himself.
- A mature Madrone cluster is inside the building footprint, and if the Design Guidelines for Bald Hill are followed, those trees should be respected.
- The houses are designed beautiful but he needs to know if the houses are designed within the design guidelines and is unable to determine that because not all the trees have been marked. The other problem is with the documentation. Lot A shows the landscape plan but that was the only one that has the existing trees located.
- Lot A: the landscape plan shows the plants within the envelope and was able to understand those that would be removed. But the other documents did not support his efforts.
- Is very sensitive to the neighbor's concerns about drainage. This project must not contribute for any additional drainage to the downhill neighbors. That has to be left up to the engineers and the Town engineer. He has no problem with the process but there has to be a safety factor so that on the worse year, this has to be mitigated.
- Staking of story poles: the obligations of the resolution states the story poles need to be at the corners of the buildings (all of them)
- The hydroseed: the area of the geo-grid needs something other than hydroseed to get the area softer than it is now.
- It is critical to have staff verify the original approval for the subdivision improvements and verify what changes have been granted by staff and to determine if the project is now in conformance.
- The real problem, given the information, is that he cannot say that this project is consistent with the design overlay. He could support large houses if they are not viewed as large off site and would not eliminate so many trees.
- Some of the houses are fairly monolithic; the dormers have added some charm. The biggest roof for lot 1 is still fairly large. Support the notion for those houses that have no visibility.
- Resolution 3263 states a photomontage is necessary.

Mr. Arago responded that they were only asked to have building corners staked on B and C. He personally taped the trees are requested by the Commission from the last meeting.

Commissioner House stated that several houses are bigger than staff allows and wants them no larger than what is allowed.

Commissioner Cronk concurred with Commissioner Israel. She is sensitive to all the work that has been done by the development team but based on the current information she does not feel the houses fit with the design goals.

Commissioner Dowd thought he would approve the project but after what he has heard tonight, he now feels he is lacking information. He is leaning towards a down scale development unless a photomontage could change his mind.

Commissioner Wittenkeller provided the following comments:

- Landscape plan is minimal. If they cannot plant because of rocky soil and geo-grid, he wants some ground cover or other native materials planted, which would make a substantial difference even though it would be difficult to plant. Landscape will happen over a period of time to reach maturity.
- There must be some irrigation and two years will not be enough time to see if the landscape would be successful. He would recommend least 5 years at a minimum.
- Would want to establish a planting trust fund of between \$25k - \$50k, to maintain and repair irrigation system and plants.
- Drainage: Should consider a mitigated drainage maintenance fund, between \$100k - \$150k for any unforeseen drainage problems that may take place down stream.
- House sizes: The sizes should be smaller. If the average is 1,600 to 1,700 square feet in the neighborhood, he would consider houses around 3,400 square feet (double the size). The apparent size of the house will appear larger if the exterior color is light. Any colors approved must be dark hues, but could be highlighted with light trim. The mass could be mitigated by the dark color.

Chair Zwick provided the following comments:

- Does not feel compelled to look at the house sizes based on his previous comments at the beginning of the meeting. Because of a prior agreement, fewer houses and larger homes could be built. Usually he looks at FAR on a flat site and how the drainage affects it. Part of the overlay is: do these homes fit into the neighborhood? He does not agree with the Assessors figures.
- He likes what the architect is doing and feels they are heading in the right direction.
- Is not satisfied on the information he is getting from civil engineer and landscape architect.
- What was approved in the original plan versus what it now being proposed troubles him. The cut slope is terrible and is at the entrance to the development. Perhaps a solution would be to take out the geo-grid fabric and substitute it with something else.
- Would not want to see the building envelopes larger to meet the scale and character of the neighborhood.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 1999**

Commissioner Israel further commented that looking at the section for lot 2, the driveway comes in and there is an entry, and everything is in the same level. The entry piece should be following the contours, rather than just shooting out and should step down the hill.

Mr. Hartman wanted clear direction from the Commission.

Commissioner Israel provided the following guidance:

- The trees were not shown on lot C on the landscape drawing. The guidelines are quite clear. Great efforts should be made to keep the trees.
- Do not have a problem with the building envelope if it better fits the site and reduces the mass.
- Do not have a figure for size threshold. If no visual impact, and very little offsite impact, he could go for upper house sizes. But if the trees are going to be removed, it is hard to give the maximum.
- Houses should be made of smaller elements.
- Would be willing to give flexibility in the building envelope.
- General Plan requirement and Bald Hill Guidelines both have to be met.
- Would not approve a flatland house on a hillside lot.
- Plans need to show existing trees to be removed and existing to remain.

Consensus by the Commission was that they could look at changing the building envelopes.

Warren Chapman, marketing representative for the applicant, stated he wanted to remind the Commission is that they want houses that look good but the goal is also to make a house that people want to live in. People do not want the houses chopped up or houses that is stepped down the hill.

In response to Commissioner Wittenkeller comment about the question of a maintenance trust fund, Chair Zwick stated that he has confidence that the architect will make great changes. If they put in a landscaping plan and a permanent irrigation system, he is not sure if it would still be necessary to have a maintenance plan. However, he would like staff to research this to see if a drainage and landscaping maintenance mitigation plan has been done for any other projects.

Commissioner Israel stated that he does not want to be punitive.

Commissioner House suggested that a homeowners association be responsible for monitoring the maintenance. Commissioner Israel concurred, about the homeowners' association.

Mr. Bush stated that it could only do if it includes all the properties. It is difficult to impose a drainage maintenance requirement on uphill properties for properties downhill as it violates riparian rights. The Town's ordinance requires each property owner to maintain their watercourses.

M/s Israel/ House and unanimously passed (6-0), to continue the application to March 15, 1999.

**7. V-9903/DR-9904/U9902 Naim Karkabi, 1501 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-011-25, 1) Use Permit to establish three (3) new dwelling units (total of 5); 2) Design Review for new commercial spaces (1 new, 1 existing). Project includes offsite parking on adjacent lot zoned C-1. Lot includes 5 sets of tandem spaces (10 spaces total); and 3) Variance to allow parking within 0' of the front property line, on property located within the C-1 Zoning District (staff person: Griffin)**

Mr. Griffin presented the staff report.

Trigger Wagner, agent for the applicant, stated that Mr. Karkabi purchased the building to create more affordable housing. The building has become somewhat dilapidated and he is also proposing to make improvements. The proposal is to place parking in the front of the lot. Part of the design will be to develop a garden space. After a meeting with the former Planning Director, they were under the impression that because there was a great deal of parking on the site and they would create affordable housing, they would be able to get approval for the project. She presented a diagram of the proposed handicapped parking space. The building would be mixed use and would therefore have shared parking. There is also additional parking on San Anselmo Avenue. There is a four way stop sign at the intersection of San Anselmo Avenue and Center Boulevard and there is clear visibility in the event there are delivery trucks. They are sure that they could make the parking work even though it is tandem parking.

Commissioner House commented that it looked like there was a garage there at one time and wondered if it could be converted back to a garage. Ms. Wagner responded that they probably could but they want the space to be used as office space.

In response to Commissioner Cronk, Ms. Wagner stated that the commercial space will continue to be used by the current tenant and he does not have many customers.

SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 1999

Commissioner Wittenkeller commented that eliminating an existing parking space seems severe although he might consider it based on the fact that there is affordable housing, although he liked the possibility of a small office too.

In a response to Commissioner Cronk, Mr. Griffin clarified that these apartments are not considered affordable housing and not regulated like the use permitted second units.

Ms. Wagner stated that because the units are so small, the rents would not be as high as a larger unit.

Commissioner House stated she liked the idea of adding apartments and it was nice to spruce up the patio area and the side that faces Center Blvd but she was not sure tandem parking would work. It might be better to have the garage functional and charge more rent for the garage/apartment. She noted that by putting parking in the front, there would be a loss of one on-street parking space.

Chair Zwick liked the little commercial strip on San Anselmo Avenue. The C-1 zoning places retail over housing but this application allows for more housing than commercial. Tandem parking is very difficult. He would like to see the porch go away and would like the emphasis placed on the building that faces the street and secondarily add to the garden for the tenants. Also, this proposal is not considered affordable housing.

Commissioner Dowd stated he would love to see the area improved but he is troubled with the parking. He does not count the tandem parking and only comes up with 7 parking spaces. He would be inclined to reduce the number to 9 if it could be reconfigured. His thought process is because there is plenty of on street parking during the day for the commercial use.

Commissioner Cronk said the housing element is more viable in this neighborhood. If parking is increased by one parking space, this seems to be an improvement over what exists.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said the Town needs modest income units in town. If this were a block away from downtown he could not support it. But parking in this location is not an issue. He thought the tandem parking would work because of the modest use of the commercial space. He liked the little patio and could also support keeping the garage.

Commissioner House said she would like to see the Center Boulevard frontage more attractive and have more articulation.

Commissioner Israel stated that the tandem parking works for the commercial space but works badly for one-bedroom apartments. There needs to be 5 dedicated parking spaces for the apartments and the front 5 stalls could be transitional stalls. He wondered if two spaces in tandem on the satellite site could be reserved for commercial. He noted that the businesses in the area have never generated a lot of traffic. He would love to see a prettier building but is more concerned about the visual aspect of the cars on the street. He would like to push the cars back from the street, closer to the 15' creek setback and would like to see a 3' high fence and some screening. He would not want to see the garage maintained as a garage because it does not enhance the building façade. The ground floor bathrooms do not indicate handicapped bathrooms and would need to be made bigger. The handicapped parking must be required to have the stall 9' and the access 9', and the diagram is 17.6". He would be willing to grant approval of a compact parking space next to the handicapped space.

The consensus of the Commission was that this item was to come back to the Commission at the next meeting and would be placed on consent with the following conditions: 1) more permanent screening around the parking; subject to review by staff; 2) the parking be moved back from the street edge; 3) one of the stalls be converted to a compact stall to allow for a handicapped space; 4) the curb cut be removed (red zone to be removed) and 4) all other proposed conditions as listed in the staff report.

M/s Israel/House, and unanimously passed (6-0), to continue the item to the meeting of March 1, 1999, at which time it will be placed on Consent.

8. **DR-9905 -- John and Nancy Riordan, 121 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-271-44, design review of a 1,033 square foot main level living addition and a 222 square foot upper level living addition on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Wight)**

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said that the site is very secluded and not visible to anyone except the neighbor across the street and if the neighbor across the street does complain, he has no objection.

Commissioner Israel stated that the addition in the lower left hand corner looks very close to the pine tree and wanted to make sure the tree is not in jeopardy. Mr. Chartock responded that the root system would be protected but if it is damaged, it would be replaced.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 1999**

Commissioner Israel responded that staff stated the trees are important for the screening so everything should be done to make sure the tree is saved. If the tree is replaced, it will take several years to screen.

Commissioner Wittenkeller commented that if the piers are kept 5' away from the roots, the tree should be okay.

In response to Commissioner Conk, Mr. Chartock stated that the flat section in the middle of the roof is to keep the mass small.

M/s Wittenkeller/House, and unanimously passed (6-0), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report. Conditions of approval are: 1. Prior to issuance of building permits, those trees identified to be preserved shall be protected according to an Arborist's recommendations in order to minimize damage to these existing trees during construction of the addition. 2. The removal and pruning of the pine trees is prohibited except for reasons of disease, and the need to maintain fire and human safety. 3. Exterior lighting shall be designed to eliminate off-site spread of light through the use of hooded, low level light, low wattage light fixtures, which cast light in a downward direction. Such lighting should be permitted for safety and security purposes only and must be unobtrusive and maintain privacy. 4. The exterior materials shall be as followed: Siding: Natural Cedar Shingle; Roof: Charcoal Fiberglass Shingle; Windows: Brown Anodized Aluminum Framed Windows; 5. Should construction not begin within one year from the date of this approval, the approval shall be considered null and void. A one-time-only, one-year extension can be requested in writing to the Planning Director prior to the expiration date. 6. Prior to building permit issuance, a deed restriction listing the above condition nos. 2,3, and 4 shall be signed by the applicant, notarized, and recorded at the County.

**CONTINUED ITEMS**

1. Master Plan Amendment – San Francisco Theological Seminary, 2 Kensington Road. - Proposed revisions to the Master Plan regarding the catering service, on property located within the SPD Zoning District (Staff person: Chaney) CONTINUED TO 3/1/99

2. ER/DR-9848/U-9810 - Safeway Store, 838 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-061-23, review of traffic study and use permit/design review amendment to the Redhill Shopping Center to expand the existing 27,492 square foot Safeway Store to 37,699 square feet, a fenced trash enclosure and new retaining walls in the rear for the loading area, and additional parking spaces in both the front and east side of the store on property located within the SPD Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight) CONTINUED TO 3/1/99

3. V-9861/DR-9850 – Jeff & Diane Ramsey, 14 Spruce Avenue, A/P 7-024-05, Design Review and Variance to build a new 2,014 square foot, three-story house and a 423 square foot attached garage. Variances are requested as follows: 1) To build the house and garage within 11' from the front property line (20' required) this request also includes the allowance of all parking spaces within the front setback area, 2) to allow a 36'-5" building height (35' allowed), and 3) build an elevated driveway within 0' of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff person: Griffin) CONTINUED TO 3/1/99

4. 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: Griffin) CONTINUED TO 3/1/99

5. DR-9851 - Andronico's Market, 631 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 6-101-05, Design Review of proposed parking lot and landscape plan, which includes a fountain, and 'Welcome to San Anselmo' sign, on property located within the C-3 Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight) CONTINUED TO 3/1/99

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 a.m. to the next meeting on March 1, 1999.