

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2000**

A. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioners Present: Chair Cronk, Commissioners Wittenkeller, House, Jochum, Couture and Zwick
Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Planning Director Feagans and Senior Planner Wight

OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION

No one spoke during this time.

CONTINUED ITEMS

1. **U-0005/V-0018/DR-0022 – Henry Foulk, 30 Carlson Court, A/P 5-062-72** – Design Review and Use Permit request, and side yard setback variance to construct a two-car garage with a second unit above. The structure is proposed to be within 4' of the rear property line (20' required) and 6' of the side property line (8' required) in the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff person: Feagans) **CONTINUED TO AUGUST 21, 2000**

2. **DR-0020 - TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO-CORPORATION YARD, 500 San Francisco Boulevard, A/P 177-204-01**, Review of the landscape plan and proposed lighting plan for the Corporation Yard facility, on property located within the PF (Public Facilities) Zoning District. (Staff person: Feagans) **CONTINUED TO AUGUST 7, 2000**

CONSENT AGENDA

1. **Minutes – June 5 and June 19, 2000 (June 5 minutes are continued)**

M/s Wittenkeller/House and unanimously passed (6-0) to approve the Minutes of June 19, 2000

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **ER-0001/DR-0014/U-0003/V-0013 - Svend Hansen, 7 and 9 Mariposa Avenue, and 131 and 151 San Anselmo Avenue, A/P 7-301-07**, Environmental Review and Design Review of: a) a new commercial/residential, two-story building (1,980 square feet commercial and 4:2-bedroom apartments) facing Mariposa Avenue; and b) construction of a new commercial/residential two-story building (1,038 square feet commercial and 1:2-bedroom apartment) facing San Anselmo Avenue. No change to existing commercial/residential two-story building (2,180 square feet commercial and 2:2-bedroom apartment) facing San Anselmo Avenue. Removal of a 600 square foot commercial building facing Mariposa Avenue. Use Permit: for 5 new and 2 existing residential apartment units. Parking variance: for two spaces to be substandard in width, at 8' (Code: 9') and two spaces to be in tandem, and one space, on property located within the C-2 Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight)

Ms. Wight presented the Staff Report.

Tony Wright, architect representing the applicant, stated that they addressed the concerns about the windows by modifying them to reflect the hierarchy of the façade. The building divides roughly into two buildings. There is symmetry about the façade now. They have provided a model of the building as suggested by the Commission. The essential mass of the building remains the same. They considered putting the living rooms on the street side but it was rejected. The project is one that conforms with the scale of the surroundings buildings and the town itself. It derives a lot of its elements from a number of the store frontages along San Anselmo Avenue. They would like to get approval tonight for their project.

Sven Hansen, applicant, said he liked the windows that have the small panes. He would rather have divided lights than the larger windows.

In response to Commissioner Jochum, Mr. Wright stated that he presented a color sample at the last meeting.

In response to Commission Wittenkeller, Mr. Wright explained that the design was to have a street frontage that presented a two-story façade rather than have a single story façade and stepped back. The living accommodations worked better facing the courtyard.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2000**

In response to Commissioner Cronk, Mr. Wright explained that the street frontages have a more formal façade. Where the building scale breaks down at the back of the building, that sort of cornice and molding does not work. There was not a lot of point of taking it all the way around the building but they will take it down the sides. With regard to the front of the building, he placed more molding in the front of the windows on the Mariposa side to give a center to the façade.

Commissioner Couture asked about the reason for leaving the carports in their current location. Mr. Wright responded that it is an existing symmetry to the buildings and includes storage lockers. The original intention was not to do anything to the existing building at all. However, they have done some upgrades to the windows and carport.

In response to Commissioner Couture, Ms. Wight stated that she counted the storage area in the Far.

Commissioner Couture stated that he still has a problem leaving the carport in its current location. It will cost more to fix it up than to tear it down. Also, the carport is a messy structure and if it is removed, the parking would improve and the curb cut could be closed up, which could add an extra street parking space. By cleaning up the curb cut will also help clean up the street front. He appreciates the model, which helps him a lot. Although bold, he is willing to accept the colors if they are tested on site.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said the project would be a great addition to that part of town. He does not have any more specifics in terms of design review. Although he is disappointed that the bedrooms are on Mariposa, he will recommend approval based on the findings and conditions in the Staff Report.

Commissioner House said she wants the project to be required to underground the utilities and wants to see more trim, particularly on the Mariposa building. The front of the building is just a solid mass. She thought that an awning might help the articulation. She likes the stucco trim that was added at the top and she could support the colors.

Mr. Wright stated that they are planning on painting the carport the same color as the existing building and thought the undergrounding was a building department requirement.

Commissioner Jochum said he couldn't see why they want to go through what is necessary to keep the carport. To make up the grade differential and place a retaining wall would be more expensive than to get rid of it. If the carport were to remain he would at least like to see stucco columns added to help it blend in. As far as the Mariposa elevation, it is an improvement although he hoped for a little more. He agrees with the assessment of the two-story frontage on Mariposa. He would think it would be less successful to have the balconies on San Anselmo Avenue. He would prefer having the decks on the south side of the building. He does not necessarily want more articulation to the building. It could be equally successful if it were less articulated and more severe. He noted that he would not want to see more snap in windows and white windows on a red building would be a mistake. Commissioner Jochum did not understand why they want to keep the carport but if it were to stay, if it had stucco columns at least it would blend in. Want a stucco band and some substantial columns if they want to leave it in place.

Chair Cronk said she would like more façade to the building but does agree that it is a big improvement to the neighborhood. It is the applicant's choice to shore up the carport but she would like to see the removal of it if it allows more parking and fixes up the curb cut.

Commissioner Zwick said there have been a lot of improvements but they are not there yet.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said he would favor the awnings being a requirement because it would benefit the street front.

M/s Wittenkeller/Jochum to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report; and amended to require the applicant add awnings to all the building and have all the utilities underground.

Commissioner Jochum offered an amendment to the motion that snap in windows were prohibited. Commissioner Wittenkeller said he did not want that added to his motion.

General Discussion:

Commissioner Couture said he could not support the project unless the carport was removed and the curb cut fixed. He noted that if the carport were removed there would be an area sufficient to get five parking spaces.

Commissioners' Jochum, Couture, House and Zwick wanted the carport demolished. Commissioner Wittenkeller was opposed to the removal of the carport.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2000**

Consensus of the Commission was to remove the carport and enclose the curb cut and have the parking brought back on consent for the parking variance.

Consensus of the Commission was that they did not want snap in grids for any of the windows.

M/s Wittenkeller/Jochum and unanimously passed (6-0), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the Staff Report; and amended as follows: add awnings to all the buildings, have all the utilities underground, snap in windows are not allowed and approved windows are as shown on the plans and material board.

2. V-0007/DR-0008 – John Paletta, 90 Camino de Herrera, A/P 5-071-55, Design Review of a 3 story, 2,896 square foot single family dwelling; and a setback variance for the garage to be within 0' of the front property line, on property located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' msl). (Staff person: Wight)

Ms. Wight presented the Staff Report.

Bob Hatfield, architect representing the applicant, stated that Mr. Paletta is still willing to take the drainage from behind the walls and take it down the easement to Rosemont. The issue of the easement is therefore, still germane. The surveyor found a couple of existing points on the site based on three hours of site reconnaissance. The surface water will go onto Camino de Herrera. All of the curbs and the two new drain lines have been calculated from above as well as the rest of the hillside. It seems that this project will make it stronger to accept the water from the hillside. Also, the water runoff has been greatly improved because of the Town improvements.

In response to Commissioner Couture, Mr. Hatfield said the storm drain would be an upgraded version of what is at 56 Rosemont. With regard to Jay Nelson's comment about the existing roadbed having a history of failure, they would not be doing any work in that area.

With regard to the various correspondence that was submitted about the applicant, Mr. Hatfield said there is a letter that casts dispersions on the applicant. It is really out of what is acceptable behavior.

Alberta Hare, 56 Rosemont, said that they are still talking about putting a pipe down the easement and it is not factual. She is also not sure about the location of the trees affected in the easement, one, which is 91 inches in circumference and another one is 56 inches. There are other trees that are very close to the fence, although they are not heritage trees; they may be lost when they have to excavate. She wanted the roof water runoff taken off the ravine. The surface runoff water does not bother her that much but they do have a lot of extra surface water. She was concerned about what could happen if they construct in very highly fractured bedrock. She would like a soils analysis to be taken during the rainy season, not the dry season. This is a very unstable area and should not be tampered with.

Ed Shyrus, 56 Rosemont, presented photographs of the fence line. He did not think much could be done without ruining the bamboo, or their garage. He wanted to know the location of the water/sewer lines.

Gary Gross, 4 Herrera Court, stated that parking on the street is non-existent because the street is only 12' wide and wondered how parking for construction vehicles or workers would be addressed? What recourse would there be to the residence if the street were blocked for an excessive amount of time? He also asked if the street would be widened to 14'? He would also like to request a pedestrian right-of-way on Rosemont.

Mr. Hatfield said they would provide a survey that includes the trees at the time of building permit submittal. Their intent is to take the water off site and down to Rosemont. He asked if the neighbors down hill are asking them to distribute the water on site rather than taking it down to Rosemont, noting that it would cause a lot of problems to take it down to Rosemont.

Commissioner Wittenkeller stated that in Jerry Lloyd's letter of 7/11/00, said it would be possible to collect water to the south end of the site. He asked if the applicant is proposing that because it is not reflected in the drainage plan.

Mr. Hatfield said that they would submit a plan that has been signed and stamped by the engineer at the time the working drawings are submitted for a building permit. If there were conflicts with trees at that time he would suggest coming back to the Commission at that time.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2000**

Ms. Wight noted that the Municipal Code addresses the removal of trees in the easements, noting that the easement would take precedent and if necessary, trees would have to be removed for the easement. Regarding drainage, the ultimate decision on the drainage plan is up to the Town Engineer to review and approve. The conceptual plan was brought to the Commission because they requested it.

Commissioner Zwick stated that it is up to them to discuss the conceptual elements. The plans as drawn are in conflict with what had been written by the civil engineer. Ms. Wight responded that a conditions of approval could be to have the neighbors review the final drainage plan when it is brought in for the building permit.

With regard to concerns about parking for construction vehicles; there is a conceptual construction management plan that has been prepared by the applicant which addresses parking. The garage and parking areas will be constructed first and then will be used to parked cars. Regarding the request for a pedestrian easement, the area in question is private property on Rosemont and the property owner would have to give permission. The Fire Department has reviewed the plan and has required a turn out.

Larry Cass, 41 Rosemont, stated that for many weeks after the rainy season they have a lot of water. He feels there is an underground stream and he does not know how it would impact construction. He questioned whether it was a good idea to have such a mass over the Moskowitz property.

Commissioner Zwick said the last time the Commission met they put together a list of what was needed to make a reasonable determination. He does not think what he asked for was brought back. It is not that he opposes the design but he does not understand how the drainage works. In order to make the determination he would have to evaluate it. He would also like to see the roadbed addressed. He noted that there have been improvements on the architecture.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said her requested a drainage plan, wet stamped by a civil engineer. The drainage plan was not done by Jerry Lloyd. The Commission is asked to review a project for health and safety issues and on a site such as this, more information is needed prior to making a determination. The letter by Jerry Lloyd contradicts the plan. He wants to see how the surface water drains down the site and he had no problem with a conceptual plan.

Commissioners' House and Jochum had nothing to add.

Commissioner Couture said the construction management plan answers the questions of one neighbor. He was not sure the pedestrian access could be tagged on to this application. He wanted to see a true conceptual drainage plan. It appears that it is a closed pipe underneath the road that it can be tied into. He would also like to see the rest of the water go down the easement. He wants to see the pipe, the easement and the location of the trees in the conceptual drawing.

Chair Cronk said she would like to discuss the replacement trees if any are to be removed but it is frustrating to make the applicant wait for a survey before hearing the application again.

Ms. Wight said the applicant is at the end of the time period. A decision should be made tonight unless the applicant can agree to a 90-day appeal period.

The consensus of the Commission was that they would be in support of the project with the sewer information and drainage plan.

John Paletta, applicant, said the civil engineer would not sign a conceptual plan unless it is a working plan. They have the plan they want to use. This is plan B. It is not supposed to be misleading but only to be used if the tight pipe would not work down to Rosemont. Plan A is to collect all the water and take it to Rosemont.

Commissioner Wittenkeller said it is important for the town engineer to take the water down Rosemont or Camino de Herrera. Any additional surface water going down to Rosemont could cause problems. He would rather have it go down Camino de Herrera.

Commissioner Zwick said the engineer must look at the existing conditions and as well as the future impacts and the type of pipes. That plan should then be discussed with the Town Engineer.

Ms. Wight stated that the Town Engineer did evaluate the drainage in a letter dated April 2000. This was done before plan B.

Mr. Paletta agreed to a 90-day extension on his project.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2000**

The consensus of the Commission was that the conceptual drainage plan designed by a civil engineer and reviewed by the Town Engineer. The plan did not have to be wet stamped. The trees are addressed in the Heritage Tree Ordinance with regard to the easement and can be handled at staff level.

M/s Zwick/Jochum, and unanimously passed (6-0), to continue the application to August 7, 2000.

Commissioner Wittenkeller excused himself from the remaining items.

3. V-0020/DR-0022/U-0006 – Alaris Group, 1509 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, A/P 5-153-03, Use permit to install three wireless panel antennas to be mounted and concealed within a false chimney with a maximum width of 2'-6" and maximum height of 28'-11" above grade. A sign variance is requested to construct two monument signs, one, 111 square foot in size, and the other sign will be 65 square feet in size. The signs will conceal the antenna equipment. The project site is within the R-2 Zoning District. (Staff: Feagans)

Ms. Feagans presented the Staff Report.

Commissioner Couture said the size of the enclosure block wall structure has the volume of a one-car garage and should have design review. Ms. Feagans stated that the Commission could review the project excluding the sign variance at this time if they chose to.

In response to Commissioner Jochum, Ms. Feagans stated that the sign faces Sir Francis Drake and the playground.

Tully Aghazarian, Sprint representative, said the most recent design is to meet the Town's concerns.

Robert Anderson, Sprint PCS representative, explained that these antennas will serve the customer client base of Sprint. The space of the configuration allows for room to work around the equipment. The space is for back up or additional radio cabinets that need to be added. They can look at the possibility of moving the structure but he would have to verify that. They could also look at mitigating it with shrubbery so it is not visible from the street; or they could even berm up the dirt to minimize the height impact. They did look at the other side of the building but it did not meet setbacks. They originally looked at peaking the roof and placing the antennas inside. They decided that this location was satisfactory with the Planning Department so they left it there. They would be willing to look at placing it to the rear of the building.

In response to Commissioner Jochum, Mr. Anderson explained that the equipment had to be properly ventilated and the fan they are using meets the decibel levels acceptable.

Elliot Maggeson, 7 Maple Lane, was concerned about the transmission levels that have been studied at the ground level and the horizontal level. His home is directly behind the site and his windows are level with the antennas. He was concerned about the visual impact as well. He stated that from the majority of the windows of the back yard of his home he could see the false chimney.

Jonathan Harman, 86 Medway, was concerned about the emission levels. The engineer's report discussed the horizontal level. The other concern is with any radio frequencies that would be emitted. He would like this report reviewed by an independent party prior to approval of the application.

Jeff Hopkins, 73 Medway, was concerned about the safety of his children.

Joan Weinheimer, 8 Sais, thinks it is sheer madness to encourage this. Currently she has experienced interception in her television because of cell phones. She also thinks it is being non-challenged by the town. The drug companies have to do a lot of research before a drug is brought into the marketplace. This caution is not happening with the cell phone industry. There must be wide spread notification for this cell site to notify the citizens.

Joan Ripple, Center for Wireless Technology Board, stated that in other places in the world they are taking action against these cell sites because there is uncertainty on the impacts on health risks. She has already presented this data to Staff at a Town Council meeting. There are bills in Congress for RF research assessment but they have not been heard yet. A local study has been done on the Sutro Tower. It was found when topography was taken into account, there was an increase in Leukemia the farther you move away from the site. They are recommending to the Town Council that San Anselmo have a moratorium so they can determine the placement of the antennas and local government should monitor the emissions. By year-end, they will have a map that identifies the cell site locations.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2000**

Gerald Richburn, consultant for the applicant, said he concurs with the Halmet/Edison Report. The levels, once you are about 6' away, are below exposure, even if you are at the same level in the air. There is no question in his mind that no one would be exposed to levels of exposure. There is a perception that health studies are just beginning but they have been ongoing for over 50 years. He provided an overview of how there is no negative impact on the citizens of San Anselmo.

Commissioner Couture asked about placing warning signs on the building. Mr. Richburn responded that because they are in close proximity of the antennas so they would not work directly in front of the antennas until they call a certain telephone number. This sign would not be seen from the street.

Commissioner House said that the science at this point does not support the concerns about antennas so she has no problem with the location of the antennas.

Commissioner Jochum said that the Commission could only listen to the experts on the subject. Visually, he has no problem with the chimney but would rather have seen it in the chimney, even though it would have required a variance.

Commissioner Couture said the Commission's hands are tied in regard to the health issues. The design for the false chimney is acceptable. The variance for the sign for the equipment house is an inappropriate location. The wall is a huge detriment to the beautiful church. It is a structure, not a sign. The equipment should be relocated, perhaps to the rear, even though it may upset the residents.

Commissioner Zwick concurred with Commissioner Couture.

Chair Cronk said she would like to see the equipment room squeezed and would like to see it moved but is concerned that it is in the back where there is a day care center. The chimney is a creative design.

M/s Zwick/Couture, and unanimously passed (5-0), to continue the application to the meeting of August 7, 2000.

4. ER-0002/V-0019/DR-0021 – Ned MacDonald, 14 and 20 Greenfield Avenue, A/P 6-251-07 and 08, environmental review, demolition of an existing building at 14 Greenfield Avenue, construction of a new office building, with potential to be used for retail, install new site utilities, install landscaping, install paving as required for parking, construct new sidewalk/curb. 330 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, (Tam Building), A/P 6-251-04 and 06: construct raised parking deck and ramp. Application includes a proposal to transfer title of the two public easements, one on Greenfield Avenue, and one on Smith Lane. The existing Tam Building is 9,500 square feet and the building floor area of the new building will be 18,430 square feet, necessitating a total of 62 on-site parking spaces. Planning applications include design review and parking variance for the number of on-site parking spaces to be substandard by up to 5, on property located within the C-3 (General Commercial) Zoning District. (Staff: Wight)

Ms. Wight presented the Staff Report.

Ned MacDonald, applicant, provided an overview of the Tam Theatre. The Tam Theatre is now the inspiration of the current plan.

Steve Murch, architect representing the applicant, presented digital photographs of the site, noting that the area of Greenfield appears to be a ghost town. The three-story proposal was perfect at time they previously submitted their project but that window is closing now because of rising interest rates. It was received by the Commission very well, even if it meant going over FAR and necessitating variances. They wanted to upgrade Greenfield Avenue and make that area of town become alive. Looking at Greenfield from Miracle Mile, it is now starting to be upgraded and they want to continue to improve it. This is an urban setting and a downtown commercial zone. They ended up with a building that stands tall. Access to the site comes from different areas. People who work in the building will access off Smith Lane but people visiting the building will access it from Greenfield. Some tenants will be assigned parking on the ramp and would access it from Greenfield. Although the traffic report indicates an increase in traffic, it states Smith Lane can handle the increase. The zoning allows for 100 percent FAR. They designed a building that is flexible. The Greenfield space is versatile and could be used for retail and office. They do not want to be locked into total retail on the Greenfield space. The least amount of retail will have the least impact in terms of traffic. It was necessary to park under the building to meet some of the parking requirements. The upper floor would be serviced by a lobby. They are proposing colors and texture that are similar to the Tam Theatres but the parapet would be a bronzed anodized color. The base portion gives the building some foundation. They would darken the color there. The second story lines under the window provide a variety of texture. The awnings on the Greenfield side are proposed to be metal, the same color as the building. Along the

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2000**

side and rear, there is a different kind of awning because of the sun and glare but they are also of metal material, the same color as the building. The roof is the shape of the second floor. The site slopes front to back, which allows the parking deck to be as low as possible to gain an access ramp to be low in front. It also won't block windows on the main building. He explained the proposed landscaping for the building. He felt this use would have the least amount of impact to the neighbors.

In response to Commissioner House's question about affordable housing on the second floor, Mr. Murch said it is less important now because the Town would probably end up with apartments and it would be difficult to condominiumizing. Also, this type of use is not commensurate with the downtown district.

Commissioner House said she could prefer stronger paint colors. Mr. Murch said he is not opposed to other colors but they would want them to blend.

Commissioner Jochum said it seems that as high a base as shown, it would be fairly limiting to retail space because of the 42" high window. It therefore looks like the applicant is forcing the spaces to be office use. Mr. Murch agreed that it is tall but it does not preclude retail, although he agreed it would be a challenge to the tenants.

Commissioner Jochum said he liked the way the façade is articulated to the rear to break down the scale but questioned the reasoning behind the two strips being one color. Mr. Murch responded that he did not think it would because a portion of it is recessed. The only time you will view the entire building is when you are in front of it on Red Hill. Because of the length of the building, it won't be seen in entirety.

Commissioner Couture wondered if the awnings and the siding could be a little stronger to make it a little more visually attractive. Mr. Murch said they are not opposed to looking at alternative colors.

Commissioner Couture asked about the parking in the rear on Smith Lane. He would suggest one entrance in and one entrance out, and he would like to see them landscaped. There is one corner of the building by the second story parking deck that is close to the neighbor. He asked if they have considered moving it over closer to the Tam Theatre and reduce the side of the deck, which would benefit the neighbor.

Mohamad Al Jundi, 13 Smith Lane, said Smith Lane is unsafe to use now and it is difficult for him to use his front entrance because his front door is right on the street. Large trucks must go through the Greenfield lot because they cannot use Smith Lane. He is concerned about the noise pollution with the traffic as well as the proposed parking for his tenants. He suggests the applicant build a barrier to reduce the noise. Smith Lane also has a blind intersection.

Roger Bettini, 18 Bank Street, is against the second story parking deck. The largest entrance and exit is from Smith Lane, which is really just an alley. He does not know why the Town wants to abandon the easement.

Lisa Jablon, 46 Lincoln Park, wanted to know why the parking couldn't be subterranean. There needs to be a plan addressed to take care of garbage trucks and delivery trucks. She was also concerned about the traffic on Bank and Lincoln Park. A good solution would be to make Lincoln Park a cull de sac. She appreciates the sensitivity of the buildings but would like it to have more charm and in line with the feel of the Tam Theatre. She really likes the parking lot that was just completed by Andronicos Market, which is almost subterranean.

Louise Matthews, Foothill Road, brought up the easement to the Council, but it was tabled. If you make a determination this evening, it would forego the action by the Council. She would not like to see a variance for any parking. The Traffic study by w-Trans is 22 cars per hour, and up to 66. That is a lot of traffic on Bank and Smith. She is not in favor of two-way traffic onto Greenfield into the parking area. Mr. Bush, the previous Public Works Director said the ownership of the easement of Smith Lane was a liability. The citizens do not want a splashy building; they want to see it subdued. If there were any affordable housing, she assumed it would come forward for a use permit. She did not know why there is no lighting plan submitted for such a prominent building. She wanted to know how the parking could be used after business hours.

Mike DeLucca, 40-52 Greenfield Avenue, is concerned for his tenants because parking is a concern at times. The size of the building is a bit aggressive and he would like the parking studied for Greenfield, perhaps to get diagonal parking.

Dean Larson, 17 Lincoln Park, is concerned about parking stating that the overall parking must be addressed. He feels the traffic study should include more than just Smith Lane. He knows he lives in a downtown area but there needs to be a balance. The neighborhood has been trying to address traffic in the neighborhood by stop signs, no

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2000**

parking and no turns. This will also be a bicycle path in the vicinity of Greenfield and Lincoln Park/Bank Street, which will also increase traffic.

Robert Capuro, 15 Lincoln Park, said this is a very large project that is trying to go into a small area and in the wrong area. The idea of starting at a two story parking deck and a large commercial building is out of character. He is also concerned about the traffic and safety issues. Perhaps the underground parking is the way to go for this project. The Council has been very supportive to the residents of Lincoln Park to add stop signs because they recognize the safety issues.

Commissioner Couture said it would appear that Smith Lane encroaches onto 13 and 15 Smith Lane. Ms. Wight affirmed that it did.

Commissioner Jochum asked the status of the easement abandonment. Ms. Wight explained that they are okay with the timing. A decision must be made on the Negative Declaration within 6 months. There is no timing on the abandonment of the easements. In February 1999, the applicant approached the Town Council to consider vacating the two public easements, but the item was tabled because there was no specific project planned for the property. The applicant is delaying the easement abandonment proposal until he has an approved plan to show the Council.

In response to Commissioner House, Mr. Murch said the concern about underground parking is that water is running through the site consistently.

Commissioner Zwick said he believes the traffic engineer's study. His instincts are towards retail but it probably not supported. He is not sure low/moderate income is the place for this on this site. In general, he is in favor with the project. He would like to see additional landscaping and would like the applicant to consider the landscaping as stated by the traffic study. He also wanted them to consider moving the parking structure closer to the Tam Theatre. He would like to see the windows changed to allow for retail space and would like there to be a way to have the pedestrian walkway through the site, and allow it to be a secret path back to Greenfield. He liked the suggestion of allowing parking for residents at night. There is some room to be daring, without going over the top with colors. He suggested that the base to be of a different color, that there are too many multi pane windows and he would like to make the awnings a little more assertive. He is unable to determine how close the adjacent houses are. He would also like to see a color rendering of the building.

Commissioner House said she would like to see some things not change but the owners are entitled to build on the lot. She hears the concerns of the neighbors but the applicant has taken time and thought in the development of the site and not make it incredibly detrimental to the neighbors. It would be nice to see some retail in the building because there is some on Greenfield now. Like that the building is articulated. Don't want to see the multi color buildings like in San Rafael. Need more information about Smith Lane and how to make it safer for the pedestrians. Would consider losing a few parking spaces or moving the parking deck closer to the Tam Theatre. What about the trash pick up and dumpsters.

Commissioner Jochum said he liked the Greenfield elevation but has concerns about a background minimal color that would intensify the scale of the building. If the windows at the lower level were designed with a lower sill, he would support that. He liked the industrial look, maintaining the street façade, yet stepping it back. He liked the simplistic design of the awnings but perhaps use a different color to provide accent. The Smith Lane problem and the way the parking butts up against it needs more study. They need a plan that shows the edge of paving as it really exists, including the fencing. The portion of parking that butts out to Smith Lane accentuates the problem. If it were turned inboard and double loaded and they create a curb edge to Smith Lane, possibly with enough depth to create a planting strip, and the cars come out in only two lanes onto Smith Lane, might be a better solution to controlling traffic. He does not have a clear handle on the parking deck and the property across Smith Lane. He tends to agree that pushing it up against the Tam building would be unfortunate, because it would make it dark.

Commissioner Couture has a problem with the location of the parking deck. If there is to be second story parking, the parking needs to come at the expense of the applicant, rather than the neighbors of 15 and 12 Smith Lane. The layout of the parking must have a single driveway in and a single one out. He wants to see a lighting plan. He does not see the retail option working now but it may in the future. He wants to see the window lowered. The awnings and signs need a little more punch. The delivery vehicles and the trash enclosures should be included on the plans

Chair Cronk said she is in general agreement with the plan but would like to see adjustments in the parking plan, particularly inverting the spaces that back into Smith Lane. She wants the cars separated from the neighbors, either by landscaping or a barrier. She wants to assess what the livable situation would be for the neighbors if the parking were reduced.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 2000**

M/s House/Zwick, and unanimously passed (5-0), to continue the application tot he meeting of August 21, 2000.

5. DR-0024 – Steve and Kimberly Smith, 115 Ridge Road, A/P 005-172-82 – Design Review to-construct a 3-level addition with 335 square feet on the lower level, 399 square feet on the middle level and 156 square feet on the top level for a total addition size of 890 square feet to an existing 1,300 square feet. The project also includes two decks 4'x17' in size and 1 deck 9'x9' in size in the R-1 Zoning District (above the 150' msl elevation) (Staff person: Feagans)

Due to the lateness of the hour, this application has been continued to the meeting August 7, 2000

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The Commission wanted a report from Staff on the following items:

1. Sir Francis Drake Boulevard – the planter strip in the sidewalk fronting Drake High School has been filled in and asked if that was going to happen in other parts of town?

Staff: The high school was very insistent that the area be paved because it is very difficult to maintain.

2. What is going on with Park Apartments? It appears that they have been demolished and what would be built in its place?

Staff: The owner of the apartments was concerned about the safety of the building. His future proposal is to have a single story project in this location.

3. An 8' high cinderblock wall is being built at 1408 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. Did it receive approval by the Town?

Staff: The owner of the property received approval for an administrative variance for a stucco wall, 6' high, and up to 8' on the right side, with plantings to grow over the wall.

REPORT OF UPCOMING APPEALS TO TOWN COUNCIL

None at this time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, August 7, 2000

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 a.m.

BARBARA CHAMBERS