

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF AUGUST 20, 2001**

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioners present: Chair House, Commissioners' Jochum, Harris and Morita

Commissioners absent: Commissioners' Zwick, Wittenkeller

OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION

None

CONTINUED ITEMS

SR-0101 – Bob Chapman and Jon Marchant, 780 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, APN 6-091-41, sign review of a freestanding sign and planter to be erected on subject property at the intersection of Loma Robles Drive and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, and a sign on the building, located within the C-L Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight) CONTINUED TO 9/04/01

Dr-0134 – Ram and Billie Bergman, 17 White Way, APN 007-141-09, design review of a two-story addition which includes a 552 square foot garage and 120 square foot living space on the second story and 672 square foot addition on the first level. The proposal also includes a 345 square foot deck addition, on property located within the R-1 (Above 150' msl) (Staff person: Faw) CONTINUED TO 9/04/01

U-0109 – Metro PCS, 330 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, APN 6-251-04, use permit to install six antennas on the building, located within the C-3 Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight). CONTINUED TO A DATE TO BE DETERMINED

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes – July 16, 2001 and August 6, 2001

2. V-0130 - Dermont Coogan and Laura Brown, 108 The Alameda, APN 005-120-56, a 9.5 foot front yard variance to construct a 136.5 square foot covered porch (Code: 20') and 1'6" side yard variance to add two 8' long projections (Code: 8') within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff person: Chambers)

M/s Jochum/Morita and unanimously passed (3-0), to approve Minutes of August 6, 2001.

M/s House/Jochum, and unanimously passed (3-0), to continue the minutes of July 16th to the meeting of September 4, 2001.

M/s Morita/Harris and unanimously passed (4-0), to approve V-0136 108 The Alameda based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report.

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

REGULAR AGENDA

3. V-0123/DR-0129 – Peter G. Joseph, 53 Summit Road, APN 7-031-44, design review of a new 669 square foot garage to replace an existing carport, and to exceed the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) by 167 square feet, located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' msl). (Staff person: Wight).

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Bill Callahan, representing the applicant, stated that they modified the plan so they are no longer over the FAR, moved the garage door in 3.6' and eliminated the trash container. The roof is essentially the same due to solar reasons. They are also planting two trees.

Commissioner Jochum stated that he was now able to support the project because it meets the requirements.

Commissioners' Harris and Morita were also able to support the planning application.

M/s Harris/Jochum and unanimously passed (3-0), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF AUGUST 20, 2001**

Chair House advised all parties of interest of the 10-day appeal period.

**4. V-0131/DR-0133 – Jim Anderson, 52 Woodside Drive, APN 005-262-08, design review and variance to construct a 400 square foot parking deck within 0' of the front property line and design review for two decks that total 1,425 square feet, located within the R-1 Zoning District (above 150' msl) (Staff person: Chambers)
(Taken out of order)**

Planner Chambers presented the staff report recommending changes to the plan.

Steven Mark, designer, explained the project. He and the owner would agree to a 5' deep reduction in the lower deck size, but the height might be a challenge, as the owner's parents might eventually need disabled accessibility. Plans are to build a wheelchair ramp from the front of the house to the deck. With regard to staff's safety concerns about the parking deck, Mr. Mark acknowledged the curve in the road and suggested the parking deck be accessed off the driveway easement, which would not change the number of driveways accessed from Woodside Drive. Based on this, he would withdraw his request for the parking deck at this time.

In response to Commissioner Harris' inquiry about whether the garage will be converted to a living unit, Mr. Marks said the reason for additional on-site parking is the owner's intention to move his parents to the property, who will use the garage, and he will use the new car deck.

Commissioner Harris suggested that if the lower deck cannot be lowered in height, then perhaps it could be reduced in size.

Commissioner Morita said that based on the story poles, it appears that the deck will loom over the neighbors, up to nearly a height of a 3-4 story building (including the railing) at its downhill corner. As there is no precedent for such a large deck so far from the house (30' deep) so high up off the ground (almost 30'). She questioned the appropriateness of its size and height.

Jim Anderson, applicant, said that his deck will not extend as far as his adjacent neighbor. He is trying to make his home handicapped-accessible. Mr. Marks said the ramp would provide exterior access to the lower floor from the front yard.

Planner Chambers pointed out the potential for the lower floor to become a separate living unit since there is no handicapped-accessible interior access between the two floors. She additionally noted that if the parking deck were relocated to access off the driveway easement, only an administrative variance would be required for the side setback encroachment.

Commissioner Harris suggested the applicant speak to the owner of the driveway easement, and questioned whether the applicant had spoken to the owner of 44 Woodside Drive about the project.

In response to Chair House's inquiries about hot tub approval and the Commission's ability to impose landscape requirements, Planner Chambers said the tub would have to conform to the Code setbacks and obtain a permit, and landscaping could be part of the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Harris acknowledged the letter from the owners of 56 Woodside Drive, and suggested a continuance so the poles can be relocated to be 5' closer to the house and then determine whether or not there is still an impact, and if not, it be placed on the consent agenda.

Commissioner Morita said that with the required railing, the decks would appear to be higher. She suggested the deck be lowered and its depth reduced 10'.

Commissioner Jochum said that reducing the deck depth 5' would be significant without lowering the deck.

Chair House said she agrees with reducing the lower deck depth from 30' to 25' and leave the upper deck as proposed. She added that she would support a condition of either lattice or landscaping with automatic irrigation to hide the deck posts, to which the applicant requested this be left up to the lower neighbor at 20 Kenrick.

Commissioner Jochum said lattice would work better than landscaping alone. It was agreed that the structure material would be subject to staff approval, with the understanding that it be "lattice-like" and be to the neighbor's satisfaction.

M/s Jochum, Harris, and passed (3-1 Abstain: Morita) to move the staff report, with the exception of not requiring the lowering of the deck. To enclose the structure area of the lower deck with a lattice material, which would be subject to staff approval. The applicant was advised of the 10-day appeal period.

**5. DR-9911 – Paul Nave, 545 Oak Avenue, A/P 7-201-08, design review amendment to the previously approved exterior color on property located within the R-1-H Zoning District. (Staff person: Wight)
(Taken out of order)**

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF AUGUST 20, 2001**

Ms. Wight presented the staff report.

Paul Nave, applicant, stated that the color of the house is what was approved by the Commission. He gave a copy of the approved color to the paint company. He noted that variations of the color could be due to how natural light hits the building. The color is identical to earth and blends with the mountains and fits properly with his terra cotta roof.

Jonathan Braun, 479 Scenic, stated that it very clear that when the project was discussed and subsequently approved that the house would be screened and not visible. That is certainly not true because there is a massive wall that can be viewed against the valley. This does not comply with the Bald Hill Plan requirements of a dark earth tone color. There is another inconsistency in the staff report. The windows and door appear to be white, which was not approved. It is really important to be consistent with what was approved. He would propose the north elevation be recoated with a much darker color.

Mr. Nave responded that he was approved to have an earth tone. The windows he installed are also what was approved. He has vinyl, white windows.

Chair House stated that she was on the Commission at the time of approval. The Commission did not think anyone would see the house so color did not really matter. It is now quite clear that the house can be seen. Knowing what we know today, the Commission would require placing a large swatch on the building. However, the color that was painted is what was approved. The Planning Commission made a mistake.

Commissioner Harris stated that if the only issue before the Commission is the paint color, the applicant in good faith put up the color that was approved. As a gesture to the community, if the applicant wants to paint the north elevation that would be commendable but he would not make it a condition.

Commissioner Morita agrees that the Commission did not feel the color was going to be more important because it was not going to be visible. However, the architect stated that only a portion of the roof would be visible and screened with massive tree canopy, which is not true. Removing the massive tree canopy has exposed the face of the house to everyone on that side of the valley and facing hills. The Commission has a responsibility to the town to bring the house into compliance within the Bald Hill Plan guidelines. She agrees that the house blends in with the top of the hill. She has no problem with the front entrance staying the same color but the side of the house that faces out towards the valley should be changed. There needs to be a compromise because the high visibility was misrepresented. She wants the house to blend in more with the forest bringing it more into consistency with the Bald Hill Master Plan.

Chair House stated that she did not think it was misrepresented to the Commission.

Commissioner Jochum said it was unfortunate that the color was approved and he would not support the color today. However, as an architect he understands that there is a variation in color. The variation of the approved sample that has been applied to the house is within range of acceptability. The applicant painted the house in good faith however, the Commission must be more careful of getting larger color samples in the future.

M/s Jochum/Harris and passed (3-1 Noes: Morita), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report.

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

6. V-0132 – Lori Shannoff, 867 San Anselmo Avenue, APN 007-162-02, a variance to replace an existing garage with a carport conforming to the rear setbacks but within 3' of the west side property line (Code: 8'), on property located within the R-1 Zoning District. (Staff person: Faw)

The Commission waived reading of the staff report.

Commissioner Harris stated that he would like the front of the carport to be behind the chimney for aesthetic reasons.

Commissioner Morita noted that 855 and 829 San Anselmo Avenue have a similar parking situation. In those cases the driveways were shorter so it seems not inconsistent with the neighborhood. Also, after seeing the small backyard and noting the noise from the street, she can support the staff report.

Chair House said the gravel driveway must be replaced with a permeable driveway surface.

M/s Harris/Jochum and unanimously passed (4-0), to approve the application based on the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff report and amended as follows: 1) the carport shall be constructed on the lot with a front setback of thirty-nine (39') feet instead of the 34 foot front setback requested by the applicant.; and 2) the driveway have a permeable surface.

**SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF AUGUST 20, 2001**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

BARBARA CHAMBERS