

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

SAUSALITO PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, January 4, 2012
Approved Summary Minutes

Call to Order

Chair Keegin called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 420 Litho Street, Sausalito.

Present: Chair Stafford Keegin, Vice Chair Joan Cox, Commissioner Stan Bair
Commissioner Richard Graef, Commissioner Bill Werner

Staff: Community Development Director Jeremy Graves
Associate Planner Lilly Schinsing, City Attorney Mary Wagner

Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Cox moved and Commissioner Werner seconded a motion to hear Item 3 first. The motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Cox moved and Commissioner Werner seconded a motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Cox moved and Chair Keegin seconded a motion to hear Communications from Staff and Planning Commissioners after taking action on Item 3. The motion passed 5-0.

New Business

3. 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Calendar

Commissioner Cox moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion to approve the 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Calendar. The motion passed 5-0.

Staff Communications

- Housing Element status update: On January 9, 2012 the Housing Element Task Force will receive the entire Draft Housing Element update from M Group. The Task Force will review it at that meeting and hold a meeting on January 16th to forward the draft to the City Council and Planning Commission for a joint meeting on the 24th or 31st of January.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None.

Approval of Minutes

None.

1 **CALL TO ORDER – MEETING OF THE HISTORIC LANDMARKS BOARD**

2
3 Board Member Nichols called the meeting of the Historic Landmarks Board to order at
4 6:56 p.m.

5 Present: Secretary Vicki Nichols, Board Member Carolyn Kiernat,
6 Board Member John Flavin

7 Absent: Chair Morgan Pierce
8

9 **Public Hearings**

10
11 **Declarations of Public Contacts**

12
13 Chair Keegin disclosed that Robert Freeman of View Restaurant LLC is his neighbor,
14 but he has not had any direct discussion of Item 2 with Mr. Freeman.

- 15
16 **1. DR/SP/EA 11-331, Design Review Permit, Sign Permit, Encroachment**
17 **Agreement, McManus, 670 Bridgeway.** Design Review Permit, Sign Permit and
18 Encroachment Permit to allow for a projecting sign located in the Bridgeway
19 public right-of-way fronting 670 Bridgeway (APN 065-133-10).
20

21 **Chair Keegin indicated the applicant had requested the public hearing for 670**
22 **Bridgeway be continued to a date uncertain.**

23
24 **Commissioner Cox moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion to**
25 **continue the public hearing for 670 Bridgeway to a date uncertain. The motion**
26 **passed 5-0.**
27

28
29 **Board Member Flavin moved and Board Member Nichols seconded a motion to**
30 **continue the public hearing for 670 Bridgeway to a date uncertain. The motion**
31 **passed 3-0.**
32

- 33 **2. DR/MUP/VA/SP 11-330, Design Review Permit, Minor Use Permit, Variance,**
34 **Sign Permit, 558 Bridgeway.** Modifications to a previously approved Design
35 Review Permit to allow for the expansion of a previously approved upper level
36 dining deck, addition of a new circulation staircase, reconfiguration of the eastern
37 façade fenestrations, and a new pergola system on the lower dining deck level; a
38 Minor Use Permit for a 40-seat outdoor dining area on the proposed exterior deck
39 and for indoor live music; a Variance for the encroachment of the upper level
40 outdoor dining deck into the southern side yard; and a Sign Permit for new
41 business identification signage for the Trident restaurant at 558 Bridgeway (APNs
42 065-172-12, -13, -15).
43

44 The public hearing was opened.

45
46 Associate Planner Schinsing presented the Staff Report.
47
48
49
50

1 Commission questions to staff:

- 2
- 3 • When was the deck that was there during the time that the building was the
- 4 San Francisco Yacht Club removed and would it have mattered if it were
- 5 removed after the passage of the ordinance, meaning have they lost their
- 6 nonconformity rights? *Staff responded they do not know when it was removed,*
- 7 *but if someone removes a legally nonconforming structure the rights to it are*
- 8 *lost.*
- 9 • The deck was removed, but the underside continues to be nonconforming.
- 10 Does a remaining nonconforming portion of the building give anyone a right of
- 11 any sort? *Staff responded it does not. Once a portion of a nonconforming*
- 12 *structure is removed it has been brought closer into conformance with current*
- 13 *code. If one wanted to build it out the way it was in the past a variance would*
- 14 *be needed.*
- 15 • With respect to Finding 1, how are this building's extraordinary circumstances
- 16 different from the only other building in the district, Scoma's, which is in exactly
- 17 the same kind of situation? *Staff responded Scoma's is similar in that it is over*
- 18 *the water, but this building is a little bit different because it is set back from the*
- 19 *roadway, whereas the Scoma's building is closer to the street. Additionally,*
- 20 *there are no other neighboring structures to the south of this building, whereas*
- 21 *Scoma's has this building next to it. The purpose of the setback regulations is*
- 22 *to provide light and air for neighboring properties. Since the southern property*
- 23 *will not ever be built out next to this building staff thinks this is an exceptional*
- 24 *circumstance that could merit the finding for the variance.*
- 25 • What were the two variances that Scoma's has received in the past for? *Staff*
- 26 *responded Scoma's received approval for relief from building coverage, floor*
- 27 *area ratio and parking in 1967. In 1971 a variance was approved for relief from*
- 28 *floor area ratio, building coverage and setbacks.*
- 29 • The subject building has received four previous variances? *Staff responded*
- 30 *yes.*
- 31

32 The public testimony period was opened.

33

34 Presentation was made by Eric Long of Don Olsen and Associates, the applicant.

35

36 Commission questions to Mr. Long:

- 37 • Is the sign like the old original Trident logo? *Mr. Long responded yes.*
- 38 • Why did you choose steel for the letters rather than something like aluminum
- 39 that would not rust since they will be painted? *Mr. Long responded steel was*
- 40 *metal he picked off the top of his head, but he appreciates the suggestion of*
- 41 *aluminum.*
- 42

43 HLB question to Mr. Long:

- 44 • Have any changes been made to the drawings since they were previously
- 45 presented to the HLB in early December? *Mr. Long responded no, nothing*
- 46 *other than detailing out the building for the construction documents.*
- 47

48 The public made no comments.

49

50

1 The public testimony period was closed.

2
3 HLB comments:

- 4 • Since the HLB had not seen the southern deck wraparound there was concern
5 initially, but after seeing the historic pictures and taking into consideration the
6 fact that the fenestration on the south side had been changed in the 1960s and
7 the vertical windows like those on the façade were no longer there, so the look
8 of that southern elevation was lost, the HLB finds this plan acceptable.
- 9 • One of the findings is economic vitality of a building. The light emitted from the
10 larger windows is good for the restaurant and the deck will also be good for the
11 building and not too different from what it was. This is not an absolute historic
12 restoration, but this replicates what is seen in the older photographs. There are
13 historic elements in the arched fenestration in the back that makes it look like
14 the old eastern exposure.
- 15 • The staircase is not a problem; they are needed for the two decks to function.
16 Historic photos show people not only on the two decks but also on the roof
17 deck, so there has been a tradition of having a lot of activity in those two areas
18 of the eastern elevation.
19

20
21 HLB question to staff:

- 22 • With respect to Finding 5, what triggered the opinion that the Secretary of the
23 Interior Standards Design Guidelines would not apply to this addition to the
24 deck? *Staff responded it was a mistake, because the HLB did review the*
25 *Secretary of the Interior Standards Design Guidelines during the study session*
26 *and found it was in compliance and did ask for that as a criterion.*
27

28 HLB comment:

- 29 • Item F on page 22 refers to the northern and southern lots and notes that the
30 proposed deck is located in the rear of the building and faces the water. Item H
31 on page 23 refers the proposed deck on the south. Since proposed deck will be
32 on eastern and southern sides of the building, the wording in these sections
33 referring to the deck locations needs to be consistent.
34

35 Commission comment:

- 36 • What is proposed is far better than what was approved in 2009 and far better
37 than what is there now.
38

39 HLB comment:

- 40 • Although the ordinance says the size of the letters should be smaller than what
41 is proposed, because this is the first location a person sees going along
42 Bridgeway the proposed two foot height of the letters is appropriate and an
43 exception can be made.
44

45 HLB questions to staff:

- 46 • This location includes a public bathroom that has not had signage but needs to
47 be clearly signed for the public as this is in the Historic District and signage
48 was a Condition of Approval. *Staff responded all the Conditions of Approval in*
49
50

1 *the previously approved Design Review Permit follow through with this Design*
2 *Review Permit, so bathroom signage will be required.*

- 3 • Is there an example of what the restroom signs will look like? *Staff responded*
4 *they have not seen an example from the applicant.*
5

6 Commission comments:

- 7 • The scale of the sign is appropriate to the size of the building and appropriate
8 because the building is set back far enough from the street that it is important it
9 be easily identifiable to pedestrian and motor traffic.
10 • The sign is fine in general, but the Burton's Nightmare typeface is difficult to
11 read being decorative and lightweight, but it is fine if the applicant is satisfied it
12 can be read from a distance.
13 • One of the defining characteristics of this building is the arches. This sign
14 mimics to some extent the arches and fits in well and is the appropriate size.
15 • The Burton's Nightmare typeface is appropriate to the memory of what the
16 Trident used to be.
17

18
19 Additional Conditions of Approval:

- 20 • Finding 5 shall be modified to state that the Secretary of the Interior Standards
21 Design Guidelines will apply to the addition to the deck.
22 • Under Items F and H it shall be stated that there will be a deck in the back on
23 the waterside and around the south in order to be consistent.
24

25 **Commissioner Cox moved and Commissioner Werner seconded a motion to**
26 **approve modifications to a previously approved Design Review Permit and a Sign**
27 **Permit for 558 Bridgeway subject to the additional Conditions of Approval and**
28 **revised finding. The motion passed 5-0.**
29

30 **HLB Secretary Nichols moved and Board Member Flavin seconded a motion to**
31 **approve modifications to a previously approved Design Review Permit and a Sign**
32 **Permit for 558 Bridgeway subject to the additional Conditions of Approval and**
33 **revised finding. The motion passed 3-0.**
34

35 **HLB Board Member Flavin moved and Board Member Kiernat seconded a motion**
36 **to adjourn the Historic Landmarks Board meeting. The motion passed 3-0.**
37

38 Commission comments:

- 39 • The Minor Use Permit is fine and is no different from what was approved in the
40 past.
41 • The Variance findings can be made, as this is a unique situation. The south
42 side of this building is far better for having the balcony added to it.
43 • The findings for the Variance can be made in light of the exceptional
44 positioning of this building and the absence of the infringement on air and light
45 by the increased building coverage in this situation.
46 • The only other building in this district, Scoma's, has outdoor seating on the
47 southern side of the building, which is a choice location that gives sunlight and
48 warmth where there might otherwise not be. The granting of this Variance
49
50

1 would let the owner of this building enjoy the same benefits of a south-facing
2 dining deck.
3

4 **Commissioner Werner moved and Commissioner Cox seconded a motion to**
5 **approve a Minor Use Permit and a Variance for 558 Bridgeway. The motion**
6 **passed 5-0.**
7

8 The public hearing was closed.
9

10 **Old Business**

11 None.
12

13 **Adjournment**

14 **Commissioner Cox moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion to**
15 **adjourn the meeting. The motion passed 5-0.**
16

17 The meeting was adjourned at 7:50p.m.
18

19 
20

21 _____
22 Submitted by
23 Jeremy Graves, AICP
24 Community Development Director

25 
26 _____
27 Approved by
28 Stafford Keegin
29 Chair

30 \\Astroboy\data\CDD\Plan Comm\Minutes\2012\01-04-Approved.doc
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50