

SAUSALITO PLANNING COMMISSION
Monday, October 22, 2012
Approved Summary Minutes

Call to Order—Special Joint Meeting with Historic Landmarks Board

Chair Cox called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 420 Litho Street, Sausalito.

Chair Pierce called the Historic Landmarks Board meeting to order.

Planning Commission:

Present: Chair Joan Cox, Commissioner Richard Graef,
Commissioner Stafford Keegin

Absent: Vice-Chair Bill Werner, Commissioner Stan Bair

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

Historic Landmarks Board:

Present: Chair Morgan Pierce, Secretary Vicki Nichols,
Committee Member Carolyn Kiernat, Committee Member John McCoy

Approval of Agenda

HLB Committee Member Kiernat moved and Committee Member Nichols seconded a motion to hear Item 2 after Item 3. The motion passed 4-0.

Commissioner Graef moved and Commissioner Keegin seconded a motion to hear Item 2 after Item 3. The motion passed 3-0.

HLB Chair Pierce moved and Committee Member Kiernat seconded a motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion passed 4-0.

Commissioner Keegin moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion passed 3-0.

Public Comments On Items Not on the Agenda

None.

Approval of Minutes

None.

Public Hearings

Declarations of Planning Commissioner Public Contacts

Chair Cox disclosed that she had discussed Item 2, Plaza Vina Del Mar, with several members of the community.

1. **DR 12-180, Design Review Permit, City of Sausalito, El Portal/Tracy Way Intersection.** Design Review Permit for the installation of an ATM within the existing Chamber of Commerce Visitor Kiosk located in the public right-of-way at the intersection of El Portal and Tracy Way.

The public hearing was opened.

Associate Planner Burns presented the Staff Report.

HLB questions to staff:

- Is it necessarily to go to five feet in the width of the cut through the hedges? Would four feet be acceptable and allow us to preserve more of the greenery? *Staff responded four feet would be acceptable.*

Commission question to staff:

- Will the City's building staff make all ADA determinations? *Staff responded yes, The Chamber would submit an application for a Building Permit, which would be routed to the City's consultant who would do a plan check and include the accessibility requirements.*

The public testimony period was opened.

Don Olsen, the applicant, was available for questions.

HLB question to Mr. Olsen:

- Could the hedge's root balls be inspected to ascertain the best side of the hedge to trim so that entire plants could be preserved? *Mr. Olsen responded they would look at that and see if it makes any difference.*

Commission question to Mr. Olsen:

- The photograph shows benches that are not shown on the drawings. Where would those benches go? *Mr. Olsen responded they would be pushed apart with a trash receptacle between them.*

Chair Cox indicated that as there were only three members of the Planning Commissioners present that approval of the project would require a vote of 3-0.

The public made no comments.

The public testimony period was closed.

HLB comments:

- This is a great project with no impact to the Historic Overlay District.
- Widening the shrubs by one or two feet makes no difference.

Commission comments:

- The hedge should be trimmed off the right side because there is not very much edge on the left.
- The best way to decide where to trim the hedge would be to look at the root balls and see where there would be the least impact to the existing hedge since it is a mature plant.

Additional Conditions of Approval:

- The benches shall be reflected on the site plans so the plan checker may ensure that they fit.
- The opening in the hedge shall be four feet rather than five feet with the placement of the opening taken into account to preserve the root balls.
- The Community Development Director shall determine the ultimate placement of the four-foot wide path taking into account the retention to the maximum extent possible of the existing shrubs.

HLB Committee Member Nichols moved and Committee Member Kiernat seconded a motion to approve the Design Review Permit, subject to the additional Conditions of Approval. The motion passed 4-0.

Commissioner Keegin moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion to approve the Design Review Permit, subject to the additional Conditions of Approval. The motion passed 3-0.

The public hearing was closed.

- 3. DR 11-332, Design Review Permit, Henry, 660 Bridgeway.** Modifications to a previously approved Design Review Permit for rooftop modifications, including modifications to the approved mechanical equipment, screens, and new planters. All of the improvements are proposed for the building at 660 Bridgeway (APN 065-133-25).

The public hearing was opened.

Associate Planner Schinsing presented the Staff Report.

The public testimony period was opened.

Presentation was made by Chris Henry, the owner.

HLB questions and comments to Eduard Llorca, the architect and applicant:

- Is the top of the screen that runs parallel to Bridgeway and then turns east a foot above the surface of the roof at the point where it makes that turn? Mr.

1 *Llora responded it is pretty close to zero. The adjoining perpendicular screen is*
2 *about 15 inches taller.*

- 3 • If it is zero, why is it continuing across? *Mr. Llora responded because the HLB*
4 *requested it be lowered.*
- 5 • The HLB's request was the screen that runs parallel to Bridgeway should be
6 moved back 12 inches from the face of the vertical wall, as shown in the story
7 poles, and then it was to continue until it died into the top of the roof surface.
8 *Mr. Llora responded that is correct, and it does do that.*
- 9 • When the HLB visited the site the screen ran parallel to Bridgeway and died
10 into the roof and screened the mechanical equipment and addressed the visual
11 impact needs. It does not seem necessary to have that screen a foot higher
12 and turning east. *Mr. Llora responded it is there because it was the existing*
13 *taller screen, but they could eliminate it.*

14
15 Commission questions to Mr. Henry and Mr. Llora:

- 16 • Has the applicant erected revised story poles to show where the actual
17 screening would be? *Mr. Henry responded yes, and a surveyor has certified*
18 *them.*
- 19 • Does the roof shield the equipment from the perpendicular angle to
20 Bridgeway? *Mr. Llora responded yes.*

21
22 HLB comment:

- 23 • The new proposed screen should be removed from the proposal. Then it
24 would be the condition that the HLB reviewed and discussed onsite, which
25 was adequate and is more consistent with the structure.

26
27 Commission questions to Mr. Llora:

- 28 • What is the purpose of the existing screen that you show tying into the 9 foot,
29 8 inch section of screen. *Mr. Llora responded that was previously approved to*
30 *screen the equipment from residents higher up on Princess Street.*
- 31 • Is the 9 foot, 8 inch section of screen necessary for the perspective of those
32 residents on Princess Street? *Mr. Llora responded no.*

33
34
35 **Chair Cox indicated for the record that Sheets A-1.1 and A-2.3 provided by the**
36 **applicant as a late submission would be added into the record.**

37
38 The public made no comments.

39
40 The public testimony period was closed.

41
42 Additional Condition of Approval:

- 43 • The new nine foot, eight-inch portion of the screen wall shall be eliminated.

44
45
46 **HLB Committee Member Kiernat moved and Committee Member McCoy seconded**
47 **a motion to approve a Design Review Permit for 660 Bridgeway subject to the**
48 **additional Condition of Approval. The motion passed 4-0.**

1 **Commissioner Keegin moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion to**
2 **approve a Design Review Permit for 660 Bridgeway subject to the additional**
3 **Condition of Approval. The motion passed 3-0.**
4

5 The public hearing was closed.
6

7 **2. DR 10-029, Design Review Permit, City of Sausalito, 700 Block of**
8 **Bridgeway.** Design Review Permit to allow accessibility improvements,
9 including but not limited to the removal of the bandstand, installation of an at-
10 grade paved surface, and installation of five-foot wide paths around the fountain
11 at Plaza Vina Del Mar located in the 700 block of Bridgeway (APN 065-074-01).
12

13 The public hearing was opened.
14

15 **HLB Committee Member Kiernat indicated she would recuse herself from**
16 **participating in the hearing.**
17

18 Associate Planner Burns presented the Staff Report.
19

20 Presentation was made by Andrew Davidson, Staff Engineer and applicant:
21

22 The public testimony period was opened.
23

24 Michael Rex, architect, indicated the following:
25

- 26 • He supports the project.
- 27 • On textures and colors he likes Option 2-D. Making it all sidewalk makes it feel
28 more spacious and part of the streetscape rather than making it feel separate
29 by changing the finish color.
- 30 • Regarding Commissioner Werner's letter disagreeing with the necessity of
31 providing a five foot path circular around the fountain, Mr. Rex spoke with Kim
32 Blackseth, Certified Access Specialist, who told him:
 - 33 ○ The federal standard is three feet wide path and the state requires four
34 feet, but in terms of code compliance getting up to the fountain is what it is
35 all about and is consistent both with the intent and letter of the law.
 - 36 ○ There are plenty of examples for being able to just get up to or to one side
37 of an element.
 - 38 ○ There is nothing in the code saying a person has to get all the way around
39 an element. That is particularly true if there is nothing on the backside of
40 the fountain that one would miss experiencing.
 - 41 ○ There is only the risk the City might have to defend against a lawsuit
42 where somebody claims you would have to get around the fountain, and
43 that is the City Council's decision.
- 44 • Mr. Rex however recommends the City stay with the proposed plan with the
45 five-foot circular path around the fountain, not to defend against a lawsuit by a
46 wheelchair bound person, but simply to accommodate the public. Without that
47 extra width there would only be about 29 inches of asphalt and people will be
48 stepping on the grass and damaging the perimeter. There will still be plenty of
49 lawn.
50

1
2 The public testimony period was closed.
3

4 HLB comments:

- 5 • Option 2-E's five-foot circular path would be advantageous for the public to
6 have that walking place and it would protect the grass.
- 7 • The one problem with Option 2-E is the materials, putting brick back into where
8 the bandstand is. The HLB has discovered in their research that the brick is a
9 fairly new addition to the plaza. This is an opportunity to take the plaza back to
10 its historical roots.
- 11 • Preferred Option 2-C, by continuing the sidewalk consistently in line and taking
12 the bandstand with the mesa buff concrete it keeps its place in the hierarchy
13 and delineates it as a bandstand, which it was originally built and intended for,
14 and it is framed by the elephants and holds its original intent as a place of
15 gathering and not so much as a path of travel. By extending it out to
16 Bridgeway, when there are a few hundred people walking on the sidewalk the
17 demarcation is lost along with its importance. It becomes part of the sidewalk
18 and does not read as the bandstand of Plaza Vina Del Mar.
- 19 • Preference for 2-C also involves the fact that by making the sidewalk the
20 continuous material that is being proposed it maintains the delineation of this
21 lot and the shape, which was notable in the historical evaluation by Page &
22 Turnbull. This is an unusually shaped lot that used to be at the terminus of the
23 railroad. The "bleed out" of Option 2-D extends the landing area straight out to
24 the sidewalk and causes the loss of the definition of that shape.
- 25 • Brick was never in the plaza and should not go there now. It was concrete, and
26 using scored concrete gets closer to the original materials used.
- 27 • The HLB's job is to preserve the spirit of the Historic District wherever possible
28 by respecting proportions and relationships of spaces. Option 2-C does that
29 well relative to the bandstand using its original dimensions with a different
30 material that allows the sidewalk to flow past it as it originally did back when it
31 was a raised element. It also relates better to the elephants and fountain from a
32 scale standpoint.
- 33 • In judging the amount of turf in that small park with the amount of new paving,
34 the turf is preferred. There has never been a wear ring in the grass around the
35 fountain.
- 36 • When the bandstand is peeled away there is an exposed portion of the
37 elephant's bases that will not match what is now visible. It is important to get a
38 conservator to clean the elephants and put in infill material to make it look
39 consistent and meet the Secretary of the Interior's standards for preserving.
- 40
- 41

42
43 Commission comments:

- 44 • The seeded, scored concrete of Option 2-D is favored because the filler
45 between the elephants does not serve any purpose and is a distraction.
- 46 • There has never been a path worn around the fountain. This is a small park. To
47 fill it with at least one hundred square feet of concrete for no particular purpose
48 is abusive to what exists there and unnecessary. Option 2-D has a ten-foot
49 walk straight to the existing base of the fountain.
- 50

- Option 2-E with the five-foot path around the fountain does not seem feasible. The path should just go to the fountain, which is symmetrical; one side looks the same as the other.
- The paving materials in Options 2-C and 2-D are both nice. While understanding the rationale for Option 2-D, carrying the exposed aggregate, there is something nice about having a strip of the other material that ties those two elephant platforms together. Both options work and the difference would be lost on most people, especially if there is a large crowd down there.
- The mesa buff color shown in Option 2-C is favored. The elephant bases look better against the mesa buff color and is jarring against the aggregate concrete. It differentiates the fact that the plaza starts here and this is the entryway to the park; this is a notable historic feature.
- The consensus on the Planning Commission is for Option 2-E, which is no path, but if the Council wishes a path, then the Commission would like Option 2-C that has a narrower path.

HLB Committee Member McCoy moved and Committee Member Nichols seconded a motion to approve a Design Review Permit for the 700 Block of Bridgeway with two phases.

- **Phase One approves removal of the elevated landing and construction of an at-grade landing with the scored concrete color of mesa buff as the material for the fountain and the plaza, and the scored and seeded aggregate concrete as the material for the sidewalk, and the color fir for the utility shed.**
- **Phase Two, subject to City Council approval, approves removal and replacement of the existing asphalt path from the landing to the fountain with a ten-foot wide concrete surface consistent with the materials approved in Phase One and the elimination of the five-foot wide horseshoe concrete path around the fountain. If the City Council does not approve the elimination of the five-foot wide horseshoe concrete path, then Phase Two approves the narrowest possible concrete horseshoe path consistent with the Phase One materials consistent with the requirements of the ADA and the settlement agreement.**

The motion was amended to stipulate:

- **Option 2-C**
- **Use of scored mesa buff concrete using a lighter color with a heavier finish in appearance and**
- **Retention of a restoration expert to patch the exposed portion of the elephant bases to match the existing materials and tone.**

The HLB motion passed 3-0.

Commissioner Keegin moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion identical to the HLB motion.

The Planning Commission motion passed 3-0.

1 The public hearing was closed.

2
3 **By consensus the Historic Landmarks Board adjourned its portion of the joint**
4 **meeting.**

5
6 **Old Business**

7 None.

8
9 **New Business**

10 None.

11
12 **Planning Commission Communications**

- 13
 - 14 • On the City Council's consent calendar for their October 23, 2012 meeting is a
15 consent item for an Encroachment Agreement at 140 Bulkley Avenue that never
16 came before the Planning Commission. *Staff responded there are certain criteria*
17 *that allow the Community Development Department to make recommendations*
18 *for minor projects that require an Encroachment Agreement, as stated in Section*
19 *10.56.030 of the Zoning Ordinance, which happened in this case.*

20
21 **Adjournment**

22
23 **Commissioner Graef moved and Commissioner Keegin seconded a motion to**
24 **adjourn the meeting. The motion passed 3-0.**

25
26 The meeting was adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

27
28
29
30 _____
31 Submitted by
32 Jeremy Graves, AICP
33 Community Development Director

30 _____
31 Approved by
32 Joan Cox
33 Chair

34 I:\CDD\Plan Comm\Minutes\2012\10-22- Approved.doc