

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, November 14, 2012
Approved Summary Minutes

Call to Order

Chair Cox called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 420 Litho Street, Sausalito.

Present: Chair Joan Cox, Vice Chair Bill Werner, Commissioner Stan Bair
Commissioner Richard Graef, Commissioner Stafford Keegin
Staff: Community Development Director Jeremy Graves
Assistant Planner Alison Thornberry-Assef, City Attorney Mary Wagner

Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Keegin moved and Vice Chair Werner seconded a motion to approve the agenda. The motion passed 5-0.

Public Comments On Items Not on the Agenda

None.

Approval of Minutes

October 17, 2012 October 22, 2012

Vice Chair Werner moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion to approve the minutes of October 17, 2012 as amended. The motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Bair moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion to approve the minutes of October 22, 2012 as amended. The motion passed 5-0.

Public Hearings

Declarations of Planning Commissioner Public Contacts

None.

1. **ZOA 12-264, Zoning Ordinance Amendment/Review of Guardrails, City of Sausalito.** An amendment of Zoning Ordinance Sections 10.54.040.B and 10.54.050.B and 10.56.030.A regarding review of Design Review Permits and Encroachment Agreements for vehicular traffic safety guardrails.

The public hearing was opened.

Assistant Planner Thornberry-Assef presented the Staff Report. City Engineer Todd Teachout was available for questions.

1 Commission questions to staff:

- 2 • Is the metal guardrail also the Caltrans standard guardrail? *Staff responded*
3 *yes. Typically the City would defer to the state and Caltrans standards.*
- 4 • When the old, low wooden posts with the white planking need to be replaced
5 will they be replaced with a more modern guardrail and is it possible to request
6 those types of barriers for small streets as opposed to guardrails designed for
7 use around large vehicles that would not be on residential streets? *Staff*
8 *responded there are a number of such wooden guardrails that are rotted and*
9 *need to be looked at. A safety assessment will be made, a plan will be*
10 *developed, notification would be made to the affected property owners, and*
11 *feedback will be taken into consideration.*
- 12 • Will the City consider pedestrian safety as well as vehicular safety when
13 considering this matter? *Staff responded yes.*
- 14 • When going through this expedited procedure is it staff's intention to utilize only
15 the two types of guardrails that have been tested and approved? *Staff*
16 *responded not necessarily. Staff has considered a broader spectrum of*
17 *guardrails, as shown in the Staff Report.*
- 18 • What ordinarily would trigger a Design Review for one of these guardrails that
19 would not if this were changed? *Staff responded currently all City capital*
20 *improvement projects require Design Review Permits, unless they do not*
21 *change the appearance of the area being maintained, such a repairing a*
22 *guardrail as opposed to installing a new one or changing an old one's design.*

23
24
25 The public testimony period was opened.

26
27 The public made no comments.

28
29 The public testimony period was closed.

30
31 Staff comments:

- 32 • When Public Works staff determines a stretch of roadway needs a guardrail
33 they would reach out to the neighbors for their input as part of the design
34 process. Public Works would then submit an application to the Planning
35 Division for an Administrative Design Permit. Planning staff would then post
36 notices at the site and send it to neighbors within 300 feet. For approval of
37 Administrative Design Permits Staff uses the same findings as the Planning
38 Commission taking into consideration compatibility with the neighborhood and
39 the character of the neighborhood.
- 40 • Regarding pedestrian safety, one of the findings for approval of a Design
41 Review Permit or Administrative Design Review Permit speaks to providing an
42 appropriate level of traffic safety and ease of movement, which can be applied
43 to include pedestrian traffic safety.

44
45
46 The public testimony period was re-opened.

47
48 Gail Woolaway, 17 Glen Drive, indicated the following:

- 49 • She owns the property at 18 and 20 Glen Drive.

- Twice yearly Public Works trims hedges there, but the last time they leveled it, leaving no visual or sound barrier between Old Glen Drive and Upper Glen Drive.
- Public Works told her they would plant a Pittosporum in place of the hedges when they replace the wooden guardrail at the site.

Rog Brown, 10 Glen Drive, indicated the following:

- An expedited process is needed and he urges the Planning Commission to recommend City Council approval of the Zoning Ordinance amendment.

The public testimony period was closed.

Vice Chair Werner moved and Commissioner Bair seconded a motion to recommend City Council approval of the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Cox requested the motion include the suggestion that staff memorialize the procedures that would lead up to that application being addressed by the Zoning Administrator.

The maker of the motion and the seconder accepted the modification to the motion.

The amended motion passed 5-0.

The public hearing was closed.

Old Business

- 2. CDD 12-262, Zoning Ordinance Interpretation, City of Sausalito.** Planning Commission interpretation of criteria for Design Review Permits in Zoning Ordinance Section 10.54.050.6 (Design Review Permits).

Old Business was opened.

Community Development Director Graves presented the Staff Report and noted late correspondence was submitted by architect Dennis Key.

The public testimony period was opened.

The public made no comments.

The public testimony period was closed.

Commission comments:

- The Commission does not agree with Mr. Key's comment that the staff interpretation would allow larger projects.
- The two interpretations are two different approaches to adding space to an existing building and are there for a reason and should stay there. The historical

1 interpretation staff has used all along was appropriate; the change was
2 inappropriate.

- 3 • There is a solution for an Applicant that disagrees with the interpretation, and
4 that is to file a Design Review Permit and bring it to the Planning Commission.
5 No resident is left without a viable approach to whatever type of renovation they
6 seek.
7

8 **Vice Chair Werner moved and Commissioner Keegin seconded a motion to**
9 **approve Historic Interpretation E. The motion passed 5-0.**

10 **New Business – None**

11 **Staff Communications**

- 12 • At the November 13, 2012 City Council meeting:
13 ○ The Council moved forward with its first reading of the regulations for
14 accessory dwelling units, including amnesty dwelling units.
15 ○ The Council authorized the City Manager to sign a contract for an
16 environmental consultant to prepare an Environmental Impact Report
17 regarding the application for conversion of the Valhalla Inn into a 20-room
18 boutique hotel.
19 ○ An appeal was filed for the Planning Commission denial of the Conditional
20 Use Permit for the Harmonia project and was to be heard by the Council.
21 However the Applicant requested a continuance to a date uncertain due to
22 family emergency. Staff anticipates the matter will be brought before the
23 Council in January 2013.
24
25
26
27

28 **Planning Commission Communications**

- 29 • The HCD approved the Sausalito Housing Element.
30

31 **Adjournment**

32
33 **Commissioner Keegin moved and Commissioner Graef seconded a motion to**
34 **adjourn the meeting. The motion passed 5-0.**
35

36 The meeting was adjourned at 7:29 p.m.
37

38
39 
40 _____
41 Submitted by
42 Jeremy Graves, AICP
43 Community Development Director

44 
45 _____
46 Approved by
47 Joan Cox
48 Chair

49
50
I:\CDD\Plan Comm\Minutes\2012\11-14-Approved.doc