

SAUSALITO PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, June 26, 2013
Draft Summary Minutes
Excerpt

Call to Order

Chair Cox called the special meeting to order at 5:00 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
Absent: Commissioner Stafford Keegin
Staff: Community Development Director Jeremy Graves
Associate Planner Heidi Scoble, Administrative Assistant Lilly Schinsing,
City Attorney Mary Wagner

Public Hearings

- 1. ZOA 10-355, Zoning Ordinance Amendment, City of Sausalito, City-Wide.**
Amendment of Title 10 (Zoning) of the Municipal Code regarding the standards and regulations for residences in the Multi-Family (R-2-2.5 and R-3) Zoning Districts. The proposed regulations would be applicable to projects that provide fewer units than the maximum density allowed. The amendment would lessen the allowable floor area, building coverage and impervious surfaces of the largest unit on a parcel in the R-2-2.5 and R-3 Zoning Districts and mandate that floor area, building coverage and impervious surfaces be held in reserve for an additional unit(s).

The public hearing was opened.

Administrative Assistant Schinsing presented the Staff Report.

The public testimony period was opened.

Susan Samels indicated the following:

- Why does the ordinance require that the builder of a single-family home provide a schematic for another unit on the same property?
- The schematic requirement is ill-defined, difficult, vague and open to interpretation.
- If every new building is required to allow for the maximum number of units, then perhaps R-1 properties should also be required to show that an ADU could be built in the future for any proposed home.
- She supports the fixed percentage approach to sizing because the sliding scale allows for a larger building footprint than allowed by current laws.

1 Kerry Headington, Third Street, indicated the following:

- 2 • Many of the incentives that encouraged maximum build-out have been
- 3 removed from the amendment with the exception of small units, parking and
- 4 tandem parking.
- 5 • The requirement of the schematic architectural drawings discourages single-
- 6 family homes and encourages maximum build-out.
- 7 • Could a home on a next door property be built closer to the common property
- 8 line to allow for a future home that may never be built? This would impact
- 9 quality of life and space. Or would that neighbor be more inclined to build up?
- 10 • Housing Element Program 20 can be met by simply limiting the size of single-
- 11 family homes, which in theory leaves space for future units.
- 12 • There is a trend towards high-density in Sausalito and Old Town in particular.
- 13 The streets, sewage and drains in Old Town are overburdened and not meant
- 14 to be maxed out.
- 15
- 16

17 Michael Rex indicated the following:

- 18 • The changes in the ordinance made in response to Commission and public
- 19 comments are fine with the exception of the revised parking provisions. The
- 20 revised parking standards are so important the Commission should reconsider
- 21 and put them back in the ordinance.
- 22 • He is against removing the proposal that provides relief from parking for a unit
- 23 under 1,200 square feet because of fear it will encourage bigger units.
- 24 o An ADU less than 700 square feet can be added and needs to park only
- 25 one car. But a 700 square foot unit may not accommodate two bedrooms,
- 26 which is needed by families and the public has stated in multiple hearings
- 27 that it wants the City to encourage new, young families to live in Sausalito.
- 28 o If an ADU over 800 square feet is added or if a third unit and a second
- 29 bedroom is added, now they have to park two cars.
- 30 o They are trying to provide some relief between the 700 and 1,200 square
- 31 feet.
- 32 o Adding the proposal back is an exception, but not a huge exception and it
- 33 is needed. It was there originally for a good reason.
- 34 • With the exception of parking relief, the ordinance is ready to adopt and he
- 35 encourages the Commission to do so.
- 36
- 37

38 Jan Johnson, 301 Second Street, indicated the following:

- 39 • The parking Mr. Rex has suggested may work in other parts of the City but in
- 40 Old town there is already 2-3 blocks of housing with well over 60 cars on the
- 41 waterfront that have no parking at all. Those cars all park in Old Town. If the
- 42 exception is reduced there will be no parking for residents who will then have to
- 43 park 5-6 blocks from their homes.
- 44

45 Lee Daily, 115 Fourth Street, indicated the following:

- 46 • She disagrees with Mr. Rex.
- 47 • Old Town is parked-out already.
- 48 • Old Town's sewer, storm drains and roads are also maxed out.
- 49 • Infrastructure for these additional units has not been taken into consideration
- 50 and needs to be before considering expanding and encouraging multi-use

units. The past winter, which was mild, saw the storm drains unable to handle the storm water.

Michael Rex indicated the following:

- The reason for the schematic requirement, which should stay in the amendment, is to demonstrate the project did not spread out the main unit so much that there is no physical way to construct another unit if they are in a multi-unit zone.

The public testimony period was closed.

Commission comments:

- The schematic:
 - o Mr. Rex is correct that the schematic is simply there so that wherever a house is built does not preclude building something in the future in R-2-2.5 and R-3 districts.
 - o The schematic should be thought of more as a site diagram and does not need to be done by an architect. It could simply be a diagram showing how the site would be used, so it is very simple.
 - o Perhaps the language could be changed be, "a conceptual site diagram," instead of, "a schematic design," which implies completeness in terms of plans that would require an architect.
- The parking concession for units between 700 and 1,200 square feet:
 - o This concession should remain excluded from the ordinance in order to make this ordinance consistent with the ADU Ordinance.
 - o The concession is an after-the-fact earmark being added to an ordinance whose objective got expanded inappropriately. It should not be included.
 - o It is inappropriate to worsen an already difficult situation throughout the City with this concession.
- Sliding scale option or the fixed percentage option:
 - o The fixed percentage system is preferred. The sliding scale option has too many problems. The fixed percentage carries through to building coverage and impervious surfaces, provides a clear nexus with the rest of the Zoning Ordinance and does not invent a new way to do it.
 - o The fixed percentage system would make it easier on the applicant or landowner.
 - o The subcommittee's concern was the constraints that would be placed on owners of smaller parcels. The facts that owners of smaller parcels can seek relief through the CUP process helps to ameliorate that issue.
 - o Staff prefers the fixed percentage approach because it is much easier to administer.
- The purpose and intent; Conditional Use Permit findings; Design Review Permit findings:
 - o The purpose and intent language modifications are what the Planning Commission had asked for.
 - o The strengthening of the Design Review Permit findings are fine, although it is not so much being strengthened as some things are being clarified.
 - o The proposed Conditional Use Permit findings are fine.
- The 200 square foot floor area bonus:

- o The one-time, 200 square foot bonus is still of concern. It is not known how it will be administered, how it works or why it is in the ordinance. This ordinance set out to deal with the specific problem of overbuilding single-family dwellings. Little changes such as this have confused and complicated it. This bonus should not be in the ordinance.
- o The 200 square foot bonus was unclear and did not make a lot of sense in the context of the rest of the proposed ordinance.
- o A site is only restricted in terms of the largest unit on the site. This 200 square foot bonus does not do anything other than add potential square footage to a site. There are difficulties inherent in small lots. More impact on a neighborhood is generated by overbuilding or building to the limit on a small lot than is done on a larger lot. This bonus exacerbates a problem we already know about. Let this ordinance do what it set out to do as opposed to hanging other little things onto it. There is always the variance route.
- o The bonus is a major bonus to the small lots, which are the most difficult ones in the first place and the ones that are most adversely affected by this ordinance.
- o The small lots are the ones that most adversely affect the neighborhood by their development.
- o The 200 square foot bonus gives more opportunity to have onsite parking and not burden the neighborhood.
- Planning Commission review of ordinance:
 - o Staff comment: As an alternative to public hearings annually for 3 years staff could bring forward a resolution directing staff to bring this matter back to the Commission annually for three years. This would be put on the Planning Commission's calendar.
 - o The Commission agrees with Staff's suggestion to leave the 3-year annual meetings out of the ordinance and remove Section 9.

Commission direction to staff:

- "A schematic design" shall be changed to, "A conceptual site diagram."
- The fixed percentage option of sizing shall be adopted, not the sliding scale option.
- Remove Section 9, since staff will bring forward a resolution directing staff to bring a review of the ordinance matter back to the Commission annually for three years.

Chair Cox moved and Commissioner Bair seconded a motion to approve the Amendment of Title 10 of the Municipal Code subject to Commission direction to staff.

Commission question to staff:

- How often is the 200 square foot bonus for small properties brought into effect?
Staff responded for someone to request the 200 square foot floor area bonus they would need a Design Review Permit. Also, the bonus applies only to existing buildings.

The motion passed 4-0.

I:\CDD\PROJECTS - NON-ADDRESS\ZOA\2010\10-355 - Multi-family Standards\Planning Commission\06-26-Minutes - Draft-Excerpt.doc