

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, February 17, 2010
Approved Minutes

Call to Order

Vice-Chair Bair called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of City Hall, 420 Litho Street, Sausalito.

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

Absent: Chair Bill Keller

Staff: Community Development Director Jeremy Graves
Assistant Planner Alison Thornberry, City Attorney Mary Wagner

Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Werner moved and Commissioner Cox seconded a motion to approve the agenda. The motion passed 4-0.

Approval of Minutes

February 11, 2009.

Commissioner Keegin moved and Commissioner Cox seconded a motion to approve the minutes of February 11, 2009 as amended. The motion passed 3-0-1 (Werner-Abstain).

Public Comments

None.

Public Hearings

- 1. DR 10-029, Design Review Permit, City of Sausalito, Plaza Vina Del Mar Accessibility Project .** Design Review Permit to allow accessibility improvements at Vina Del Mar park located at intersections of Bridgeway, Elevation Portal and Tracy Way (APN 065-074-01).

Staff recommended the public hearing for Plaza Vina Del Mar Accessibility Project be continued to the meeting of March 10, 2010 in order to allow time for the staff to address the concerns of the Historic Landmarks Board.

Commissioner Werner moved and Commissioner Cox seconded a motion to continue the public hearing for the Plaza Vina Del Mar Accessibility Project to the meeting of March 10, 2010. The motion passed 4-0.

- 2. CUP 10-006, Pizzeria, Pine Lane Apartments, LLC, 45 Caledonia Street.** A Conditional Use Permit to allow a restaurant with alcohol service at 45 Caledonia Street (APN 065-56-21).

1 The public hearing was opened. Assistant Planner Thornberry presented the Staff
2 Report.

3
4 Commission questions to staff:

- 5 • How do people get upstairs to their apartments? *Staff responded they access*
6 *the apartments off of Pine Street.*
- 7 • Sheet 1-A shows modifications to the front of the building, yet staff said there
8 were no modifications. *Staff responded any proposals to the site are not part*
9 *of this actual application. The applicant is not requesting any external*
10 *modifications as part of this project.*
- 11 • The plans show a modification to the front door. *Staff responded that would be*
12 *handled through the Building Permit process and is not part of the application*
13 *tonight.*
- 14 • What is in here does not meet the Building Code, does not meet accessibility
15 standards. Where does that put the Commission if it approves the Conditional
16 Use Permit for something that is shown as non-compliant? *Staff responded*
17 *the internal ADA requirements would addressed through the building code*
18 *plan check process.*

19
20
21 Commission question to the Don Olsen, the applicant:

- 22 • Does this project trigger a utility undergrounding issue? *Mr. Olsen responded*
23 *all of the power lines are undergrounded in this portion of the street.*

24
25 The public comment period was opened. There being none, the public comment period
26 was closed.

27
28 Commission comments:

- 29 • The conceptual drawings on Sheet A-1 should be removed so as not to lead
30 someone to believe the Commission is approving a particular version of the
31 interior and exterior of the structure.
- 32 • It is good to see something go into this space that has been vacant since 2006.
33 It is a smaller space and difficult to fill.

34 Commission modification to the resolution:

- 35 • For purposes of the resolution there should be added at the end, after
36 Attachment 3, “, but do not include Sheet A-1.”

37
38
39 **Vice-Chair Bair moved and Commissioner Cox seconded a motion to approve a**
40 **Conditional Use Permit as modified for 45 Caledonia Street. The motion passed 4-**
41 **0.**

- 42
43 **3. DRP 10-030, Bocce Ball Court, City of Sausalito, 1600 Block of Bridgeway—**
44 **Dunphy Park.** A Design Review Permit to allow a local public enhancement
45 project for the installation of a second bocce ball court at Dunphy Park (APNs
46 065-084-01, 02, 08.

47
48 The public hearing was opened. Assistant Planner Thornberry presented the Staff
49 Report.

1 Commission questions and comments for Parks and Recreation Director Mike Langford,
2 the applicant, and staff:

- 3 • The installation of the bocce ball court has been funded by public donations,
4 but if Dunphy Park is reconfigured it could be removed. Under what
5 circumstances might a park element that was funded by donations be
6 removed? *Mr. Langford responded there has been talk regarding reconfiguring
7 Dunphy Park by adding City-owned adjacent property or by acquiring additional
8 property, but the City does not want to be “stuck” with something that is going
9 to be right in the pathway adjoining the two different areas of the park. That is
10 why the condition was added that should the bocce ball court be redesigned,
11 relocated, or removed that the proposed action would go through the public
12 review process.*
- 13 • It is understandable to have a Condition of Approval to allow relocation of the
14 court, but the language also includes the possibility of removing of it. *Mr.
15 Langford responded the City needs to keep its options open in the event public
16 interest in bocce ball declines.*
- 17 • If the bocce ball court were removed, would the City refund the donations to
18 the people who contributed? *Staff responded none of the donations were
19 contingent on the court being there for a particular period of time. The Planning
20 Commission should not impose a Condition of Approval that limits the ability to
21 reconfigure Dunphy Park. In the event the Council seeks to reconfigure the
22 park the public will have opportunity to voice their interest in maintaining
23 improvements to the park.*

24
25
26 The public comment period was opened:

27
28 Thomas Clark indicated the following:

- 29 • A second court has been needed for a long time, as there are more teams that
30 want to play.

31
32 Commission questions to Mr. Clark:

- 33 • Seats at the ends for the court for the players are as important as seats along
34 the side for the spectators. Can the design be improved by having benches at
35 each end of the court? *Mr. Clark responded the existing Dunphy Park bocce
36 ball court has a rise at the end of each court that is used for seating. The
37 proposed second court would be an exact replica and would also contain rises
38 used for seating.*
- 39 • What is the estimated cost for the second bocce ball court? *Mr. Clark
40 responded they are not sure what the exact cost would be, but they anticipate
41 between \$5,000-6,000.*
- 42 • Does the league have a problem with the limiting language that could give the
43 City the right to remove the court in a year or two if it redesigns Dunphy Park?
44 *Mr. Clark responded there is an understanding that if the park is redesigned
45 that the two bocce ball courts will be put elsewhere in the park or at the same
46 location, but that the number of courts would remain at two. The courts work so
47 well in that area, which is largely unused except for bocce ball, that he believes
48 the City would want them to remain there.*

- 1 • The language in the resolution gives the City the right to not only relocate the
2 courts but to remove them. *Mr. Clark responded he understands and does not*
3 *have a problem with the language.*
4

5 The public comment period was closed.
6

7 Commission comments:

- 8 • A second bocce ball court is a great use of space that is not being used. There
9 is a viable league poised to expand and a second court provides them that
10 opportunity.
11

12 **Vice-Chair Bair moved and Commissioner Keegin seconded a motion to approve**
13 **a Design Review Permit for the 1600 Block of Bridgeway—Dunphy Park. The**
14 **motion passed 4-0.**
15

16 **Old Business**

17 None.
18

19 **New Business**

20 **4. FY 2010-11 Prioritized Project List, City of Sausalito.** Suggestions for FY 21 2010-11 Prioritized Project List. 22

23 Community Development Director Graves provided the Staff Report.
24

25 Commission comments:

- 26 • Item P, 2—Heightened Design Review: The Heightened Design Review
27 language does not have teeth. Amendments of the Zoning Ordinance
28 regarding Heightened Design Review should be considered so the 80% of the
29 FAR requirement that triggers the design review should be the maximum.
30 Floor area above that would be allowed through an incentive program where
31 property owners could get additional square footage if they do certain green
32 and sustainable projects related to the green building regulations such as
33 LEED certification, solar panels, et cetera. *Staff responded this might come in*
34 *the context of an omnibus Zoning Ordinance review and suggested the*
35 *Commission give staff parameters that should be used for incentives.*
36 • Item A — Housing Element: The Housing Element Committee is contemplating
37 an ordinance to permit liveaboards as a way to meet some of the residential
38 requirements of the Housing Element. Would it be worthwhile to list that
39 separately or somehow list it as part of the Housing Element project? *Staff*
40 *responded a liveaboard ordinance would be one of the implementation*
41 *measures of the Housing Element, and that implementation measure would*
42 *provide a timeframe for adopting such an ordinance, which would be a year or*
43 *two out. The ordinance would not have to be adopted simultaneously with the*
44 *approval of the Housing Element.*
45 • Item Q, 1—Improvements to the Infrastructure System: Consider amending the
46 Underground Ordinance to lower the threshold to require more undergrounding
47 of utilities as part of Design Review.
48
49
50

- 1 • Item C — Marinship Specific Plan (MSP) Review and Update:
 - 2 ○ The MSP Update is not yet in progress but is a top priority and needs
 - 3 clarification. *Staff responded they are awaiting the recommendations of*
 - 4 *the Waterfront and Marinship (WAM) Steering Committee. They hope*
 - 5 *WAM will make a presentation to the City Council in late spring and have*
 - 6 *their final report completed in early summer.*
 - 7 ○ The MSP is 25 years old. Should the MSP be reviewed and updated or
 - 8 should we go to a full General Plan update and bring the Marinship back
 - 9 into the General Plan and address it like the rest of the City is addressed
 - 10 in the General Plan? The MSP encourages maritime and light industrial
 - 11 uses. The pressure is coming from the landowners who want to generate
 - 12 more income from their property than those uses can provide. Part of the
 - 13 problem with the MSP is it has not been embraced within the General
 - 14 Plan.
 - 15 ○ The MSP is very outdated and the process of its review has been
 - 16 protracted. If acting on the MSP is delayed as the entire General Plan is
 - 17 reviewed it could further delay the remediation of some of the outdated
 - 18 elements of the MSP.

19
20
21 **Communications**

- 22 • Director Graves reviewed the status report on the conditions of approval for
 - 23 restaurants with outdoor dining in the public right-of-way along Caledonia Street.
 - 24 The Commission asked staff to provide this list of conditions with staff reports on
 - 25 future projects seeking CUPs for outdoor dining.
- 26 • Staff—The joint meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission tentatively
 - 27 scheduled for March 27th does not work. Staff will contact Commission members
 - 28 via email regarding possible new dates for the meeting.
- 29 • Staff—The City Council will take up the appeal of Akraboff/600 Locust Street at
 - 30 their meeting on February 23rd.

31
32 **Adjournment**

33 The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

34
35
36 /s/ JEREMY GRAVES
37 Submitted by
38 Jeremy Graves, AICP
39 Community Development Director
40

 /s/ BILL KELLER
Approved by
Bill Keller
Chair

41 I:\CDD\Plan Comm\Minutes\2010\02-17-10-Approved.doc
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50