

The Joint Meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission and Design Review Committee was called to order by Chairman David Ainsworth in the Council Chambers at 8:10 p.m. on May 10, 1976. Representing Town Staff: Patricia R. Perry, Planning Technician.

1. ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Members Present: Ainsworth, Eisgrau, Fairchild, Goltz
 Planning Commission Members Absent: Bolles, Greenfield, Ragan

Design Review Members Present: Dandelet, Stevens, Strassman, Eisgrau*
 Design Review Members Absent: Anawalt,

(*Commissioner Eisgrau served on the Planning Commission, but was present)

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

- A. Proposed Amendments to the Municipal Code, Design Review Ordinance, Title 10, Chapter 4.

The March 30th memo by Patricia Perry suggesting amendments to the Design Review Ordinance, as agreed upon by Design Review was discussed.

1. Design Review felt "Construction of single family residences, appurtenances, and accessory improvements in the Health & Safety (Conservation) Zone and on parcels fronting the Scenic Highways" should come under their jurisdiction.

The Planning Commission agreed construction on parcels in the Health and Safety (Conservation) Zone and on the Scenic Highways should be reviewed. Parcels zoned "PPD" should also be reviewed by the Design Review Committee. The section in the Code covering Planned Development currently made no provision for Design Review. Staff was asked to research the reason for not providing for review by the Design Review Committee.

Chairman Ainsworth made the comment to the Design Review Committee that the Commission was following a priority list established by the Council on the work to be done. The changes proposed could not be properly considered for at least another six months.

2. "Additions and alterations to single family residences, appurtenances and accessory buildings that diverge from the architectural features and lines of the existing building..."

Commission felt the residential areas should not be considered for review by the Design Review Committee, with the exception of residences which had come before the Planning Commission for a variance. These were usually forwarded to Design Review as a Planning Commission policy.

3. "All Planned Development applications" should be reviewed by Design Review.

The Planning Commission agreed the above should be reviewed by Design Review. (See comments under Item 1 above.)

4. "Exterior colors of buildings in major commercial areas, including C-2 and C-3 zones".

There was some disagreement between the Planning Commission and Design Review members on this item.

Design Review members felt reviewing the color of a commercial building was part of a complete package. It would be beneficial to the Town to have colors which are complimentary.

Design Review members noted that many of their past applicants had been in favor of their help in suggesting colors. They also wished to make it clear that this would not be of an enforcement nature.

5. "Projects not otherwise covered which have visual impact on the community."

Commission felt this item was unacceptable for reasons similar to those mentioned for Item #2, and should be stricken.

DDB863

Planning Commission/Design Review Minutes

Meeting of May 10, 1976

Page Two

Design Review members felt items of "visual impact" would include such things as:

- Swimming pool domes
- Public utilities
- Landscaping & Lighting in Commercial areas
- Recreational areas
- Tennis courts
- Parking areas
- Corrals
- Retaining walls
- Accessory buildings in commercial areas

Chairman Ainsworth stated he was not ready to take action to recommend this to the Council this item should be placed on the next Planning Commission agenda for further discussion.

M/S Goltz, Fairchild that the recommendations requested by the Design Review Committee in their separate memo of March 30, 1976 be put on the next Planning Commission agenda under "Matters for Consideration" with the following changes:

1. That #1 under Amendment A be changed to read: "At such time as the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan is implemented, construction of single family residences, apurtenances, and accessory improvements in the future Health and Safety (Conservation) Zone and on parcels fronting on the Scenic Highways".
2. Item #2 under Amendment A be stricken.
3. Item #3 under Amendment A to read the same.
4. Item #4 under Amendment A to read: "Design Review requests the jurisdiction to preview exterior colors for commercial buildings in C-2 and C-3 areas".
5. Item #5 under Amendment A be stricken.

In Amendment B, the Planning Commission agrees with that section, however, there was some reservation about the time period to start, and the Commission recommends that the period be made a year and a half.

Passed unanimously. (Planning Commission votes only.)

B. Instructions to Design Review from the Planning Commission on referrals.

Design Review requested they be provided a copy of the Planning Commission minutes and Staff Report on Items referred to them.

C. Design Review vs. Designing


Design Review felt there wasn't a problem with people coming in with applications which required designing. Most applications were well prepared by Staff. Those few that weren't were returned to the applicant.

D. Condominium Conversion Ordinance

Held over as a trailing item for the May 17th meeting.

3. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.


Catherine Carpenter, Secretary to
the Planning Commission