

CITY OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
November 16, 1966

Minutes

The special meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Warren Perry at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, on November 16, 1966.

Commissioners Present: Anderson, Creighton, Gue, Heinecke, West, Perry
Commissioners Absent: Moore

ADJ. 364 Gordon Chan

Mr. Chan was present with a sketch of his proposed carport. Commissioner Perry suggested he move the carport closer to his house. Commissioner West asked on what grounds a variance was requested since there is no apparent hardship involved. Commissioner Perry stated a variance could also be requested where practical difficulties, unnecessary hardships or results inconsistent with the purposes and intent of this Ordinance may result from the strict application of certain area, height, yard, parking and space requirements thereof.

After a brief discussion Commissioner West made a motion as follows: Re Adj. 364, Mr. Chan's application for a variance be approved for a 3'6" sideyard setback for the construction of an open carport. Commissioner Gue seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Commissioner West stated this four foot setback will allow Mr. Chan to build a 12'6" carport.

DESIGN REVIEW ORDINANCE

Commissioner Perry opened discussion by asking if the Commission wanted an independent or Advisory Board? A brief discussion followed in which Commissioner Creighton suggested a part-time Board to which only difficult situations could be referred. Commissioner Heinecke stated that the Board should have some independent authority rather than just advise.

Commissioner West asked, "What are we after?" The Board cannot legislate against color, etc., the answer seems to be protection in extreme cases. He felt we would not get this protection with a long and specific building code which would only confuse. Also a Board not involved with the daily problems of the City would be a bad idea.

Commissioner Perry suggested the Board should include a member of the Planning Commission. He also suggested a fee be charged to defray costs. Commissioner Heinecke said that a fee would not be necessary since it is already covered in the building permit. Commissioner Perry also mentioned that in P.7 "Appeal of interested persons" could cause problems from chronic complainers and there should be an appeal bond or something to discourage it.

Commissioner Heinecke made the final summation; agreed upon by all:

1. Appeal directly to the City Council.
2. Appeal within 10 days.
3. 35 days to act on application.
4. 3 members must vote to pass.
5. One member from Planning Commission for 1 year.
6. A clear definition between Planning Commission and Board.
7. More study be given to "interested persons" appeals.

Commissioner Heinecke was asked to rewrite the proposed ordinance and incorporate the above suggestions. At 10:00 p.m. Commissioner West moved, seconded by Commissioner Perry, to adjourn. Unanimously approved.


WARREN R. PERRY
PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

CITY OF SAN ANSELMO
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 8:00 P.M., NOVEMBER 21, 1966

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Warren Perry in the Council Chamber at 8:00 p.m. on November 21, 1966.

1. Roll Call:

Commissioners present: Anderson, Creighton, Gue, Heinecke, Moore
Perry
Commissioners absent: West

2. Approval of minutes of November 7 & 16, 1966

Commissioner Perry asked that minutes of November 16, 1966, paragraph 2 of ADJ. 364, be corrected to read as follows: Commissioner Perry stated a variance could also be requested where practical difficulties, unnecessary hardships or results inconsistent with the purposes and intent of this Ordinance may result from the strict application of certain area, height, yard, parking and space requirements thereof.

Commissioner Anderson asked that in regard to Adj. 364, Commissioner West's motion be changed to read: Re: Adj. 364, Mr. Chan's application for a variance be approved for a 3'6" sideyard setback for the construction of an open carport.

Commissioner Heinecke moved adoption of the minutes as revised, seconded by Commissioner Gue, unanimously approved.

3. Old Business

A. Adjustments

- (1) ADJ. 362 -- Martha Bruckner. Application for a variance to construct a carport with a zero setback at 178 Camino de Herrera

Mrs. Bruckner had submitted a final plan as required by the Commission showing grading plan, contours and a profile. The City Engineer stated that there is an existing drain, however, it is not open, and it will be necessary to see that it is cleared of obstruction.

Commissioner Heinecke moved that Adj. 362, Martha Bruckner, application for a variance to construct a carport with a zero setback at 178 Camino de Herrera be approved on the conditions that it be constructed in accordance with the plans submitted to the Commission and that adequate drainage at the foot of the driveway, constructed satisfactory to the City Engineer, be installed as part of the improvements. Motion seconded by Commissioner Anderson, approved by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Anderson, Gue, Heinecke, Moore, Perry

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Commissioner Creighton abstained for the reason that he was unable to visit the site and he didn't think it would be prudent to vote as he could not properly evaluate the situation.

B. Subdivisions

- (1) S-72 Martha Bruckner - Application for a three-lot subdivision A/P 5-031-29, located on Camino de Herrera

When first heard on October 17, 1966, this application was referred back to the applicant for staking of corners; subsequently a field trip for site inspection was held. Access will be past the Cruckner house, through the driveway. Parcel #3 was not designated on the map, however, it is the existing parcel which is being improved by enlarging the site. Commissioner Moore said he thought the access

should be somewhat wider than 10 feet. Commissioner Creighton said he didn't feel it was good planning to approve a subdivision in which access was insufficient for emergency equipment. The City Engineer said the access was adequate for a fire truck.

Commissioner Heinecke moved that S-72, Martha Bruckner, application for a three-lot subdivision of A/P 5-031-29, ... located on Camino de Herrera be continued until such time as Mr. Bruckner has deposited with the City Attorney documents indicating to the satisfaction of the City Attorney that if this subdivision is approved, the purchasers of lot #2 will have legal access from Camino de Herrera to the lot line as proposed, and the City Attorney has reported to the Planning Commission. Motion seconded by Commissioner Moore, unanimously approved.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Correspondence

Letter from Division of Highways re Public Hearing Route #17.
Letter from Local Agency Formation Commission re Annexation of Rivers Brothers Ranch to the City of Fairfax.
Announcement of Exhibit of San Francisco Historic Sites.

Notice of Annexation to Sanitary District #1.

B. Matters for Consideration of the Planning Commission

(1) Loma Robles Landscaping Plan

Mr. Leitzell said a condition of approval of Use Permit #105 was the issuance of building permits shall be limited in number to 18, at which time the applicant shall submit landscaping plans and specifications, including a planting schedule for the entire subdivision. Also the Planning Commission has reserved the right to take further action to insure execution of the landscaping plan. A letter from Mr. Felkins of Meadowbrook was read which requested approval of the landscaping plan for the existing 18 units under construction. Mr. Leitzell said he felt it was necessary to have a bond to insure completion of the landscaping. Noen of the Planning Commissioners felt they were qualified to approve the proposed landscaping plans and felt they were qualified to approve the proposed landscaping plan and the matter was held over until the City Engineer has submitted the plans to the Council of Consultants available to the City and the approval of a competent consultant was given on the desirability of the plan. If possible, it is desirable to have the consultant meet with the planning commission when the matter is next considered.

(2) Design Review Ordinance

Commissioner Heinecke stated several changes had been made in the proposed ordinance after the two previous meetings on the proposed ordinance. He read the proposed changes. Commissioner Gue moved that the Design Review Ordinance be submitted as amended by Mr. Heinecke to the City Council with the Planning Commission recommendation that it be adopted by the City of San Anselmo seconded by Commissioner Moore, unanimously approved. Commissioner Heinecke said he had prepared a cover letter to the Council.

(3) Agreement between County of Marin and City of San Anselmo re Uniform Zoning Ordinance Study.

Each Commissioner had received a copy of the agreement and the prospectus. Mr. Leitzell said the city was required to furnish 3 manhours per month as their contribution. Commissioner Creighton moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the City participate in the program as projected in the prospectus dated November 2, 1966, seconded by Commissioner Gue, unanimously approved.

(4) Commissioner Heinecke questioned the manner in which the Planning Commission agendas were set up, and the need for reading correspondence at the meeting inasmuch as each commissioner had previously received a copy. It was suggested that correspondence that would be of interest to the audience could be thermofaxed to provide copies for interested persons.

At 10:15 p.m. Commissioner Creighton moved the meeting be adjourned, seconded by Commissioner Gue, unanimously approved.


WARREN R. PERRY
Planning Commission Chairman