

The regular meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order by Vice Chairman John West at 8:00 p.m. on November 6, 1967, in the Council Chamber.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Anderson, Creighton, Heinecke, Moore, West

Commissioners absent: Gue, Perry

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 1967

Commissioner Creighton moved the minutes of October 16, 1967 be approved as written, seconded by Commissioner Moore, unanimously approved.

3. OLD BUSINESS

None

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. USE PERMIT APPLICATION

- (1) U-135 Application of Harold Sharrow to operate existing car wash at 580 Red Hill Avenue under the name of San Anselmo Car Wash

Mr. Harold Sharrow, prospective purchaser of the Car Wash was present with Mr. Jack Fink of Western Associates to whom the original Use Permit for the car wash had been issued. Mr. Fink said when the car wash was built the contractor had complied with the plans submitted, and all of the building inspections had been made and approved. He said it was not practical to plant trees in the rear of the lot because the hill continues to slough during the rainy season.

Commissioner Creighton said he had no objection to the operation of the car wash, but felt there should be some suitable ground covering installed on the bank at the rear of the car wash. Commissioners West and Anderson agreed.

Commissioner Creighton moved that U-135, application of Harold Sharrow to operate existing car wash at 580 Red Hill Avenue under the name of San Anselmo Car Wash be granted following the approval of the City Engineer of improved landscaping, either with planters or ground covering on the bank behind the car wash; further, the operating schedule and conditions of the new operators will be precisely the same conditions required of the former operators. Motion seconded by Commissioner Moore and approved by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Anderson, Creighton, Moore, West
NOES: Commissioner Heinecke

Commissioner Heinecke said he did not see why landscaping should be required at this time, that it should have been provided for at the time of the original Use Permit. He also said he felt approval of the landscaping by the City Engineer was putting too much of a burden on the City Engineer. The Chairman asked for a staff report including a short resume of the Sharrow Subdivision.

B. SUBDIVISION APPLICATION

- (1) S-55 Approval of Final Map, Maria Garaventa 3 lot subdivision on corner of The Alameda and Holstein Road. A/P 5-053-10

Mr. O'Rourke reported that the bond had been posted, fees paid, subdivision agreement signed, and the final map agrees with the tentative map previously approved by the Planning Commission.

11/6/67

Commissioner Anderson moved that the final map of S-53, Maria Garaventa, 3 lot subdivision on the corner of The Alameda and Holstein Road, A/P 5-053-10, dated May, 1967, be recommended for approval to the City Council. Motion seconded by Commissioner Creighton and unanimously approved.

5. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING COMMISSION

A. Changing the Name of San Diego Avenue to Alderney Road

The Engineer's report was read. It stated that there are no properties facing San Diego Avenue, therefore changing the street name would not necessitate any address changes and would eliminate confusion as to where El Cerrito Avenue ends and Alderney Road begins.

Commissioner Moore moved that San Diego Avenue, from Memorial Park to where it meets Alderney Road. Motion seconded by Commissioner Anderson and unanimously approved.

B. Associated Bay Area Government Preliminary Regional Plan

The Chairman asked the staff to make recommendations to the Planning Commission regarding the Preliminary Regional Plan.

C. Drafting of the Sign Ordinance

Chairman West suggested taking staff recommendations and the Chamber of Commerce recommendations and apply them to the Mill Valley Ordinance in order of section numbers. Mr. James Reed was present representing the Chamber of Commerce.

Section 16.04.010, line 4 "Director of Community Development" should be deleted and "Building Official" substituted. Unanimously agreed.

Section 16.04.030. In the second paragraph, line 10 reads: "Before a permit may be issued the application may be referred to the Architectural Advisory Committee....." The Chamber of Commerce recommends that the building department approve signs having an area of 40 square feet or less, only those signs having an area of more than 40 square feet be referred to the Design Review Committee for approval.

Commissioner Creighton felt 40 square feet was too large a sign to be approved by the building department; he recommended 25 square feet. Commissioner Moore thought 20 square feet more appropriate. All of the present Commissioners agreed that the 40 square feet recommendation of the Chamber of Commerce should be modified. No decision was made, and this item will be discussed further.

Section 16.04.040. The Chamber of Commerce recommends a flat fee of \$5.00 per sign permit. The Chairman asked for a staff recommendation on the cost of processing a sign permit application. (This should include signs that would have to go before Design Review as well as any approved by the Building Department.)

Section 16.04.080 B. The Commissioners felt the limitation of rustic projecting signs should be eliminated.

The staff was asked for a recommendation on the height of a projecting sign should be above the sidewalk. The Chamber of Commerce recommended 7-1/2 feet; however, Commissioner Anderson felt there was an existing ordinance which requires a 10 foot clearance.

11/6/67


There was some discussion regarding the limitation of the number of projecting signs per business frontage. Commissioner Creighton and Commissioner Anderson were in favor of limiting the number of allowable projecting signs if found inappropriate.

Section 16.04.120. The Chamber of Commerce has recommended that the size of signs on the building face should be limited in size to 1 square foot per front foot of building face, with the exception of buildings fronting on certain divided streets which would be allowed 1 & 1/2 square feet of signs per business frontage.

Most of the Commissioners were not in favor of increased sign area on certain divided streets. Commissioner West felt that if a larger sign is justified it could be handled through variance procedure.

The discussion of the proposed sign ordinance was continued until the next short agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.



JOHN F. WEST
VICE CHAIRMAN

