



## Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 22-209  
**Type:** Minutes **Status:** Agenda Ready  
**File created:** 4/29/2022 **In control:** Planning Commission  
**On agenda:** 5/2/2022 **Final action:**  
**Title:** April 18, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes  
**Sponsors:**  
**Indexes:**  
**Code sections:**  
**Attachments:** 1. Minutes

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

MINUTES  
TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO PLANNING COMMISSION  
Monday, April 18, 2022  
This meeting was conducted via Zoom.

Commissioners Present: Chair Thomas Tunny  
Jennifer Asselstine  
Leyla Hilmi  
Danny Krebs  
Gary Smith

Commissioners Absent: Tim Heiman

Staff Present: Town Clerk Carla Kacmar  
Assistant Town Attorney Emily Longfellow  
Planning Consultant Lorraine Weiss

### 1. Call to Order

Chair Tunny opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

### 2. Open Time for Public Expression

There were no comments.

### 3. Planning Directors Report

There was no report.

### 4. Approval of Minutes

A. Approve minutes from the March 21, 2022 meeting.

M/s, Krebs/Smith, motion to approve the March 21, 2022 minutes as submitted.

Ayes: All

Absent: Heiman

## 5. Public Hearings

- A. 24 Woodland Avenue: Design Review for a significant remodel and second story addition. The applicant requests design review to construct a 174 square foot first story addition and 1,093 square foot second story addition to an existing legal non-conforming single-family residence in an R-2 Medium Density Multifamily Zoning District. The lower-level floor would be elevated 1'9" to comply with Town flood prevention regulations. The maximum building height would be 26'-6" (up to 30 feet allowed). This project was continued for further redesign at the January 10, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.

Planning Consultant Weiss presented the staff report. She made the following corrections to the staff report: 1) On page 3, first bullet under "Project Description", the reference to a reduction in the garage size is not applicable to this project and the end of the sentence should read, "...this eliminates the legal non-conformity"; 2) On page 6, the staff recommendation is to the Planning Commission and not the Town Council. The Commission continued this application at its January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting to allow the applicant to revise the design to provide a 20-foot upper floor front yard setback in order for the front building elevation to be further back from the street and sidewalk and to revise the story poles to reflect these changes. She summarized the revisions made to the design.

Chair Tunny opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Jeff Kroot, architect, gave the following comments:

- They considered the Commission comments from the last meeting.
- They looked at the floor plan and decided to move the house back four feet.
- The plans are similar to what was submitted in January.
- There are existing rooms on the lower floor that they wanted to keep.
- There will be a new foundation.
- This two-story house is similar to the others in the neighborhood.
- They are keeping the front porch.
- The design will be attractive as seen from the street.
- There was universal support from the neighbors.

Commissioner Krebs asked if the new plans were presented to the neighbors. Mr. Kroot stated he was not sure. The change in the story poles depicted the design. Commissioner Krebs asked if there was an obligation to re-notice this application. Town Clerk Kacmar stated all residents within a 300-foot radius received a notice.

Chair Tunny closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Smith provided the following comments:

- He likes the direction of the changes.
- The façade is softened by having multiple planes at different lengths from the street.
- It looks less massive.
- He likes the east elevation- it is softer due to the relief given by the different planes. It has a sense of depth and texture.
- The west elevation window wall is a by-product of having a two-story home. It would be difficult to

change the number of windows without impacting the program.

- The revised proposal conforms to the Commissions' prior recommendations.

Commissioner Hilmi provided the following comments:

- Her prior concerns about the setback distance and setting a precedent have been addressed.
- She has no objections to the design.
- She could approve the application.

Commissioner Asselstine provided the following comments:

- She appreciated the owners and the architect addressing the Commission concerns.
- A fair bit of work will be done on the site given the need for a new foundation.
- She supported the overall re-massing.
- She is pleased with the amount of neighborhood support.

Commissioner Krebs provided the following comments:

- He agreed with the comments made by Commissioner Asselstine.
- This is a well-designed house.
- This is a fairly large house on a smaller lot (0.45 Floor Area Ratio) but this is common in this neighborhood.
- He supports the project.

Chair Tunny provided the following comments:

- He agreed with the comments made by the other Commissioners.
- This design is well done.
- He appreciates the efforts of the owners and the architect.

M/s, Krebs/Hilmi, motion to approve the application based on the findings and conditions set forth in the staff report.

Ayes: All

Absent: Heiman

Chair Tunny stated there is a 10-day appeal period.

**B. Continued to May 2, 2022**

931 San Anselmo Avenue: Request for a Conditional Use Permit to convert the existing Full Circle residential home for individuals recovering from chemical dependency into a licensed care facility. The facility would continue to serve 17 adults in total at any given time. However, clients would not have vehicles at this site. Additional staff would work at the site and use the existing parking spaces. Clients are expected to stay for periods of 30 days, where existing clients generally stay for several months. Clients would not see visitors on site. The applicant proposes client admission during daytime business hours and an offsite business office. This item was continued from the March 7, 2022 Planning Commission Public Hearing.

Assistant Town Attorney Longfellow stated this item has been continue to the May 16, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.

**C. Continued to May 2, 2022**

141 Crescent Road: Design Review for two-story addition and floor area exception to construct a 172 square foot, two-story addition to the south facing side of the existing single-family residence. The maximum building height would be

approximately 22' (up to 30 feet is allowed)

- D. Determine the Commission's preferred meeting format based on the Town Council direction

Town Clerk Kacmar presented the staff report. The Council has decided that the public cannot attend meetings in person and the focus of the discussion should be on Commissioner's attendance options. She discussed the options: 1) Continue Zoom meetings; 2) A hybrid option. In person attendance would require proof of two vaccinations.

Commissioner Krebs asked how the hybrid option would work (camera system, TV screen, etc.). Town Clerk Kacmar stated Marin TV would be in the Council Chambers with a monitor that would allow screening of the Zoom participants. The goal is to duplicate the experience whether participating in person or via Zoom.

Commissioner Smith asked if in person attendance would require wearing a mask. Town Clerk Kacmar stated it was optional.

Commissioner Hilmi had questions about how documents and plans would be displayed. Town Clerk Kacmar stated the Town would have a Smartscreen for this purpose.

Assistant Town Attorney Longfellow stated many of the jurisdictions in Marin have decided to do hybrid meetings. Officials and staff attend in person.

Commissioner Asselstine had a question about how public presentations and testimony (applicants and neighbors) would be handled.

Chair Tunny opened the Public Hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Tunny closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Krebs stated he could support trying out a hybrid meeting. However, there is great benefit in the interaction between the Commission and the public.

Chair Tunny supported the hybrid option and would like to know ahead of time what Commissioners planned to do. He would probably attend the meeting if everybody else did. He did not want to burden staff.

Commissioner Hilmi stated it did not make sense to have in person meetings without the public. She asked if an exception could be made to allow the public at Commission meetings. Assistant Town Attorney Longfellow stated it would be difficult for the Council to make one set of findings for the Planning Commission and another for the other bodies.

Commissioner Smith agreed and supported the continuation of Zoom meetings until everyone can attend in person.

Commissioner Asselstine stated she would attend in person if everyone else did. She emphasized that all individuals speaking to the Commission must be treated equally. The use of Zoom can make things more democratic.

M/s, Krebs/Asselstine, motion to approve the continuation of a solely virtual meeting format and re-evaluate in May.

Ayes: All

Absent: Heiman

6. Items from Planning Commission

Commissioner Asselstine asked Town Clerk Kacmar if the Commission could receive materials for the 931 San Anselmo Avenue application as soon as possible. Town Clerk Kacmar stated “yes”.

Commissioner Krebs asked about the recruitment for a new Planning Director. Assistant Town Attorney Longfellow stated staff has received responses to the Request for Proposal (RFP) and will be looking at the candidates.

7. Adjournment- Chair Tunny adjourned the meeting at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Toni DeFrancis, Recording Secretary