

MINUTES

SAN ANSELMO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

A meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of San Anselmo, State of California was held at 8:00 P. M., Monday evening March 19, 1951 in the Council Chambers, City Hall, San Anselmo, Calif.

Commissioners Present: Thomas Pring, Presiding as Chairman
Mary Gilkey
E. D. Pitman

Commissioners Absent : Merritt Webster
Charles Alfsnes

Inasmuch as there were only three commissioners present, and this did not constitute a quorum, the following account of the meeting is a resume of business brought before the commission as of this date, but no official action was taken.

SECOND HEARING - AMENDMENT TO ZONING ORDINANCE NO. 254 - RECLASSIFYING THE PRESENT UNRESTRICTED DISTRICT TO A COMMERCIAL DISTRICT - ESTABLISH A FUTURE WIDTH LINE OF 45 FEET FROM THE CENTER LINE OF SIR FRANCIS DRAKE.

Commissioner Pring announced that this was the Second Hearing for the above and City Engineer, who was present (Mr. A. H. Siemer) was called upon to state his ideas.

Mr. Siemer stated that it was his feeling that an additional 15' set back on each side of Sir Francis Drake at this time was not necessary, but that it was his feeling that a universal set back of the 15' allowed on both sides of the street as it now stands, from the Ross line to Fairfax would accomplish taking care of all traffic problems on that street during the foreseeable future.

Mrs. Gilkey stated that this amendment had been proposed to her by Mr. Siemer at a Planning Commission Meeting several months previous in the presence of the Mayor and other members of the City Council. Mr. Siemer had definitely suggested that a fifteen foot future width line be established from the Hub to the Fairfax line and it was pointed out to him that if this was to be the future street width, the residences should be set back from that line by an additional 15' from the one now established so that they would be in proper relationship to the future street. Mr. Siemer had agreed upon this point, and therefore the amendment was proposed as one of the changes in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Siemer stated that he had evidently not made himself clear or they had gained the wrong impression, for he did not mean that an additional fifteen feet should be established on each side of the street.

Mr. Salvatore Tartaul, 1547 Sir Francis Drake spoke aversely to the plan of taking more of the property for set back purposes than has already been planned. He questioned Commissioner Gilkey as to what the Master Plan covered, which the County was working on at this time. She explained this, stating it included both Sir Francis Drake and the old Railway Right of Way as well as an over all Plan for the whole County.

Mr. E. J. Shaw, 1510 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. questioned "Who is the Master Mind behind this plan"? This was explained to him. He suggested that the City Engineer be called into consultation with those who were working on the Master Plan for the County.

Mr. Milton Tonini's son, who is an Attorney, questioned the Commission as to just what steps are to be taken immediately to accomplish the plan as set forth in the above mentioned Ordinance. He asked what the County and City was ready to do to protect the individual right now, inasmuch as this matter coming up at this time has caused property owners to be alarmed about the future set backs on their property. This was discussed at length.

Mr. Tartaul questioned Mr. Siemer again about the Railway Right of Way and he explained that at the present time the City was not in a position to go ahead with plans for the Railway Right of Way, that the City does not hold title in fee to this property and it would be hazardous for the City to spend money now on making this a highway, but stated again he was not in favor of an additional fifteen foot set back along Sir Francis Drake at this time.

Much discussion followed about this matter and Commissioner Gilkey explained that the reason the matter had been brought up at this time was because traffic conditions and statistics taken by the County thru traffic counts, showed the need for future planning.

Commissioner Gilkey then moved that this question should be held in abeyance until June 4th which would give adequate time for the Master Plan, on which the County is working, to be submitted and considered by the Cities in Marin County. Inasmuch as the Commission lacked a quorum, legal action could not be taken at this meeting anyway.

Mr. Pitman seconded the motion and same was carried by an affirmative vote of all members present.

PUBLIC HEARING ON APPLICATION OF MR. RUDY LANG, JR. - REQUEST FOR REZONING THEIR PROPERTY ON REDHILL AVE. FROM FIRST RESIDENTIAL TO COMMERCIAL

Mr. Lang showed his tentative plans to the Commission members, but the plans still were not clear as to just how he intended to handle the traffic to and from his planned apartment buildings, and the members expressed reluctance to make any recommendations for his plans until something better could be worked out.

Mr. Lang again stated that he wanted to change his request from Commercial Zoning to Second Residential. Mrs. Lightbody, who was present, stated both Mrs. Ross and they would agree to such zoning, but not to Commercial.

The question about the 15' frontage which has been promised to the City by Mr. Lang's Grandfather came up and Mr. Lang stated such property would be deeded to the City when fifteen feet of property on the other side of Sir Francis Drake was deeded to the City for street widening purposes.

Mrs. Lightbody stated she had talked to Mr. Tucker relative to a right of way across his property and he had made it clear he had no intention of granting the Lang interests any such right of way. She stated that the present street - Spalding - which would carry the traffic to and from the buildings Mr. Lang has in mind, is overcrowded at the present time, since a machine shop uses it as well as the O'Connor Construction Co. Any additional traffic on this street would be extremely dangerous, due to the very steep approach.

It was suggested to Mr. Lang that he work out the matter of the dedication of the 15' for street widening purposes for the City, the drainage problem and better ingress and egress to this property and since no action could be taken at this meeting, he present these matters to the Commission at the next meeting. Therefore the hearing was continued to April 2nd.

PETITION OF CLARA JANSEN, HARRY PRUYN AND H. H. HEIFETS, TO REZONE PROPERTY AT 210 RED HILL AVENUE FROM FIRST RESIDENTIAL TO COMMERCIAL

Mr. Shone, attorney for the above, was present and stated that they had requested this rezoning as they felt that it was logical since the property along Red Hill is predominantly commercial. The present owners had bought this property with the thought of developing it into commercial property.

Mr. Roy Farrington Jones represented the opposite view and he presented his ideas and those ideas of those who felt this property should not be rezoned to Commercial property. He presented the same arguments as previously given on March 5th, at the First Legal Hearing on this petition.

Mr. H. H. Heifetz, one of the owners, was present and he answered Mr. Jones relative to the matter of disturbing Parkway, saying that it had not been their intention to disturb anything on Parkway Drive. It was their intention to use Red Hill as a means of ingress and egress.

Lack of quorum prevented decision and this hearing was ordered held over until the next meeting - April 2nd.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PETITION OF A. C. SIGNORELLI, J. S. SOUSA, JAMES R. BRANDON and J. W. MC CALL TO REZONE PROPERTY FROM FIRST RESIDENTIAL TO SECOND - LOTS 4, 5, 6 and 7, BLOCK 1, SEQUOIA PARK, UNIT ONE.

First Public Hearing had been advertised for this meeting.

Mr. Signorelli was present and represented the above group. He stated he ~~felt~~ that he had requested this zoning as it was the opinion of the owners that this property could best be utilized by zoning it to Second Residential in order to build a duplex on same.

Lack of a quorum prevented decision and this hearing was held over until the next meeting - April 2nd.

March 19, 1951

Page 4.

MR. WM. SOUSA - REQUEST FOR APPLICATION TO REZONE HIS PROPERTY IN
SUNNYSIDE TRACT FROM FIRST RESIDENTIAL TO SECOND RESIDENTIAL

Second Public Hearing.

Mr. Sousa was present and stated he wishes to build duplexes. He plans to build three separate units, will live in the old house until the new units have been built, and later on plans to build a new unit where the old house now stands.

He questioned as to whether or not Lot No. 29 would be covered by this rezoning. It was explained to him that it would not, inasmuch as this particular request only covered Lots 27 and 28 and that it would be necessary for the owner of lot No. 29 - Mr. Torresan, to request the rezoning of his lot, if he so wished.

Lack of a quorum prevented decision and this hearing was held over until the next meeting - April 2nd.

MR. CHARLES BEEDLE, 150 SAN FRANCISCO BLVD. REQUEST FOR ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Beedle presented "Application for Adjustment" blank which he had filled out and had shown his plan for moving his garage to the back of his lot. Explained why he was requesting to be allowed to place it closer than 15 feet to the street. It seemed to be the consensus of the members present that this could be done, since the building was a hazard to the traffic to and from the Legion Cabin as it is presently situated. Also Mr. Beedle cannot finish construction of the sidewalk along the front of his property while the garage stands where it does presently.

Lack of a quorum prevented decision and this hearing was held over until the next meeting - April 2nd.

PETITION OF P: F. WILLIAMS TO REZONE LOTS 5 and 6, BLOCK 2, SEQUOIA
PARK FROM FIRST RESIDENTIAL TO SECOND RESIDENTIAL

The following resolution was introduced by Commissioner Gilkey and moved its adoption.

RESOLUTION 9A.

Whereas: P. F. Williams has petitioned for an amendment to Ordinance No. 254 of the City of San Anselmo, in order to reclassify the property described as follows:

LOTS 5 AND 6, BLOCK 2, SEQUOIA PARK, SEC. 1.

from FIRST RESIDENTIAL TO SECOND RESIDENTIAL .

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: This Commission does hereby set times and places for public hearings on said proposed amendment, at which times and places any and all persons interested may appear and be heard thereon, which times and places are as follows, to wit:


1. At the hour of 8:00 P. M. Monday evening on the 2nd of April, 1951 in the Chamber of the City Council in the City Hall, San Anselmo, California.
2. At the hour of 8:00 P. M. Monday evening on the 16th of April, 1951 in the Chambers of the City Council in the City Hall, San Anselmo, California.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Secretary of this Commission be and the same is hereby directed to give notice of the aforesaid hearings by causing notice of said hearings to be published as provided by law in a newspaper of general circulation in said City.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a Resolution which was adopted by an affirmative vote of all the voting members of the City Planning Commission present at the meeting of March 19th, City of San Anselmo, State of California at a meeting thereof, held on the 5th day of March, 1951.


MERRITT WEBSTER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:


Irma B. Anderson, Recording Secretary

Commissioner Pring seconded the Motion and it was passed by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Commissioners: Pring, Gilkey and Pitman
NOES: None
ABSENT: Webster and Alfsnes

REQUEST FOR ADJUSTMENT BY MR. P. F. WILLIAMS - Lot 24, MORNINGSIDE CT.

Mr. Williams appeared, presented plans for a house which he is building and upon which he had been ordered to stop work by the Building Commission inasmuch as it did not conform to Ord. No. 254. Mr. Williams stated that through an error the carpenter had built the foundation to the structure closer than he had intended him to and this had brought the service porch overhang into the 5' space along the side property line, which was the reason for the stop order. (to the side property line)

Although it was the consensus of those members present that this service porch could be allowed to remain as planned, inasmuch as it would not interfere with the adjacent property, due to the terrain of the lot, they were unable to make any decision or make any recommendations at this meeting, due to a lack of a quorum and he was advised to bring this matter up at the next meeting - April 2nd.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 P.M.

THOMAS PRING, Chairman.