

CITY OF BELMONT
PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY MINUTES

TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2010, 7:00 PM

Chair Horton called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at One Twin Pines Lane, City Hall Council Chambers.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Horton, Mayer, Reed, Mercer, Frautschi, Parsons

Commissioners Absent: Mathewson

Staff Present: Community Development Director de Melo (CDD), City Attorney Zafferano (CA), Recording Secretary Turning (RS)

2. AGENDA AMENDMENTS - None

3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments) – None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

4A. Minutes of February 2, 2010

MOTION: By Commissioner Reed, seconded by Vice Chair Mayer, to accept the Minutes of February 2, 2010 as presented.

Ayes: Reed, Mayer, Parsons, Frautschi, Reed, Horton

Noes: None

Abstain: Mercer

Absent: Mathewson

Motion passed 5/0/1/1

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

5A. PUBLIC HEARING – 1 Spring Lane - CONTINUED

The applicant requests Single Family Design Review approval to construct a 1,085 square foot addition to the existing 2,004 square foot single family residence for a total of 3,089 square feet that is below the zoning district permitted 3,500 square feet for the site.

(Appl. No. 2009-48)

APN: 045-202-280; Zoned: R-1A (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303

Applicant: Zeitgeist Design

Owner: Rajenra Kumar

Planner: Rob Gill - 650-598-4204

This item was continued to the March 16, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting

5B. PUBLIC HEARING – Zoning Code Amendments

To consider Zone Text Amendments to Sections 2.94, 2.96, 8.2.6, and 8.3.2(a) & (b) of the City of Belmont Zoning Code as follows: the “*Parking Area, Private*” definition, the “*Parking Space*” definition, the “*Location of Required Parking Facilities*” and “*Access*” Sections as related to the disposition of semi-circular driveways and access to parking spaces within Residential Districts.

(Appl. No. 2010-0004) CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15308 - Actions of Regulatory Agencies for the Protection of the Environment. Applicant: City of Belmont.

CDD de Melo summarized the Staff Report, which included staff’s first draft of suggested changes, and asked for discussion and comments from the Commission.

Responding to Commissioner Reed, CDD de Melo provided a detailed explanation of Section 8.3.2, Access.

Responding to Vice Chair Mayer’s suggestion, CDD de Melo concurred that the last sentence in 2.96 could be moved to Section 8.2.6 since it is technically not a definition.

Chair Horton opened the Public Hearing.

David Marzelli, Belmont resident, was in favor of the establishment of a standard for circular driveways but suggested that they consider providing a green space side setback to avoid a potential 24” curb cut if the neighbor also puts in a circular driveway and the driveways meet at the property line. He also raised the question of what provisions are made to establish the legal property line if there is no side setback.

Charles Rinaldi, Belmont resident, commended staff and the Commission on their efforts on this amendment. His only suggestion was that additional width be allowed at the upper curvature of the semi-circular driveway where people would be parking their vehicles to load and unload items, so that they would not need to step on the vegetation on either side of the driveway. Responding to Commissioner Mercer, he stated that the space from the left corner of his garage to the front property line is 25’.

Motion: By Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Mercer, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed 6/0/1 by a show of hands, with Commissioner Mathewson absent.

Discussion ensued as follows:

Section 2.94 – Definition of Parking Area, Private

After discussion, the following language was agreed upon under the definition of acceptable permeable surfaces: “An open, hard, paved or permeably-surfaced area, made available for the storage of private passenger automobiles of occupants of the building or buildings for which the parking area is developed and is accessory. This is not the street or the public way.” Commissioner Parsons suggested the addition that “gravel or dirt or lawn-paved driveways are not acceptable.”

Section 2.96 – Definition of Parking Space

Commissioner Mercer concurred with Vice Chair Mayer's earlier observation that code specifications should not be included in the definitions. It could be moved to 8.2.6. CA Zafferano suggesting replacing the wording "toward satisfaction" with "to satisfy."

Discussion ensued regarding the parking of vehicles on circular driveways and what lot sizes and shapes that could accommodate circular driveways. Commissioner Mercer suggested that the amendment be written so that circular driveways are not permitted unless an exception was approved by the Planning Commission that met certain findings regarding lot size, safety hazards, etc. Commissioners would like to see sketches or pictures of what circular driveways would look like on various lot sizes and shapes. Commissioner Parsons added that encroachment on side yard setbacks at curbs should not be allowed. CDD de Melo will redraft the code to allow for various sized and shaped lots and to include an exceptions process to allow a circular driveway.

Regarding the last two bullet points under 8.2.6, it was agreed that a maximum of 2 curb cuts per property for a sum total not to exceed of 37 lineal feet would be allowed and that reference to paved walkways will be dealt with when they discuss hardscape.

Commissioner Reed raised a question about the City's authority to monitor how long someone is allowed to park a properly registered vehicle on their own private property. CDD de Melo commented that enforcement would be a concern and it was agreed that if larger lots are required it would not be as much of an issue.

CDD de Melo stated that staff will clean up the language of these amendments and provide sketches of the typical lot. He understood that the standards regarding the lot size, the lot frontage and the setback to the dwelling need to be increased, that a side yard setback will need to be inserted, and that there should be a front landscape requirement.

6. STUDY SESSION

6A. Discussion Regarding Belmont Zoning Ordinance Section 12.12 – Administrative Approvals of Amendments to Detailed Development Plans - *(Continued from 2/16/10 Planning Commission Meeting)*

CDD de Melo summarized the discussion and recommended changes from the 2/16/10 Planning Commission Meeting. Discussion ensued; additional amendments were suggested by the Commission to staff.

CDD de Melo welcomed the Commissions feedback on Section 12.12 and stated such feedback may result in direction towards future Zone Text Amendments.

Addendum to Item 5B

Charles Rinaldi asked to address the Commission with closing comments regarding item 5B. He stated that Escondido is a dead-end street and that no one parks on the street, residents use their garages or their driveways and there are no sidewalks. Regarding the discussion on laws on parking long-term on private property, he noted that people who have tandem garages often do not bring their cars all the way up to the front of their garages. Are they parked illegally for not having it in front of their garage? He believed that

37 linear feet is way too big and asked that the Commission reconsider that number. He invited Commissioners to visit his home if they want to visualize what a circular driveway would look like on his property.

7. REPORTS, STUDIES AND UPDATES:

CDD de Melo reported as follows:

7A. Ralston/US-101 Landscape Project

There are funding shortfalls in Redwood City relative to this project. They will have to get a re-bid from a contractor. Redwood City will try to apply for a grant for this project. The landscaping is expected to go in as planned and designed.

7B. San Mateo Development – North Road/43rd Avenue

He has been working with the Public Works Department relative to the dumpster issue adjacent to Planet Granite. Letters have been sent to the property owner. Commissioner Parsons asked if the City could ask the dumpster owner to haul them away since they are encroaching on public property. He also suggested that the Planet Granite Conditional Use Permit should be called up due to the unsightly condition of the property.

7C. Parking Study – Downtown Village Area

No report at this time.

7D. High-Speed Train (HST) Project – San Francisco to San Jose

The Alternatives Analysis study that had been targeted to be released by the end of this week is delayed with no projected date for issuance. Belmont will be hosting the consortium meetings on two Fridays a month in July, August and September. The April, May and June meetings will be held in Atherton.

7E. Emmett House

Commissioner Parsons, Chair Horton and CDD de Melo reviewed the exterior color swatches with the project manager and contractor. As soon as weather permits, the contractor will paint the front face of the building so that people can look at that corner to determine if it is the right color set. They also looked at interior finishes and will meet with the architect to go over that material.

7F. 1000 South Road

He met with the contractor and architect and believes they will be pulling permits within 30 days to rehab the entire building. He also asked for a landscape plan for the project, which will be shared with the Commission when it is received.

Other Items

Since the Bike Bridge project is slated to begin in April, he would like to add it to the Item 7 list.

Commissioner Frautschi suggested that the Mayor be asked to call Caltrans to seek clean-up of the garbage at the 101/ Ralston interchange.

Responding to Commissioner Frautschi, CDD de Melo stated that the City has not as yet taken a stand on the proposed salt flats development.

Commissioner Frautschi asked for an update on the Tree Ordinance. Commissioner Mercer reported that the committee had submitted a preliminary draft to the City Attorney for review, which had been returned to them with his comments. The committee has not met for 3 months but will be meeting again now that the draft has been returned. They hope to have a draft for Council by the end of spring. The Parks and Rec Director and Parks Supervisor will be taking it to City Council in the next few months with conceptual policy ideas and then will come to the Planning and Parks Commission for a final vetting before it goes to the City Council with the actual wording.

CDD de Melo reported on the successful Owner/Builder Workshop that was held the previous Thursday and which was attended by 15-20 people.

Regarding proposed changes to the Belmont Sign Ordinance, an outreach meeting has been tentatively scheduled for Friday morning, March 19th, for Belmont businesses on El Camino.

Reminder that the Commission Appreciation Dinner will be held on the following Friday night.

Chair Horton's suggestion that the Commission consider meeting once a month rather than twice a month will be agendized for a future meeting.

8. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 2010

Liaison: Vice Chair Mathewson
Alternate Liaison: Commissioner Reed

9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m. to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, March 16, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. in Belmont City Hall.

Carlos de Melo
Planning Commission Secretary

*CD's of Planning Commission Meetings are available in the
Community Development Department.
Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.*

I:/Planning Com/Min03022010