

*City of Albany*  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**Approved Minutes February 23, 2010, Meeting**

**APPROVED**

*Note: These minutes are subject to Planning and Zoning Commission approval. The minutes are not verbatim. An audiotape of the meeting is available for public review.*

## **Regular Meeting**

### **1. Call to order**

The meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order by Chair Gardner, in the City Council Chambers at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 23, 2010.

### **2. Pledge of Allegiance**

### **3. Roll Call**

Present: Arkin, Gardner, Maass, Moss, Panian

Absent: None

Staff present: Planning Manager Jeff Bond, Planning Clerk Amanda Bennett

### **4. Consent Calendar**

#### **a. Minutes from the October 27, 2009 Regular Commission Meeting.**

*Recommendation: Approve.*

#### **b. Minutes from the November 10, 2009 Regular Commission Meeting.**

*Recommendation: Approve.*

#### **c. Minutes from the November 24, 2009 Regular Commission Meeting.**

*Recommendation: Approve.*

Commissioner Panian moved approval of the consent calendar. Commissioner Arkin seconded. Chair Gardner and Commissioner Moss recused themselves from voting on minutes for meetings they did not attend.

Vote to approve items **4a, 4b, and 4c**:

Ayes: Arkin, Gardner, Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 5-0.

### **5. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items**

There was no public comment.

### **6. Discussions and Possible Action on Matters Related to the Following Items**

- a. 1014 Ordway. Planning Application 10-004. Design Review.** The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to allow an approximately 213 sq. ft. addition to the first floor and a 23 square foot reduction to the second floor. The ground floor will be reconstructed and the maximum height of the home will increase from approximately 17 feet to approximately 24 feet in height.

*Recommendation: Approval*

Planning Manager Bond delivered the staff report. Chair Gardner opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Gary Samonsky, the project architect, was available to answer questions. No one else wished to speak. Chair Gardner closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Arkin found this design simply superb. Commissioner Panian noted it was modest, and would have been an administrative approval but for the change in height. Chair Gardner stated the design was nicely done. The green points were less than 50% but they were redoing a lot of the house. Commissioner Maass appreciated the clever reorganization of the interior.

Commissioner Moss moved approval. Commissioner Panian seconded.

Vote to approve item 6a:

Ayes: Arkin, Gardner, Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 5-0.

**Findings. 1014 Ordway**

**Findings for Design Review approval (Per section 20.100.050.E of the AMC)**

<b><u>Required Finding</u></b>	<i>Explanation</i>
1. <i>The project conforms to the General Plan, any applicable specific plan, applicable design guidelines adopted by the City of Albany, and all applicable provisions of this Chapter.</i>	<i>The General Plan designates this area for residential development. Additionally, the project meets City zoning standards for location, intensity and type of development.</i>
2. <i>Approval of project design is consistent with the purpose and intent of this section, which states “designs of projects...will result in improvements that are visually and functionally appropriate to their site conditions and harmonious with their surroundings, including natural landforms and vegetation. Additional purposes of design review include (but are not limited to): that retention and maintenance of existing buildings and landscape features are considered; and that site access and vehicular parking are sufficient.”</i>	<i>The proposal is in scale and harmony with existing development in the vicinity of the site. The architectural style, design and building materials are consistent with the existing dwelling and with the City’s Residential Design Guidelines. The proposed project will provide safe and convenient access to the property for both vehicles and pedestrians. The project will maintain the primary trees on the site and will not require significant grading. The project will create attractive new entrance to the residence.</i>
3. <i>Approval of the project is in the interest of public health, safety and general</i>	<i>The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of</i>

<p>welfare.</p>	<p>those in the area and would not adversely impact property, improvements or potential future development in the area. The project will include removal of vinyl siding and upgrade the structural strength of the residence.</p>
<p>4. The project is in substantial compliance with applicable general and specific Standards for Review stated in Subsection 20.100.050.D.</p>	<p>The project as designed is in substantial compliance with the standards as stated, including access, architecture, natural features, coordination of design details, retention and maintenance of buildings, and privacy.</p>

- b. 1601 Sonoma. Planning Application 10-009. Design Review.** The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to allow an 803 square foot addition to the rear of the first floor and an addition to the front and rear of the existing second floor. Off-street parking will be provided in the rear yard of the property with a driveway running off of Ordway.  
*Recommendation: Approval*

Planning Manager Bond delivered the staff report. Chair Gardner opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Josefina Coloma was available to answer questions. No one else wished to speak. Chair Gardner closed the public hearing.

Commissioners Panian, Maass, and Moss found the design thoughtful and attractive. Chair Gardner asked whether it had been agreed the shed was to be modified.

Commissioner Arkin moved approval. Commissioner Moss seconded.

Vote to approve item **6b**:

Ayes: Arkin, Gardner, Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 5-0.

**Findings. 1601 Sonoma**

**Findings for Design Review approval (Per section 20.100.050.E of the AMC)**

<p><b>Required Finding</b></p>	<p><i>Explanation</i></p>
<p>1. The project conforms to the General Plan, any applicable specific plan,</p>	<p>The General Plan designates this area for residential development. Additionally, the</p>

<p><i>applicable design guidelines adopted by the City of Albany, and all applicable provisions of this Chapter.</i></p>	<p><i>project meets City zoning standards for location, intensity and type of development.</i></p>
<p><i>2. Approval of project design is consistent with the purpose and intent of this section, which states “designs of projects...will result in improvements that are visually and functionally appropriate to their site conditions and harmonious with their surroundings, including natural landforms and vegetation. Additional purposes of design review include (but are not limited to): that retention and maintenance of existing buildings and landscape features are considered; and that site access and vehicular parking are sufficient.”</i></p>	<p><i>The proposal is in scale and harmony with existing development in the vicinity of the site. The architectural style, design and building materials are consistent with the existing dwelling and with the City’s Residential Design Guidelines. The proposed project will provide safe and convenient access to the property for both vehicles and pedestrians.</i></p>
<p><i>3. Approval of the project is in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare.</i></p>	<p><i>The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience and welfare of those in the area and would not adversely impact property, improvements or potential future development in the area.</i></p>
<p><i>4. The project is in substantial compliance with applicable general and specific Standards for Review stated in Subsection 20.100.050.D.</i></p>	<p><i>The project as designed is in substantial compliance with the standards as stated, including access, architecture, natural features, coordination of design details, retention and maintenance of buildings, and privacy.</i></p>

- c. **710 Solano. Planning Application 10-007. Design Review.** The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to allow a second 1,099 square foot unit. The maximum height of the home will be approximately 26 feet in height. The home will maintain the ranch-style design, with horizontal wood siding and hipped roof. Off-street parking will be provided in the rear yard of the property with a driveway running along the east side of the property.  
*Recommendation: Provide direction to staff and applicant and continue action to a future meeting.*

Planning Manager Bond delivered the staff report. Chair Gardner opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Bill Wang, the project designer, was available to answer questions. No one else wished to speak. Chair Gardner closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Moss provided the following notes: the front entry needs to be accented more, break the wall up with a pattern or something. Scale, massing, height okay, more detail on next set of drawings, maybe change of materials, want to see railing, could put a little roof over garage door, window on east side, ridge back front roof so you get drainage on the sides. Commissioner Maass agreed, especially to ridge roof back.

Commissioner Panian noted the design lacks contribution to the street (pedestrian friendliness), definitely agrees on roof painting material. Perhaps a gable roof, a porch integrated with the roof, transition of materials, better quality windows, perhaps. Commissioner Arkin stated the staff suggestions were good ones and he supported the front porch idea. 9'8" plate height on second story is out of scale: 8 ½ or 8 feet would be better – can use scissor truss or cathedral ceiling. Make driveway narrower, add windows, provide cut sheets of window desing, hip roofs appropriate. Change of material – can do at windowsills. He recommended looking at 1108 8<sup>th</sup> Street. Chair Gardner found this a nice approach to adding a unit in this area and it was nice to see parking.

Commissioner Arkin moved continuation. Commissioner Panian seconded.

Vote to continue item 6c:

Ayes: Arkin, Gardner, Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 5-0.

**7. Announcements/Communications:**

- a. **Status Report on City Council Special Meeting of February 22, 2010, Regarding the City's Mission, Vision, and Core Values**
- b. **Update on next steps associated with the Climate Action Plan**

**8. Future Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Agenda Items:**

- a. **Next regularly scheduled Planning and Zoning Commission hearing scheduled for March 9, 2010.**

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Next regular meeting: Tuesday, March 9, 2010, 7:30 p.m.

---

Submitted by:

---

**Jeff Bond**  
**Planning Manager**