

City of Albany
Planning and Zoning Commission
Approved Minutes January 25, 2011, Meeting

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 Commissioner Arkin, in the City Council Chambers at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 25, 2011.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

Present: Arkin, Maass, Panian

Absent: Moss

Staff present: Community Development Director Anne Chaney, Planning Manager Jeff Bond, Planning Clerk Amanda Bennett

4. Consent Calendar

a. Minutes from the December 14, 2010 Regular Commission Meeting.

Recommendation: approval.

b. 703 Solano. Planning Application #11-003. Design Review. The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to construct an enclosure for an elevator on the on the east of the residence.

Recommendation: approval.

c. 947 Jackson Street. Planning Application #09-076. Design Review and Parking Exception. The subject property is a 2,500 square foot lot with a partially constructed 1,553 square foot two-story residence. The property has been subject to code enforcement action by the City. The applicant received initial Planning and Zoning Commission approval for the project in 2004 and an amended approval in 2009.

Recommendation: status report for information only.

Commissioner Panian moved approval of the consent calendar. Commissioner Maass seconded.

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

Ayes: Arkin, Maass, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 3-0.

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. 1196 Curtis. Planning Application #10-049. Tentative Parcel Map.** The applicant is requesting approval of a parcel map to allow the subdivision of the property into two separate parcels.

Recommendation: study session only. No action will be taken at this meeting.

Planning Manager Bond delivered the staff report. Commissioner Arkin opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. John Gutierrez, representing Suzanne Portnoy, the property owner, was available to answer questions. No one else wished to speak. Commissioner Arkin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Panian asked for a full-size map with better information on adjoining properties. He wanted to know what the plan was and the justification for the demolition. Commissioner Maass would like to see the City explore possibilities for reclaiming open space. Commissioner Arkin could approve a side yard parking exception; otherwise an easement for shared access to rear parking would work. Creek setbacks would have to be adhered to. He recommended seeking information on restoring the creek. With the unique characteristics of the odd lot shape and the location of the creek, variances might be approved.

Commissioner Arkin moved continuation. Commissioner Panian seconded.

Vote to continue item **6a**:

Ayes: Arkin, Maass, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 3-0.

- b. 1614 Sonoma. Planning Application #10-065. Design Review.** The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to add 344 square feet to the second floor at the rear of the home.

Recommendation: approval.

Planning Manager Bond delivered the staff report. Commissioner Arkin opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Lillian Mitchell, the project architect, was available to answer questions. No one else wished to speak. Commissioner Arkin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Maass would have liked the wall moved two feet. Commissioner Panian appreciated the lower roof height. He thought trees should be maintained. He recommended reducing the deck. Commissioner Arkin noted the plate height and roofline and slope were reduced which would improve the neighbor's daylight. He noted the addition stepped down which was sensitive to the neighbor. He noted the roofline wrapped around the addition, which was a nice detail.

Commissioner Maass moved approval. Commissioner Panian seconded.

Vote to approve item **6b**:

Ayes: Arkin, Maass, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 3-0.

Findings. 1614 Sonoma.

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

Required Finding	<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>	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 City’s Residential Design Guidelines. The project will not create a visual detriment at the site or the neighborhood. In addition, the plate height of the new construction has been lowered and the roof pitch has been modified to reduce the height of the new construction.
3. <i>Approval of the project is in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare.</i>	<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>
4. <i>The project is in substantial compliance with applicable general and specific Standards for Review stated in Subsection 20.100.050.D.</i>	<i>The project as designed is in substantial compliance with the standards as stated, including harmonious materials, and well proportioned massing .</i>

c. 1109 Garfield. Planning Application #10-066. Design Review & Parking Exception.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to construct a new 1,500 square foot residence.

Recommendation: approval.

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

Commissioner Panian appreciated the change in materials. He wanted to be sure the windows would be recessed and have nice sills on the front and on the prominent windows on the east side. He also suggested maintaining rectangular patterns to porch and garage door. Commissioner Maass would prefer casement windows but understood they would be more expensive. Commissioner Arkin was glad to see the front door facing the street and to see the front porch. He could approve the parking exception in this location. The roof could use a larger overhang--18 inches as a minimum. A true carriage-style garage door would be preferred. He would like to see divided lights on the two upper windows facing the street—with surface muntins, not sandwiched. The gable vents should be closer to page 16 of the Residential Design Guidelines. The arch at the front porch seemed out of style—more porch columns in the craftsman style (see pp. 12-13 of Residential Design Guidelines) would be more in character. Commissioner Panian noted that the front porch detail should continue to the east side.

Commissioner Panian moved approval with the following conditions: window sills, upper front divided lights, attic vents, more rectilinear form around porch entry, carriage-style garage door, and extension of the eaves to 18-24 inches. Commissioner Maass seconded.

Vote to approve item 6c:

Ayes: Arkin, Maass, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 3-0.

Findings. 1109 Garfield.

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

<i>Required Finding</i>	<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</i>	<i>The proposal is in scale and harmony with existing development near the site. The</i>

<p><i>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>architectural style, design and building materials are consistent with the City’s Residential Design Guidelines. The project will not create a visual detriment at the site or the neighborhood.</p>
<p>3. <i>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>4. <i>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 harmonious materials, and well proportioned massing.</i></p>

Findings for Front Yard Parking Exception (Per section 20.28.040 of the AMC)

<i>Required Finding</i>	<i>Explanation</i>
<p>a. Parking within a main building, a garage, carport or other structure or in the rear or side yard is not feasible or will be disruptive to landmark trees or will severely restrict private outdoor living space on the site.</p>	<p>Allowing the front yard parking exception eliminates the need for a two-vehicle wide driveway, which results in a larger front porch and front yard landscape area.</p>
<p>b. The area proposed for parking in the front yard will not exceed seven (7) feet six (6) inches in width, and twenty (20) feet in length.</p>	<p>The proposed paved parking area is 7 feet 6 inches by 18 feet.</p>
<p>c. The parking space is designed so that no part of any vehicle will extend beyond the property line into the public right-of-way or will come within one (1) foot of the back of the sidewalk, nor permit a parked vehicle to constitute a visual obstruction exceeding three (3) feet in height within twenty-five (25) feet of the intersection of any two (2) street lines. The Planning and Zoning Commission shall not approve a front yard parking space unless a finding is made that visual obstructions are not</p>	<p>The proposed driveway does not impact the public right of way and is more than 25 feet from a street intersection.</p>

a significant safety hazard.	
d. Any required off-street parking spaces which are permitted in front yard areas are so located as to minimize aesthetic and noise intrusion upon any adjacent property.	The area designated for front yard parking is at least 17 feet from nearby structures.

- d. Election of Planning and Zoning Commission Officers.** Albany Municipal Code requires the Commission shall select a chair and vice-chair at least thirty and not more than 45 days after the annual City Council reorganization.

Recommendation: elect a Chair and Vice Chair.

Commissioner Panian nominated Commissioner Moss for Chair. Commissioner Maass seconded.

Vote to approve Commissioner Moss as Chair:

Ayes: Arkin, Maass, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 3-0.

Commissioner Maass nominated Commissioner Arkin for Vice Chair. Commissioner Panian seconded. Commissioner Arkin accepted.

Vote to approve Commissioner Arkin as Vice Chair:

Ayes: Arkin, Maass, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 3-0.

7. Announcements/Communications:

- a. Update on City Council agenda items related to Planning and Zoning activities.
- b. Review of status of major projects and scheduling of upcoming agenda items

8. Future Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Agenda Items:

- a. Next Regular Planning and Zoning Commission hearing scheduled for February 8, 2011.
- b. January 31, 2011, Commission and Committee Training, 7:30 p.m., City Council Chambers.
- c. Codornices Creek Project Phase III Ribbon Cutting, Friday, February 11, 2011, 12:00 - 1:30 p.m.
- d. Please note that the Regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting scheduled for February 22, 2011, will be rescheduled to February 23, 2011, due to the President's Day Holiday.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Next regular meeting: Tuesday, February 8, 2011, 7:30 p.m.

Submitted by:

Jeff Bond
Planning Manager