

City of Albany

Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes September 11, 2013 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 Chair Eisenmann in the City Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 11, 2013.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **ROLL CALL**

Present: Arkin, Eisenmann, Moss, Pilch

Absent: Donaldson

Staff present: City Planner Anne Hersch

Community Development Director Jeff Bond

Planning Intern Sara Muse

City Attorney Craig Labadie

4. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

(Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted by one motion. By approval of the Consent Calendar, the staff recommendations will be adopted unless otherwise modified by the Commission. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Commission Member or a member of the audience requests removal of the items from the Consent Calendar.)

Commissioner Moss asked to pull item 4B.

Commissioner Arkin noted he was absent for the May 8 and May 22 meetings and made a minor correction on the March 27 minutes, where the words "needs fixing" on page 3, line 23, should be outside the parentheses not inside.

Motion to approve Consent Calendar with exception of item 4B: Arkin

Second: Pilch

AYES: Arkin, Eisenmann, Moss, Pilch

NAYES: None

Motion Passes, 4-0

A. **PA 13-035, 911 Peralta Ave Design Review** -The applicant is seeking Design Review approval to convert an existing single-car garage to a finished accessory structure at 911 Peralta Avenue. The existing garage is 171 sq. ft. and the new accessory is proposed to be 240 sq. ft. A new half-bathroom is proposed. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing concrete

1 patio and driveway with permeable pavers and landscaping. Parking is
2 provided in the existing driveway.

3 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
4 **conditions.**

5
6 **CEQA: Categorically Exempt per Section 15303 "New Construction or**
7 **Conversion of Small Structures" of the CEQA Guidelines**

- 8
9 **B. PA 13-045, 700 San Pablo Ave Conditional Use Permit** -The applicant is
10 seeking Conditional Use Permit approval to install a paint spray booth inside
11 the building at 700 San Pablo Avenue, 101 Auto Care. The building is
12 approximately 5,000 sq. ft. and is located on San Pablo Avenue, at Castro
13 Street. The applicant is proposing to offer bodywork sales/installation to the
14 rear of the property, approximately 260 ft. in area. The proposed services will
15 be completely enclosed within the existing public and not visible from the
16 street.

17 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
18 **conditions.**

19
20 **CEQA: Categorically Exempt per Section 15303, "New Construction or**
21 **Conversion of Small Structures" of the CEQA Guidelines**

22
23 Anne Hersch presented the staff report.

24
25 Commissioner Moss- noted he would like to see two illegal items brought to
26 code along with revisions to ADA that would be made because of the
27 addition of the paint booths. These two items are: 1) a pipe that sticks out
28 from the building to the sidewalk, 2) metal box that was added to the front
29 of the building.

30
31 **Henry Seng**- noted the box was not on his property.

32
33 Commissioner Arkin- said rather than replacing the pipe, they could find a
34 more inexpensive way to correct this hazard.

35
36 The Commission agreed that the changes could be reviewed by staff.

37
38 **Motion to Approve item 4B:** Arkin

39 -with condition that fire riser pipe is given some protection to satisfaction of
40 City staff and that the pipe addresses ADA concerns

41 **Second:** Moss

42 AYES: Arkin, Eisenmann, Moss, Pilch

43 NAYES: None.

44 Motion Passes, 4-0

45
46

1 C. March 27, 2013 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
2 Recommendation: Approve
3

4 D. April 10, 2013 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
5 Recommendation: Approve
6

7 E. April 24, 2013 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
8 Recommendation: Approve
9

10 F. May 8, 2013 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
11 Recommendation: Approve
12

13 G. May 22, 2013 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
14 Recommendation: Approve
15

16 H. June 12, 2013 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
17 Recommendation: Approve
18

19 I. June 26, 2013 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
20 Recommendation: Approve
21

22 J. July 10, 2013 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
23 Recommendation: Approve
24

25 K. July 24, 2013 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
26 Recommendation: Approve
27

28
29 **5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

30 For persons desiring to address the Commission on an item that is not on the
31 agenda please note that each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. The Brown
32 Act limits the Commission ability to take and/or discuss items that are not on the
33 agenda; therefore, such items are normally referred to staff for comment or to a
34 future agenda.
35

36 **Paul O Curry**- would like Measure D rescinded. He said he's been working with the
37 Social and Economic Justice Commission but felt they could not make any
38 decision with Measure B in place.
39

40 **6. DISCUSSIONS & POSSIBLE ACTION ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS**
41

42 **A. PA 06-053 St. Mary's College High School Mitigated Negative Declaration/
43 Conditional Use Permit/Design Review for a new Music Bldg.** The Planning &
44 Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing to review and potentially take
45 action on a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to the California
46 Environmental Quality Act, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) request, and

1 Design Review for a new music building at St. Mary's College High School.
2 The CUP includes a proposal for anticipated new buildings on campus as
3 funding becomes available. If approved the CUP will establish new
4 operating conditions for the school. Design Review is also sought for a new
5 13,400 sq. ft. music building on campus. This matter was continued to a date
6 uncertain so that neighbors, City staff, and St. Mary's representatives could
7 complete mediation related to Conditions of Approval. The draft Conditions
8 before the Commission are the result of the mediation discussions.

9 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
10 **conditions.**

11
12 **CEQA: Review and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) that**
13 **was prepared for the project.**

14
15 Chair Eisenmann recused herself from item 6A.

16
17 Commissioner Arkin- took over the meeting. He asked to see if there was a
18 representative from PPNA that would like to speak for more than 3 minutes.

19
20 Commissioner Pilch- asked if the Commission should limit speakers to two
21 minutes due to the large number of items on tonight's agendas.
22 Commissioner Arkin said this would not be necessary.

23
24 Anne Hersch presented the staff report.

25
26 Commissioner Arkin- asked about the proposed finding for lack of CEQA
27 valuation for the proposed chapel referenced in Attachment 16.

28
29 Commissioner Moss- clarified the limit of use in Attachment 13.

30
31 **Vivian Kahn**, Kahn Mortimer Associates- clarified that they are asking for
32 maximum enrollment of 630 students. She said environmental impacts were
33 based on construction occurring in areas where there was not construction
34 before and would not be impacted enrollment. She said the focus of
35 discussions should be on when and where the uses for the chapel would
36 occur rather than what the nature of the uses would be. She noted the
37 maximum capacity for the chapel was 200 people so any events held there
38 would be smaller than events held on other parts of campus. She said the
39 chapel would not serve as a parish church even if it looks like one. She said
40 the applicant objects any indemnification of private property owner. Kahn
41 asked for a waiver of condition A5 which requires that St. Mary's indemnify
42 the City against any litigation. In the event this reaches council, Kahn asked
43 the Commission to make an action so that St. Mary's does not have to bear
44 the burden of condition A5.

45
46 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

1
2 **Chris Hamilton, 1316 Albina-** wanted clarification on whether there was an
3 amendment made in the June 10th letter.

4
5 Anne Hersch- said the June 26th letter was included as part of the formal
6 record. The July 10th letter was an amended request.

7
8 **Kevin Shipp, 1310 Albina-**lawyer specializing in CEQA litigation- wanted to
9 know the time period the enrollment cap was derived from. Regarding the
10 chapel, he said there was not sufficient information - for instance there is no
11 indication of when the said events will take place and how many people
12 would be attending them.

13
14 **Georgia Fishman, 1298 Albina-** shared her concerns regarding traffic and
15 trash in her neighborhood.

16
17 **Susanna Bell-Fishman, 1298 Albina-** was concerned a funding cap may not
18 be sufficient. She asked that the cap be removed or raised.

19
20 **Donna Dediemar-** said the 2008 application was entirely withdrawn and a
21 new application and initial study was submitted in 2011. She pointed out the
22 enrollment here was 609. She also was concerned about the chapels use.
23 She said she wished to see an end to this application. On behalf of PPNA,
24 she suggested the following compromises:

- 25 • Maximum enrollment at St. Mary's High should be kept to 609 students
26 after attrition. Enrollment should be measured on one date in the
27 semester which is the school's cutoff date for returning tuition should
28 someone withdraw. Compliance with this condition should be deferred
29 until the 2014-15 school year.
- 30 • Within 30 days of CUP approval, St. Mary's must submit a specific list of
31 activities that have occurred in the school the last three school years
32 and those that will be passed to the chapel.

33
34 **Robin Ramsey, 1529 Beverly Place-** said she did not want to speak out
35 against Dediemar's suggestion, but she said she is against St. Mary's position
36 on enrollment.

37
38 **Hannah Bankier, 1350 Albina-** continued Chris Hamilton's topics regarding
39 where as clauses. She said staff seems to indicate only PPNA threatened
40 with litigation. She requested the clause be changed so that it removes any
41 threat of litigation from PPNA.

42
43 Commissioner Moss- said there was a law suit threat in public hearing not
44 the closed session. He noted he researched cases that PPNA referenced
45 and said they were not factual and irrelevant. He said did not agree with
46 restricting the religious uses of the chapel.

1
2 Commissioner Pilch- was open to discussion regarding changing language
3 of enrollment but did not have any suggestions.
4

5 Commissioner Arkin- did not see the reasoning behind striking the language
6 "for religious purposes". He agreed with Moss that enrollment at 600 plus 5%
7 for attrition should be kept as the basis. In terms of the chapel operating
8 conditions, he said these were voluntarily provided by the school.
9

10 Craig Labadie, legal counsel- advised that the chapel operating conditions
11 be kept as proposed. He said in the event the school violated the
12 conditions, the City could take court action to prevent future violations.
13

14 Commissioner Arkin- suggested the "whereas" clause mentioned earlier to
15 say "legal issues" rather than pointing out PPNA as the sole party
16 threatening litigation. He was inclined to leave the indemnification as is.
17

18 **Motion to approve the negative declaration for item 6A:** Moss

19 **Second:** Pilch

20 AYES: Arkin, Moss, Pilch

21 NAYES: None

22 Motion passes, 3-0
23

24 **Motion to approve the Use Permit for item 6A:** Moss

25 Commissioner Arkin clarified that the motion was to move Resolution 2013-
26 03, approving the conditional use permit with the "whereas" statement
27 concerning the threat of litigation on page 2 of Attachment 2. Arkin
28 amended the motion -to strike the threat of litigation line and substitute it
29 with "legal issues". Moss agreed.
30

31 Commissioner Arkin- noted that the rain garden project is located in the City
32 of Berkeley. He indicated there will be permits needed for that work and
33 issues related to this matter should be discussed at that time.
34

35 **Second:** Pilch

36 AYES: Arkin, Moss, Pilch

37 NAYES: None.

38 Motion Passes, 3-0
39

40 **Motion to approve Design review for item 6A:** Pilch

41 **Second:** Moss

42 Commissioner Arkin- noted the hours of construction have been modified
43 from what was presented online.

44 AYES: Arkin, Moss, Pilch

45 NAYES: None

46 Motion Passes, 3-0

1
2 **B. PA 13-044, 726 Cerrito Street Design Review & Conditional Use Permit** - The
3 applicant is seeking Design Review & Conditional Use Permit approval for a
4 new two-story home at 726 Cerrito Street. The existing property is vacant
5 and is 4,452 sq. ft. in area. The applicant is proposing construction of a new
6 2,425 sq. ft. single-family residence with three bedrooms, two and a half
7 bathrooms, and two covered parking spaces in an attached garage. The
8 applicant is seeking a Conditional Use Permit to allow a front yard setback
9 reduction that varies between 6' and 7' due to grading and topography of
10 the lot.

11 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
12 **conditions.**

13
14 **CEQA: Categorically Exempt per Section 15332 "In-Fill Development**
15 **Projects" of the CEQA Guidelines**

16
17 Chair Eisenmann returned to the meeting.

18
19 Sara Muse presented the staff report.

20
21 Chair Eisenmann- asked for clarification in the staff report regarding the
22 setback encroachment.

23
24 Anne Hersch- said the regulations in this district were general. She indicated
25 the Commission could look at existing setback on the block for reference.

26
27 Commissioner Moss- asked about how the 785 was calculated.

28
29 Ms. Hersch noted there were a garage, staircase, and other space that
30 added to the increased building area. Moss clarified that there would be
31 grading done.

32
33 Commissioner Arkin- asked if a perimeter height calculation was conducted
34 for the garage.

35
36 **Chris Linvill, project architect-** said further from the front property line they
37 were, the more excavation would be done. He noted they wanted to find
38 the median between front setback and overall building height. In regards to
39 design review, he hoped they could work with staff on any concerns the
40 Commission may have.

41
42 Chair Eisenmann- asked about the decision to the make house closer to the
43 street and narrower. Mr. Linvill said for this particular property the layout
44 design made sense given the orientation of and lighting from the sun. He
45 mentioned it was their intent to maintain some existing mature trees.
46

1 **James Cleveland**, 724 Cerrito St. resident- was concerned this house was a
2 safety risk. He found that the FAR of the proposed property was 238%
3 greater than that of twelve other properties he researched along Cerrito.
4 He raised concerns about the trees on and surrounding the property that
5 could potentially fall and hurt people. He suggested counting the rings on
6 the trees for preventative measures and looking more closely into the
7 potential ramifications of excavation on that site.

8
9 Chair Eisenmann- noted a geotechnical report would be done on the site.

10
11 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.

12
13 Commissioner Pilch- believed staff was well prepared to address Mr.
14 Cleveland's concerns. He noted that the City arborist was available to
15 review the matter. In regards to design review, he had no concerns. In terms
16 of the setback and CUP, he asked if the staff had any additional comments.

17
18 Anne Hersch- said this decision was up to the Commission. She noted the
19 only requirement was to consider the surrounding context and streetscape.

20
21 Commissioner Moss- said an extensive soil report can be done. He said the
22 City arborist could determine whether the tree should be removed or not. In
23 regards to design, he suggested putting the second story back and
24 stepping the front. He said materials would have lots to say on this. He
25 would want to see more well integrated terraces and working with the land.
26 He had no issues with granting the CUP.

27
28 Commissioner Arkin- felt this was a good approach on a difficult site. He
29 thought the design was simple and handsome. He complimented the
30 placement of living spaces on the south side and asked that the applicant
31 verify the window setback. He noted the hillside flows down and it might be
32 a good idea to carry the parapet along the back. He said very detail soil
33 reports will be required. He said the garage level did not need to count
34 towards the FAR. He fully supported the application.

35
36 Chair Eisenmann- appreciated many aspects of the project including efforts
37 to reach the setback and the hip roof. She asked that staff determine the
38 safety of that intersection. She also pointed out that the sidewalk would be
39 parked on and asked if the house could be shifted a few feet back. She
40 agreed with Commissioner Arkin that the house was not large and that the
41 garage did not need to be included in the FAR. She added the footings
42 and calculations would be reviewed by the building department prior to
43 the permit issuance. She asked about cars pulling up the front.

44
45 **Commissioner Pilch**- asked how much space was between the sidewalk
46 and the garage door.

1
2 Mr. Linvill said from inside face of sidewalk, it was about 14 feet and 12 feet.
3 He noted parking on the sidewalk was illegal so he did not feel
4 accommodating for it was necessary. He liked the idea of having another
5 wall be the retaining wall rather than having the house as the retaining wall.
6

7 Chair Eisenmann- noted for the record that the applicant would be willing
8 to park in their garage and unload.
9

10 Commissioner Moss- asked if the retaining wall was new or existing and
11 recommended making the sidewalk wider.
12

13 **Mr. Linvill** noted that it was existing wood.
14

15 **James Cleveland** suggested moving the house more south to reduce
16 detractive impacts.
17

18 Commissioner Moss- suggested adding a trellis or walk out but the applicant
19 did not feel it would fit in their budget.
20

21 **Motion to approve Design review for item 6B (including CUP) with additional**
22 **condition that the sidewalk retaining wall be built with a minimum 12"**
23 **planning strip and made of compatible materials: Arkin**

24 **Second: Pilch**

25 AYES: Arkin, Eisenmann, Moss, Pilch

26 NAYES: None

27 Motion passes, 4-0
28

- 29 **C. PA 13-047, 1017 Ordway Design Review & Parking Exception** - The applicant
30 is seeking Design Review and Parking Exception approval for a 2nd story
31 addition and interior remodel at 1017 Ordway Street. The existing home is
32 1,261 sq. ft. with two bedrooms and two and a half bathrooms on a 3,570 sq.
33 ft. lot. The applicant is proposing a 758 sq. ft. second story addition which will
34 include master suite with bathroom, a second bedroom and bathroom,
35 laundry, closet, two exterior balconies, and access to a roof top deck. This
36 will result in a three bedroom and four and a half bathroom home, 1959 sq.
37 ft. in area, with a maximum height of 26'8". The applicant is seeking a
38 Parking Exception to allow the second parking space to encroach in the
39 front yard setback. The home will change in appearance from a flat roof
40 bungalow style to a Mediterranean style with side gable rooflines.

41 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
42 **conditions.**
43

44 **CEQA: Categorically Exempt per Section 15303 "New Construction or**
45 **Conversion of Small Structures" of the CEQA Guidelines**
46

1 Chair Eisenmann recused herself from this item. Commissioner Arkin took over
2 the meeting.
3

4 Sara Muse- presented the staff report.
5

6 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED
7

8 **Robin Pennell**, Jarvis Architects- gave a general description of the house's
9 design. He noted the garage space was counted, but the storage spaces
10 were not included.
11

12 **Don Lupino**- said he would submit his comments in writing.
13

14 **Suz-Ana Morandin**, 1021 Ordway- voiced concerns regarding: length of
15 construction, height of the house, drainage effects, the extent of excavation,
16 and negative parking impacts. She asked that the Commission look more
17 closely at how the house in the relation to surrounding properties on the
18 street.
19

20 **Andre Ptaszynski**, 1016 Ventura- referenced a letter her sent in and
21 expanded on the concerns he voiced in the letter. He pointed out the
22 homeowner had disobeyed the law before with the illegal second unit and
23 believed he would do so again. Mr. Ptaszynski added a parking exception
24 could be allowed for the accessory structure but not for the new addition.
25

26 Commissioner Moss- liked the design. He was concerned the deck on the
27 upper floor would impact the neighbors. He asked if they were reducing the
28 back of the auxiliary structure. He said Albany does not have a View
29 Protection ordinance.
30

31 **Andre Ptaszynski** - said the building would be reconstructed to be in the
32 same architectural design as the house.
33

34 Commissioner Pilch- said there would be one garage parking space and
35 there would not be space to park in the driveway so the applicant would
36 need a parking exception. In regards to the view obstruction, he echoed
37 Commissioner Moss's comment that there is not a View Protection
38 Ordinance. He was interested in further discussion on the roof deck and
39 parking exception.
40

41 Commissioner Arkin- said the house was not out of scale in relation to the rest
42 of Ordway and showed exceptional design. He suggested making a space in
43 front of the garage instead of granting a parking reduction. He said this could
44 be done by making the garage doors point in. In regards to height, he said
45 bringing the second level ceiling height to 8 feet was more reasonable. He

1 had no issues with the roof deck, but suggested reducing the railing height to
2 the ridgeline.

3
4 Commissioner Pilch- agreed with the parking and railing suggestions.
5

6 Anne Hersch- noted an additional condition in the 2005 application included
7 a deed restriction on the accessory structure.
8

9 **Motion to approve item 6C with additional requirements that:**

10 -the garage be moved into the rear of the property by two feet

11 -reduce size to 18' in depth

12 -recess door to get 17' clear dimension from back of sidewalk to side of door

13 -overall height be reduced to 6"

14 -railings of roof deck brought down to ridgeline: Moss

15 **Seconded by:** Pilch

16 **AYES:** Arkin, Moss, Pilch

17 **NAYES:** None

18 Motion passes, 3-0
19

20 Commissioner Arkin called for a two minute break.
21

- 22 **D. PA 13-040 833 Solano Ave. New Single Family Home Study Session-** The
23 applicant is seeking preliminary Design Review feedback for a new two-story
24 single family home at 833 Solano Avenue. The lot is 3,750 sq. ft. with an
25 existing 1000 sq. ft. single story home which is proposed to be demolished. The
26 proposed two-story home will include three bedrooms, two and a half
27 bathrooms, two car garage, and roof decks on the second and third levels.
28 The new home will be 2,060 sq. ft. and 25' in height. The proposed addition
29 has two off-street parking spaces contained in the attached garage.
30 **Recommendation: Receive report and provide feedback to the applicant**
31 **and staff.**
32

33 **CEQA: Categorically Exempt per Section 15332 "In-Fill Development Projects"**
34 **of the CEQA Guidelines**
35

36 Anne Hersch presented the staff report.
37

38 **Ronald Havens**, applicant- described his project and experience working in
39 Lake Tahoe. He said that he had little information or assistance in designing a
40 new home so he tried his best and was here for guidance. He mentioned the
41 large FAR was a result of the small lot size. He stated he was most likely going
42 to sell the house when it was done.
43

44 Commissioner Eisenmann- asked about the decision to make it a split level
45 design front to back.
46

1 Ronald Havens- said he did this to mitigate problems with neighbors and
2 reduce the height.
3

4 **Sarita Mathiason**, 836 Washington- said the applicant seems to encourage a
5 height competition among the surrounding houses. She says the house is out
6 of proportion with the rest of the neighbors. She was concerned her view
7 would be impacted and believed there should be a View Protection
8 ordinance.
9

10 **Mae Young Kwan**, 835 Solano- was concerned that the building looks out of
11 place on the street. She also did not like that the applicant was just going to
12 sell the property when he was done and leave her with the consequences.
13

14 **Ed Weiss**, 835 Solano- pointed out that there were discrepancies between a
15 recent survey done on that project and the assessor's map which he used for
16 his plans. He also disagreed with the installation of the decks.
17

18 Chair Eisenmann- said the Commission would assume the assessor's map is
19 correct for the time being but they could follow up with the engineering
20 company at a later time.
21

22 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.
23

24 Commissioner Pilch- liked the split level aspect, the third story tall windows,
25 and the decision to move the house back. He thought the garage being a
26 large feature in the front seemed uninviting.
27

28 Commissioner Moss- wanted to see the layout of the neighboring properties
29 on the drawings. He felt the design was a good start. His suggestions
30 included: putting windows on the left side, adding street-facing windows to
31 break up the massing, working on the awkward offset that the applicant's
32 design emphasized, lowering the roof to preserve the view for neighbors,
33 replacing the proposed greenhouse window off the kitchen with a bay pop-
34 out window, adding a small roof over the entry column to break up the long
35 horizontal line, breaking the garage door into two smaller doors and adding
36 a pilaster in between the two doors or adding a trellis over the garage doors.
37

38 Commissioner Arkin- thanked the applicant for bringing this project in early for
39 a study session. He thought the design was a good start. His minor comments
40 included: seeing the sidewalk and curb line drawn on the elevations, having
41 the mid-point of the garage be no higher than sidewalk level, considering
42 moving the center of the gables to the center of the doors, narrowing the
43 spaces between the windows, lowering the height, and moving the stairway
44 out towards the sidewalk to make it a more prominent entry.
45

1 **Ronald Havens**-said he was trying to be conservative with the windows. He
2 noted the building is more sub grade than it appears in the drawing. He said
3 he plans to mitigate the height.
4

5 Chair Eisenmann- encouraged the applicant simplify the houses and look at
6 some Albany houses in the Design Review guidelines and beyond to get a
7 better idea of houses in Albany. She suggested putting more rooms on the
8 same level to clean up the elevations, getting rid of some staircases to lower
9 the FAR, and splitting the garage door into two. She also expressed concern
10 of the house being put together hastily and inexpensively and suggested the
11 applicant look at ways to make the house details looks and feel substantial.
12

13 Commissioner Arkin- added he liked the roofline where the insulation is.
14

15 **Motion to continue the meeting 20 minutes:** Commissioner Moss
16

17 **7. NEW BUSINESS**
18

19 **A. Anticipated Review Schedule for University Village Mixed Use Project-** An
20 anticipated timeline of fall 2013 review for the University Village mixed use
21 project.

22 **Recommendation: Receive report.**
23

24 Jeff Bond presented the staff report. He noted more application materials
25 have been received and posted online. He said the major agenda items for
26 October would be both the retail and senior living aspects of the UC Village
27 project. He also suggested there may need to be a special meeting at the
28 end of October to finish some business before the end of the year.
29

30 **B. Radio Frequency Compliance Report-** An update to the Planning & Zoning
31 Commission on a recently completed survey of wireless facilities in Albany
32 which were measured for radio frequency compliance in accordance with
33 FCC standards.

34 **Recommendation: Receive report.**
35

36 Anne Hersh presented the staff report.
37

38 **8. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/DISCUSSION**

39 (Staff discussion and Commission member announcement of status of previous
40 agenda items and requests for future agenda items. No public comment will be
41 taken on requests for future agenda items).
42

43 None.
44

45 **9. FUTURE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS**

1
2 Next Planning and Zoning Commission hearing: **Wednesday, September 25, 2013 at**
3 **6:30 pm.**

4
5 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

6
7 The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

8
9 Next regular meeting: Wednesday, September 25, 2013, 6:30 p.m. at Albany City Hall

10
11 _____
12 Submitted by: Anne Hersch, City Planner

13
14
15 _____
16 **Jeff Bond**
17 **Community Development Director**