

City of Albany
Planning and Zoning Commission
Minutes April 24, 2007, 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 Arkin, in the City Council Chambers at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 24, 2007.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

Present: Arkin, Hitchcock, Maass, Moss, Panian
Absent: None
Staff present: Planning & Building Manager Jeff Bond, Assistant Planner Amber Curl,
Planning Clerk Amanda Bennett

4. Consent Calendar

There were no items on consent.

5. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

There was no public comment.

6. Public Hearing

- a. 1047 Stannage. Planning Application 07-020. Design Review.** A request for Design Review approval to allow construction of a new 514sq.ft., two-story addition to the rear area of an existing single-story home. All development requirements are met and only Design Review approval is requested.

Staff recommendation: approve.

Chair Arkin and Commissioner Hitchcock recused themselves from this item due to proximity to their residences. Assistant Planner Curl delivered the staff report. Vice Chair Panian opened the public hearing. Fred Hyer, the project architect, was available to answer questions. Vice Chair Panian asked if the applicant could comply with the staff conditions. Mr. Hyer was concerned about the window recess. Commissioner Moss stated the Marvin 1-3/4" recess would be fine. Commissioner Maass noted the siding would be different, as well. Mr. Hyer submitted a photo and a Marvin cut sheet. He also supplied a three-dimensional model of the project. No one else wished to speak. Vice Chair Panian closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Moss moved approval of this item. Commissioner Maass seconded.

Vote to approve item **6a**:

Ayes: Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 3-0.

Findings. 1047 Stannage

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

<u>Required Finding</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
<p>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></p>	<p><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></p>
<p>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></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 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 not remove any significant vegetation and will not require significant grading. The project will not create a visual detriment at the site or the neighborhood. The applicant has made a conscience effort to meet all development requirements. The architectural styles of the existing home and proposed addition are clearly different but have been designed compliment each other well. The applicant has been thoughtful in adding architectural details and accents, which create an interesting, unique appearance such as metal and glass awnings over the windows.</i></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 access, architecture, natural features, coordination of design details, and privacy.</i></p>

- b. 1025 Eastshore. Planning Applications 07-019. Design Review.** A request for Design Review approval for new wall signs on all four elevations of an existing commercial building.

Staff recommendation: approve.

Planning Manager Bond delivered the staff report. Chair Arkin opened the public hearing. Tim Southwick, Jr., the project applicant, explained he needed to comply with Toyota’s sign program. Commissioner Moss hoped the building could have the word “Albany” on it because it was located in Albany, or, instead of the word “Berkeley” alone, the words “Toyota of Berkeley.” Chair Arkin thought the signage was improved. He would have liked to see the words “hybrid” and “high MPG” added. Sam from Toyota explained that he was extremely limited in what he could do with the signage because of the rigidity of Toyota’s sign program.

Commissioners Moss and Panian were disappointed with the lack of flexibility but appreciated that the applicant had tried to change the signage. Commissioner Panian also noted the text on the pedestal sign looked cramped up against the “bug.” No one else wished to speak. Chair Arkin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Panian moved approval of this item, with the rebalancing of the text on the pedestal sign, and a recommendation to highlight fuel efficiency on the sign. Commissioner Moss seconded.

Vote to approve item **6b** as amended:

Ayes: Arkin, Hitchcock, Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 5-0.

Findings. 1025 Eastshore

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

Required Finding	Explanation
5. <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 Commercial/Service/Industrial development. Additionally, the project building already exists. The project conforms to the General Plan and all applicable design guidelines.</i>
6. <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</i>	<i>The proposal is in scale and harmony with existing building an development in the vicinity of the site. The architectural style, design and signs are consistent with that which exists in the area. The project will not remove any significant vegetation and will not require</i>

<p><i>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>significant grading. The project will not create a visual detriment at the site or the neighborhood. The change in signage will improve the aesthetics of the building and the site in that currently there are only nonpermanent, banner signs. The new signs are consistent, with each other, in style and appearance.</i></p>
<p>7. <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. The monument sign is located at the entrance to guide patrons to the appropriate driveway to enter through. The wall signs and monument improve the aesthetics of the site and both compliments the aesthetics of surrounding commercial sites and creates a more consistent appearance in the CMX corridor.</i></p>
<p>8. <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 access, architecture, natural features, coordination of design details, and privacy.</i></p>

- c. **845 Cleveland. Planning Application 06-077.** Lot Line Adjustment. Planned Unit Development. Design Review. The applicant is requesting approvals (as listed above) to develop four residential units.
Staff recommendation: approve.

Assistant Planner Curl delivered the staff report. Chair Arkin opened the public hearing. Debo Sodipo, the project applicant, made a presentation and was available to answer questions. He submitted a spiral staircase photograph. The Commissioners recommended being certain the Fire Marshall would allow the spiral stair. No one else wished to speak. Chair Arkin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Moss and Chair Arkin had some recommendations regarding the style/trim of the parapet and windows, and a flatter, more modern look for the garage door (possibly even obscure glass panels). Commissioner Hitchcock urged the applicant not to use horizontal railings on the lofts. She also had concerns about the existing and proposed landscaping. Commissioner Panian suggested removing some of the muntins from the windows.

Chair Arkin suggested locating the downspout at the 4" gap between the buildings, and noted flat roofs were great for solar panels. He also noted the applicant might want to add a horizontal shading fin on the front windows.

Commissioner Panian moved approval of this item with: the corrugated steel to have a tight wave (such as 2-3/8" w, 7/8" d); the garage door obscure glass, "firehouse" style, up to 9' in width if necessary to obviate the need for a custom door; the elevations approved including steel around the windows; simplification of the cornice at the roof; and the downspout to be in the gap between the buildings. Commissioner Moss seconded.

Vote to approve item 6c as amended:

Ayes: Arkin, Hitchcock, Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 5-0.

Findings. 845 Cleveland

Findings for Lot Line Adjustment approval (Per section 22-3 of the AMC)

Required Finding	<i>Explanation</i>
9. <i>No additional parcels are created.</i>	<i>The proposed project maintains the four existing parcels with only alterations to lot sizes and lot line locations.</i>
10. <i>The resulting change in area of the affected parcels is considered minor by the Planning Director.</i>	<i>The combined area of the four lots is 10,945sq.ft., which is less than a quarter acre. It is considered an "infill" area and therefore the affected area is minor.</i>
11. <i>The access to all affected parcels is maintained or equivalent access is provided.</i>	<i>All four parcels will have independent access, which is equivalent to the access currently provided.</i>
12. <i>The resulting parcels conform to the Zoning Ordinance.</i>	<i>The project requires PUD approval, which is also requested. With the PUD approval all development and zoning requirements are met.</i>

Findings for PUD approval (Per section 20.100.050.I of the AMC)

Required Finding	<i>Explanation</i>
1. <i>Necessity. The planned unit development demonstrates the advantages of modern, large-scale planning to an extent that could not be achieved with out the planned unit development procedure.</i>	<i>A 10' front yard setback is proposed where 15' is required. The applicant would like the additional 5' for the units to improve the internal layout of the units and to allow more generous side yards. It also creates a larger buffer for neighbors at the rear; therefore, the exceptions will create more space, increased privacy and visual relief for the neighbors at the rear.</i>

	<p>The increase in height by 1' allows for a more aesthetically appealing front façade with the large panel window with a geometrical parapet.</p> <p>The reduced lot width allows the four existing parcels to be maintained and allows for more single-family units; therefore, increasing the city's housing stock.</p>
<p>2. <i>Exceptions warranted. Any exceptions to the requirements of the applicable zoning district are warranted by an exceptional level or amenity or to other benefits to the community, which could not be achieved without the exceptions.</i></p>	<p><i>There is approximately 27' between the proposed buildings, which creates a large open space area for tenant use and which visually creates an open area so that the property does not appear as dense or bulky with maximum lot coverage. The project also provides multi-family housing on a parcel has a difficult characteristic of a busy corner location.</i></p>
<p>3. <i>Substantial Compliance. The degree and extent of any exceptions granted does not prevent the development from being in substantial compliance with the regulations of the applicable zoning district.</i></p>	<p><i>The exceptions for an increase in height, front yard setback and lot width reductions relatively small and are not far from meeting standard development requirements.</i></p>

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

<u>Required Finding</u>	<i>Explanation</i>
<p>13. <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></p>	<p><i>The General Plan designates this area for multi-family, residential development. Additionally, the project meets City zoning standards for location, intensity and type of development.</i></p>
<p>14. <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></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 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 not remove any significant vegetation and will not require significant grading. The project will not create a visual detriment at the site or the neighborhood.</i></p>

	<p><i>The applicant has made a strong effort in creating an aesthetically pleasing and interesting building that provides the homeowners a comfortable, desirable place to live but without negatively impacting existing, surrounding development.</i></p>
<p>15. <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>16. <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 access, architecture, natural features, coordination of design details, and privacy. The building has been stepped back at the rear to increase privacy for rear neighbors.</i></p>

Special Finding Regarding Multi-Family Residential Classification.

Although the buildings in the project are separated by 4"; they appear and function as a multi-family unit, and should be considered as multi-family for the purpose of compliance with the zoning ordinance.

7. Reports

a. Green Building Program Standards of Compliance.

Staff recommendation: That the Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of Single Family Residential Green Building Program Standards of Compliance.

Planning Manager Bond and Assistant Planner Curl delivered the staff report. There was a discussion including questions and suggestions from the Commissioners. Staff would bring revised language forward at a later hearing.

8. Announcements/Communications

a. Waterfront Planning Process

The Waterfront Consultant Selection Group would meet on April 30 to have an introduction to the consultant the City was planning to hire to do the initial work program.

b. Future Planning And Zoning Commission Meeting Agenda Items

May 24 would be the date for the annual volunteer appreciation dinner.

There would be a noticed tour of the field at St. Mary's before the May 8 meeting.

The June 12 meeting might be cancelled.

9. Future Agenda Items

Commissioner Hitchcock wanted to discuss encouragement of California and Albany styles.

Commissioner Panian wanted to discuss revisiting Measure D, especially regarding mixed-use projects.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:36 p.m.

Next regular meeting: Tuesday, May 8, 2007, 7:30 p.m.

Submitted by:

Amber Curl
Assistant Planner