

City of Albany
Planning and Zoning Commission
Minutes March 13, 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, March 13, 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. Public Comment on non-agenda items

There was no public comment.

5. Consent

a. 911 Ventura. Planning Application 07-005. Design Review. A request for Design Review approval to allow construction of a new 549 sq. ft., single-story addition to the front of an existing 1,493 sq. ft single-family home. All development requirements are met.

Staff recommendation: approve.

b. 1121 Key Route. Planning Application 07-002. Design Review. Parking Exception. A request for Design Review approval to allow construction of a new 393 sq. ft., single-story addition to the rear of an existing 1,030 sq. ft single-family home. The applicant is requesting Design Review approval and a Parking Exception approval to allow one parking space where two are required. □

Staff recommendation: approve.

Commissioner Panian pulled item **5a**. He asked the applicant about the lack of sill detail on the four narrow casement windows on the addition. Scott Adair, the property owner, stated the windows were more updated than the rest of the windows, but that they hoped to upgrade all of the windows in the future. Chair Arkin pointed out that the lower walls would be "battered," meaning that the windows would be recessed two to four inches. Commissioner Moss noted there were windows in the storage room, which might be better served by solid walls. Commissioner Panian moved approval with the condition that the windows would be recessed as discussed, and that the applicant would work with staff on the configuration. Commissioner Moss seconded.

Vote to approve item **5a** as amended:

Ayes: Arkin, Hitchcock, Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None
 Motion passed, 5-0.

Findings. 911 Ventura

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

Required Finding	Explanation
<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 required side yard setbacks. The applicant has been thoughtful in adding architectural details and accents, which complement the aesthetics of the home and greatly improve the front façade. It will be more aesthetically attractive and pedestrian friendly.</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>

The Commission unanimously approved the remainder of the consent agenda.

Findings. 1121 Key Route

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 residential development. Additionally, the project meets City zoning standards for location, intensity and type of development.</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 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 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 required side yard setbacks. The applicant has been thoughtful in adding architectural details and accents, which complement the aesthetics of the home.</i>
7. <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>
8. <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 access, architecture, natural features, coordination of design details, and privacy.</i>

6. Old Business

a. Waterfront Planning Process.

Staff recommendation: approve Resolution #07-02 recommending that the City Council provide guidance regarding the waterfront planning process.

Planning Manager Bond delivered the staff report. He distributed draft minutes of the February 27 meeting, and asked the Commissioners to read them. The Commissioners took a few moments to read the draft. Commissioner Panian would change the second sentence at the top of page four to read, "goals would include" rather than "it would be important." Commissioner Maass noted he had been at the meeting, and Commissioner Moss had not, so the voting records should reflect that.

Chair Arkin asked whether the proposed Project Manager position would be more of a consultant position or a staff position. Planning Manager Bond indicated it would be more of an external consultant role. Chair Arkin opened the public hearing. Jean Safir, 1127 Neilson, opined the resolution lacked a statement on why the Commission should remain the lead on the process.

Clay Larson, Adams Street, agreed that was lacking. He felt the Commission should retain sponsorship, and noted the process had been open, televised, with plenty of meetings. He stated the resolution did not address all of the Committee's proposals. He opposed hiring a consultant to spend three months preparing a plan. The idea was to start with process and find a consultant to match. No one else wished to speak. Chair Arkin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Maass was hesitant to get into a territorial dispute with the Committee, and though it might be okay for the Committee to handle more of the work. Commissioner Hitchcock did not agree with observation #2. Commissioner Moss felt no resolution was necessary because from the Commission perspective nothing had changed from the commitment indicated in Resolution #06-50. He agreed observation #2 should be reworded to indicate owner participation was encouraged, but the outcome would still be worthwhile.

Commissioner Panian agreed the Council would decide and the Commission had already indicated the determination that it was the appropriate and willing sponsoring body. Chair Arkin would emphasize that information was a key ingredient and that all of the Commissions and Committees would have roles in the process.

Chair Arkin recommended passing the new resolution with amendments. Commissioner Hitchcock recommended including part of the July 12 minutes in the resolution. Commissioner Panian recommended language requesting guidance from the Council on goals and management. Chair Arkin respectfully disagreed—he wanted community input, and management by the Commission. Commissioner Moss suggested using the word "reaffirms."

Commissioner Hitchcock suggested changing "engagement" to "discussion" and "will be" to "is" in observation #1. There was a lengthy discussion on rewording observation #2. Chair

Arkin suggested wording to the effect that the process would encourage the participation of the property owner, but would not be dependent on the participation of the property owner; he also recommended adding an observation #3 encouraging the participation of all interested parties; observation #3 would be renumbered #4; an observation #5 to the effect that early gathering of information would be key to the planning process to inform and generate land use alternatives; and an observation #6 reaffirming that the Commission was the appropriate body to sponsor the shaping of the process.

Commissioner Panian recommended striking the last clause of observation #3 (#4 as outlined by Chair Arkin).

Chair Arkin also recommended joint study sessions for the Commission and Council to establish the process. The Commissioner Moss moved continuation of this item to the end of the agenda and asked staff to print out the revised resolution for review. Commissioner Maass seconded. Commissioners Panian and Hitchcock did not feel the continuation was necessary – they were prepared to approve the revisions.

7. New Business

- a. **845 Cleveland. Planning Application 06-078. Lot Line Adjustment. Planned Unit Development. Design Review.** The applicant is requesting approvals (as listed above) to develop four residential units.

Staff recommendation: discuss and continue to a date uncertain.

Assistant Planner Curl delivered the staff report. Commissioner Maass noted the staff report referred to the front windows protruding although that was not shown on the plans. Commissioner Panian wanted the minutes from December 5, 2006. Commissioner Hitchcock asked about the retaining wall and fence and sightlines. Assistant Planner Curl noted that would be conditioned. Commissioner Moss expressed concern about a second exit being required. Chair Arkin opened the public hearing. Debo Sodipo, the project applicant, made a presentation was available to answer questions.

There was a discussion about the size of the gap between the buildings. There was a discussion about the vinyl windows. Commissioner Panian asked for a window sample. Sylvester McBride, the project manager, spoke about the noise reduction quality of the windows. Commissioner Moss recommended the applicant not wait for the building permit phase to deal with the gap between the buildings, the exiting, and the roof drainage, including downspouts and scuppers.

Commissioner Maass noted the front looked modern and the side looked traditional (inconsistent). He recommended continuing the bay on upper floors, articulating the front, and making the garage doors smaller and entries more interesting. Commissioner Panian suggested roofs and porches for the entries to make them more street-friendly. He asked for roofline detail, garage door detail, light fixtures, etc.

Commissioner Hitchcock would separate the entry doors and add transoms over them to allow more light into the entry halls. She also suggested at least one south window should be operable

for ventilation. She recommended the sewer lines run to Solano rather than Cleveland because of tree roots.

Commissioner Moss suggested moving the entries around to the sides, up a flight, so the residents would not have to go down a flight of stairs to answer their doors. He suggested that a three-dimensional model would be useful, especially for looking at how the bay was not industrial enough. He felt the decks would not be used and would be a waterproofing problem, in addition to their non-industrial appearance standing out.

Chair Arkin suggested a three-dimensional model would also show how the materials turn the corners. He recommended more overhang on the light monitors and horizontal element below the window, as well as on the bay windows and entry roof. He suggested horizontal banding with the windows, siding between them, and stucco for the rest of the exterior. He noted the center mullion could be removed, and the front and side windows might be better at the same height.

Commissioner Panian noted the floor line goes right past the window, but the plans do not show what you would see from outside. No one else wished to speak. Chair Arkin closed the public hearing.

There was a lengthy discussion about the effect of a PUD approval when the property converts to single-family ownerships. The Commission directed staff to work on conditions of approval to address that issue.

Commissioner Panian moved continuation of this item. Commissioner Hitchcock seconded.

Vote to continue item **7a**:

Ayes: Arkin, Hitchcock, Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 5-0.

Item 6a

The Commissioners read the resolution provided by staff. They asked staff to strike the second "the process" from observation 2.

Commissioner Panian moved approval of the resolution. Commissioner Hitchcock seconded.

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

Ayes: Arkin, Hitchcock, Maass, Moss, Panian

Nays: None

Motion passed, 5-0.

8. Communications

None.

9. Discussion

- a. Overview of City Council Actions on Planning and Zoning Commission Related Agenda Items
- b. Waterfront Planning Consultant Selection Group Update
- c. Clean Green Task Force Update
- d. Future Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Agenda Items

10. Adjournment

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

Next regular meeting: Tuesday, March 27, 2007, 7:30 p.m.

Submitted by:

Amber Curl
Assistant Planner