

FAIR OAKS COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

Wednesday, March 4th, 2015
6:30 PM

Old Fair Oaks Library
4200 Temescal Street
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

<http://www.per.saccounty.net/CPAC/Pages/CPAC-FairOaks.aspx>

Note: Applicant or appointed representative should be present. If unable to attend, please contact the Fair Oaks CPAC Chairperson, Ralph Carhart at (916)-276-9321. For additional information, please contact the Sacramento County Planning and Environmental Review Division representatives, Tricia Stevens at 916-874-2926 or stevenst@saccounty.net and Charity Gold at (916) 874-7529 or goldc@saccounty.net. To contact the Planning and Environmental Review Division CPAC Secretary, please call Tonja Gillen at (916) 874-5397.

Note: To receive notification of Sacramento County public meetings sign up for Sac County news. Visit the following website and enter your e-mail address: <https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/CASACRAM/subscriber/new?>

*Note: To receive additional information regarding Current Planning projects visit the Planning Projects Viewer website at <http://www.planningdocuments.saccounty.net/> Select the appropriate community from the drop down field, click the search button and a list of projects will be generated. Scroll down the list until the project is located and click on it for additional information. **For direct access to information on projects in this agenda, use the link provided below the Control Number.***

Note: To submit project comments to CPAC members, email them to CPAC-FairOaks@saccounty.net. Please identify the relevant project using the project name, control number or address.

OFFICERS: P-RALPH CARHART CHAIR
P-HARRY AZAR SECRETARY

MEMBERS: P-JOHN WALLACE P-ELISA SABATINI
P-TOM ZLOTKOWSKI P-BECKY WOOD
P-REBECCA LUND

REPRESENTATIVES: TRICIA STEVENS - COUNTY PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
CHARITY GOLD – COUNTY PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

EXA – EXCUSED ABSENCE **R** – RESIGNED **U** - UNEXCUSED ABSENCE **TE** - TERM EXPIRED **P** – PRESENT

QUORUM DETERMINATION: Yes X No
COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE: Yes X No

Matters under the jurisdiction of the CPAC and not on the posted agenda may be addressed by the general public following completion of the regular agenda. The CPAC may limit the length of any off-agenda testimony.

Start at 6:33 RC call to order.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

- CALL MEETING TO ORDER 6:33 PM
- EXPLANATION OF ROLE OF THE COUNCIL by Ralph Carhart
- ROLL CALL x
- INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS, STAFF, AND COUNTY REPRESENTATIVES, New member Becky Wood and Rebecca Lund are welcomed.

PLANNING ITEMS FOR REVIEW:**1. Control No.: [PLNP2013-00112](#)**

Project Name: **REVISED PLAN SUBMITTED FOR 7551 SUNSET AVENUE TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP, SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, EXCEPTION TO COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE, EXCEPTION TO COUNTY STANDARD GRADING ORDINANCE, AND DESIGN REVIEW**

Assessor's Parcel No.: **242-0390-019**

Location: The property is located at **7551 Sunset Avenue**, on the north side of Sunset Avenue, approximately 1,250 feet east of San Juan Avenue, in the Fair Oaks community. (Supervisor District 3: Peters)

Applicant/Owner

Phone/Email: Jeremy Jaeger
4009 Vista Park Court, Sacramento, CA 95834
916-801-6679; jjjaeger@marquespipeline.com

Engineer: Timothy Denham
Wood-Rogers, Inc.
3301 C Street, Bldg. 100-B, Sacramento, CA 95816

County Project

Manager: *Shelby Maples, Planner I, 874-6323; mapless@saccounty.net*

- Request:**
1. A **Tentative Subdivision Map** to divide the approximately 1.33 acre site into 12 single-family detached lots, 2 landscape lots, one private drive and one lot with an existing parking lot in the RD-30 zone. Note: The existing parking lot will continue to be used as access and as a parking area for the adjacent office building.
 2. A **Special Development Permit** to allow the lots to be served by a private drive and to deviate from setback and lot size requirements to conform to the residential design guidelines.
 3. An **Exception** to Title 22.110.070(d) of the County Land Development Ordinance to allow lots with a depth of less than 95 feet.
 4. An **Exception** to the County Standard Grading Ordinance to allow cut and fill in excess of two feet along portions of the project boundary.
 5. A **Design Review** to comply with the Residential Design Guidelines.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Mitigated Negative
Declaration

Investigating Member: Most members are familiar to the site from prior meetings.

Chair overview: Issues of egress, access, oak trees, and garbage situation where to be addressed. Applicant will present first.

Staff: Tricia Stevens, and Charity Gold will be our new reps to the county. Reminder, CPAC training event march 17th. Now introduce County staff Shelby Majors Maples as the Project Manger for this application .

Shelby M staff: 4th time in front of the CPAC. Subdivision to 18 block have been reduced to 12 blocks.

Ralph C: At appeal it was 15, now is 12, which addresses the reduction of lots and trees, traffic situation is to be addressed. The gate is shown in the revised plan. Parking has been addressed. And the architecture is revised.

Ralph C: Applicant to come forward.

Timothy Denham consultant presents: 12 unit, entry gate slider gate with wider apron. 4' minimum between houses room for garbage cans.

Two trees are saved out of 4. Root zones are kept passive and natural. Young professionals and empty nesters are perfect for the development. Houses are to be shifted away from East lot.

The owner of the property to the West is unwilling to give up the easement rights. So applicant has excluded the West parking lot from the project. The design still provided 4 parking per unit , code is 3 per unit.

Traffic with density issue; How people get out of Ward in morning, left-turn difficult. Number of option. Traffic department does not require any modifications to Sunset, but Applicant proposes to improve the intersection if need be. Options 1- Establish Center turn lane. Option-2 Last option is to have right turn only from the both development and Ward. Also traffic light down the street (stop control) at Kentucky is recommended. County transportation is looking into that.

The development is forming a HOA to monitor the traffic and parking. An entity to monitor.

Architecture, The have looked at the neighborhood and types of the existing architecture and tried to match them to the neighborhood context, cottages, different looking.

Elisa S: Depth of driveway for 1, 2, 1nd 3 are , 10-12 feet ?

Applicant :yes.

Ralph C: Hammerhead configurations are more conducive to give more driveway and comply with fire code. (maybe referring to West Parking)

Applicant Tim: Grading is a problem, the houses step down gradually to match grade of road, and geometry is limited.

Tom ZI: The three driveways have increased by how much: Previous 8 feet is increased to 12-14 feet. Has the fire district looked into the driveways? Fire district my have more problem with access. Have you shown these since the last plan.

Applicant: refer to county staff

Shelby M staff: There will be no parking allowed on the short driveway. Enforceable by the fire district and HOA. No parking in the development road will be allowed.

Tom ZI: DOT agreed to sign that?

Shelby M staff: Yes

Tom ZI: Where is the iron fence? Apl pointed.

Tom ZI: Right of the fence is it conducive to couple more parking?

Tom ZI: Property to the west: Have you completely given up on that?

Applicant: Owner is reluctant to give anything back and his tenants are used to parking there.

Harry A: What is the elevation difference btwn the proposed end of the hammerhead and the West parking lot?

Applicant: 5 feet. Cut and fill must equate. North East corner of the lot is 17 feet higher than the West . and cut on the east has to be filled in the West. Houses on lots 7 and 8 sit on 5 feet of fill.

Public Comments:

Homer Badal: neighbor passes out two sheet. Showing left turn movement difficulties and possibility of an accident. Left turn movements into Sunset.

"Since 2002 several times plans came up and approved for 9 units. Many issues regarding this development are still open. Can not park in the short driveway. Too short. And \$400K-500k prices won't sell. Two projects one on Kenneth and Dewey. For under 300k. The can not compete. where are the trashcans going to be placed. In the driveway?

The 2002 design had 9 units.

Center lane as recommended by Sup. Peters is acceptable. Center lane is needed. Also suggest 2nd egress from the West parking lot. In summary:

Request; 9 units, center lane, and west parking lot to be included.

CPAC Ralph C: What about the trashcans?

Applicant Tim: County provides diff size (smaller) cans, the garages are also wider to accommodate placing them inside. Developer is also open to creating a pad on the yard.

CPAC Ralph C: The property owner to West. Do you have any formal documentation? That you have offered and they have refused?

Applicant Tim: Applicant has not been able to reach them. Curious about the data. There is the matter of maintenance. Will not work out with the grade of the proposed drive.

John Hendrix: Agrees with his neighbor, with one change. As this plan went 18-15-12, the applicant is about losing unit. But neighbors see this 9 increased to 12 units. Applicant attempts to put as many units as possible. This development is competing with other dev. It worked at 9 units. The 9 units was called Sunset Oaks b/c the saved all 4 trees. But this plan at 12 can be adapted.: With lots #12 and #11 removed, the driveway on the east can be lengthened so you can park on it.

Pamela Lewis: Traffic safety is her issue. She thought the plan would be that people will come from the West parking lot into the Sunset Av. Ward Av access is narrow. People are running across the street from the apartments on the West. West bound traffic on sunset will move north wise to avoid the left turn movement from Ward Ln. This density is not allowed or possible. They are asking for exception on the setbacks and other variances. West parking lot Easement: No negotiations was done Re: "Money paid to the owner for giving up the parking." Has the applicant offered them money? Single family detached is not a cottage. If you create more space in Sunset, there will be room for improvement.

Barbara Roper: Depth of driveway. What is width? Also what is the minimum building separation, is it not 7 feet?

Applicant Tim: 34' width for lots, width of driveway is 16 feet. The separation for Zero lot line is maintained.

CPAC Ralph C: Do 2 story house need 7' separation?

Shelby M staff: Minimum is 5 feet. Shelby continues: This property was zoned RD30 and was for congregate care facility. Also pharmacy. Applicants have tried to approve that since the 60s, but it never built.

Arnold Johnson: Concern about design regarding traffic. Live on the Westover ct. Retired Civil engineer. Driveway are 10-12 fee deep. You need 40 feet to make a 90 degree turn radius. 34' is too short. Standard is 40 feet. Agrees with John Hendrix in removing units #12 and #11. 2 way left turn lanes was pursued by the board of sups. Neighbors approve. 10 units will be more viable than 9. If 9 worked once, so will this compromise.

Richard Ensburry: Ditto with neighbors in the interest of time.

CPAC Discussion

Elisa S: Tim (applicant), I appreciate the work and compromises regarding the traffic and trees, etc. Also that at some point the developer will start not realizing profit if we keep reducing units. What is that tipping point?

Applicant Tim: applicant is not looking into reducing number of lots further.

Becky W: Appreciate that the trees have been saved. Seems to be one too many houses are crammed into that driveway. (meaning lots 12, 1,2,and3)

John W; We have been at this for 2 years. I am starting to see the tipping point. Will not buy into some of the things brought up. Not our job to micro managing everything in the development. The easement is not going to happen. The owner is unable to do this. County transportation is ok with this. Guest parking is not usually provided in the new developments. I am very sensitive to 30 unit zoning. I don't care what is was before. I have a difficult time accepting short driveways.

Tom ZI: Also commend applicant and Tim Denham in the process, and engagement with the neighbors. I think we are moving in the right direction. Re: HOA, Relying on volunteerism isn't going to get you far. I am dubious of the volunteering not to park in the street, or hanging the back of car off short driveway. Short driveways would be the disaster. We are to make decision without the knowledge that those driveways are accepted by the DOT or not.

A solution can be found working with the DOT. Surprised that DOT does not find this unusual. Speed control, Left turn lanes should be considered. The difference btwn 12 and 10 units is not that much. If 2-3 lots are removed from the project, he will support the project.

Shelby M staff: Fire Dept has no issues with the driveway and the road design. it.

Harry A: Generally supports the project and admits the traffic safety issue needs to be re-reviewed by DOT. Can this be approved with a condition regarding the traffic?

Becky L: Short driveway, is not a unknown. Other examples exist in town. Does not seen totally unrealistic. Not enough information to make decision.

Ralph C; Problems on Sunset Ave concern not just this dev. There exists only 4 East-West streets in F.O., and Sunset is the oldest and most problematic. Whatever decision we make we should make recommendation to traffic Dep. to look into it. As Tom ZI said, relying on people to not to park on the driveways is not going to work. Parking issue needs to be solved. Concerned with the fill of 5 feet on the West end, and then a two story house on top of that. Esthetically there is a problem. Have a hard time approving.

Shelby M staff: Bd Sups did suggest that a traffic improvement must be done on Sunset Av. Summarize your comments, or take new vote.

Tom ZI: How can we rep the n'hood if we don't know what traffic dept will do. He is surprised that we were not given this information.

Shelby M staff: No recommendations for sunset by the developer yet. Goes back to the board. They continued it, but we do not have a new date for a hearing. They will do this application it from scratch. "De Novo" from scratch.

We have two choices: Either let prior denial stand, and make comments regarding the reasons. Have a new vote. Or see what traffic dept comes up with the parking situation and the traffic.

Tom ZI: Direction from us that traffic has to solve this situation. Dumbfounded that the DOT did not give attention . Dot is working under the direction of bd of Sups.

Elisa S: How receptive is applicant to reduction in units?

Applicant Tim; Slim margin. At 12 units, Each sell for \$385k, and at 9 lots it is \$535K nobody will buy it. Still with john.

Ralph C: Density is not the problem. The traffic situation on Sunset Ave is.

Harry A: Who does the traffic design of the necessary improvements the road? Who is ultimately responsible?

Tom ZI & staff: the Applicant.

Tom ZI: DOT might resist excessive speed control.

Ralph C: Can we separate the two issues and vote for one?

Applicant Tim: The applicant wants a solution and direction.

Shelby M staff: Number of units is not affecting the traffic situation. The difference between 9 and 12 units.

Ralph C: Voluntary won't work with the HOA issues. Also one solution; make units number 8-9, 10-11 duplexes.

Applicant Tim: We are averting duplex situations as per applicant.

Tom ZI: We want to request that this come back for review before it goes to bd sups.

Motion offered:

Prior vote stand unless the parking and traffic and sunset design is re addressed.

Motion for the staff to report to the Bd of Sups with the recommendations of the CPAC.

Shelby M staff: DOT ask CPAC what type of traffic design we want.

Elisa S: what is the motion ?

Tom ZI: There is some support with some denial. Denial would stand unless the safety issues are resolved on Sunset Ave.

Elisa: Sending that motion does not convey what transpired here.

Elisa wants to approve with condition.

Public: To say we approve as long as these are presented. That is the whole idea about community participation.

John W: What if we approve subject to, program with traffic.

Ralph C: Does not like changing ; Bd Sups meeting will be in May. What is preventing us in having this back here in April with some solutions. Can applicant come back with a plan?

Applicant Tim: AGREES. "Been at it for a year, another month is okay"

Tom ZI: "Dot and the applicant that should work this out and present to us."

<u>COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION:</u> CONTINUANCE.				
Condition that applicant come back with a revision to the traffic design. CPAC wants to hear back from the applicant come back with revisions on Sunset Ave designs.				
<u>CPAC CONSENSUS:</u>				
Requesting the CONTINUANCE, for the applicant to make voluntary revisions to Sunset Ave traffic safety mitigation design. And bring back to CPAC for approval.				
Approve the application with the following conditions:				
1- Provide left turn lanes				
2- Provide traffic safety				
by:		by:		
Vote:	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent

Action: CONTINUANCE.				
Note: This CPAC has the right to file an appeal with the County of Sacramento when the committee, commission or official takes an action or determination that conflicts with community-wide policies as understood by the respective CPAC and its constituency.				
Motion by:			Seconded by:	
Vote:	Yes:	No:	Abstain:	Absent:
Comments:				

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Robert Dieterich, Minnesota Av resident: REGARDING 4578 and 4584 Minnesota Avenue: This project was reviewed by CPAC a year ago. To Subdivide 2 lots into 3 lot. Minnesota Av. Residents concerns were Water run off to neighbors, Narrow approach drive. No place to put trash out, etc. CPAC denied the application a year ago. Developer did an end-run by lot line adjustments, and the fact that you can build auxiliary unit on the same lot. Now he has started building the same three buildings they were originally going to build. With the same problems to the neighbors of improper grading and run-off. How come it did not come back before the CPAC this time?

Staff: Built by property line adjustment. Not a subdivision. Only requires Counter issued Building Permit. Counter issued permit does not come before the CPAC for approval.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

ADJOURNMENT:

CPAC Member forwarding minutes to County Planning and Environmental Review Division: Harry Azar.

Elisa S: motion to adjourn. Becky Wood 2nd

Meeting Adjourned 9:00 PM.

The meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. Requests for interpreting services, assistive listening devices, or other considerations should be made through the County Planning and Environmental Review Division at (916) 874-5397 or 874-7647 (TTY), no later than five working days prior to the meeting. California Relay Service (CRS) is a third party interpretation service for deaf, hard-of-hearing, and/or speech-impaired persons. CRS can be reached by dialing 711 or 1-800-735-2929



**YOUR LINK
TO COUNTY SERVICES
ONLINE, OR ON THE GO!**

www.311.SacCounty.net | Dial 3-1-1
*Outside unincorporated Sacramento County
Dial 916-875-4311*