

Fair Oaks CPAC

Minutes of the Meeting

7-1-2015 6:30 PM

Items 1, 2 & 3

By: Harry Azar, Secretary CPAC

Present:

Ralph Carhart, Chair	(RC)
Harry Azar, Secretary	(HA)
Tom Zlotkowski	(TZ)
Rebecca Lund	(BL)
Elisa Sabatini	(ES)
Becky Wood	(BW)

Resigned/Absent: John Wallace

County Staff: Tricia Stevens- Planning and Environmental Review (TS)

Meeting called to order at 6:33 PM. After introductions and roll call, Quorum was established. Due to the expected length of Item 1 hearing, Chair called agenda items 2 and 3 first, in order to minimize the waiting time for the public. Members agreed.

Item 1

Control No.: PLNP2015-00060

Project Name: Traditions II Tentative Subdivision Map

Assessor's Parcel No.: 244-0064-023

Tricia S: The applicant requests Number of entitlements. Would be heard by Planning Commission. County staffs have been talking with the applicant to save the trees, and regarding access to the property to the West. Also to reduce the number of units. The applicant had an original design, Since been revised and they have been able to save some trees.

RC: Has County Planning been working with them, before the revised plan?

Tricia: They did change and grading, density and private or public street access.

Greg Thach: (Representing L&H). L& H Homes is a long time builder in this community since 1984 in, Fair Oaks, Orangevale, and have built a niche in the community. Each of them lives in one of their own subdivision. The project is an infill subdivision planned before, approved by the original owner, she passed and was for selling to L&H for this project.

Individual lot sizes are consistent with the zoning. It was 20 units, and quickly decided to revise. Now it is 19 lots and will save 3 of the protected trees and possibly a 4th oak tree.

There are some benefit to that by the road curving around the oak tree, since we picked up 15 guest parking added in addition to 53 parking and 53 outside parking.

Gated access to the community. L& H Homes is a semi custom builder and is proposing 12 floor plans that are customer reactive. They all have 3 car garages. Separate garages for in-law quarters. Market for single women and seniors.

Issues:

-Community meeting: Archer Ave. residents did want 2 story houses abutting their street, so everything along Archer is 1 story. Two interior ones can be 2 story.
-Potential traffic: committed to a traffic study; peak AM generates 15, and PM is 20 additional trips.
-Also gates is an issue, but the targeted demographics appreciate the security. The deviations of 5 ft side yard setback, driveway is also county standard, and 90 foot depth will be waved by new zoning code.

But 8 of the lots need to be moved around and may not have a 20 foot setback in the back. Some will be 10 foot. There is a property in the West which would like to have access, to have a cu de sac . Options that take the street all the way through and the people to the west of that lot do not want a cut thru to Sunrise du to increased traffic.

RC: what is the frontage on Fair Oaks Bl.?

Greg Thach: Masonry wall 6' for sound attenuation , there is a gate curb gutter sidewalk.

RC: Is there a bus stop?

RC : What is the Archer Ave frontage?

Greg Thach: Half wall.

RC: curb and gutter along Archer Av?

Greg Thach: No

RC: Will be dedicating any land along Fair Oaks Bl?

Elisa S.: I commend the applicant for modifying the plans re 2 story along the Archer Av. What about the entitlements?

Tricia S: Two requests are withdrawn, and zoning code is taking care of one

Elise S: likes the guest parking addition.

RC: How is the parking under the tree

Ron Higgins: We will use pavers with 20% encroachment into the ground, 5 spots.

RC: In terms of grading - address the grading?

Steve Norman (engineer): front drains into Fair Oaks Bl, but the back rolls back. Along Archer Ave. substantial cuts and retaining walls along Archer, and backfill on the North, and the overall drainage is to the North-West corner.

Elise : Where is Traditions one?

Ron H: It is North of this project on Carriage lane.

Ron H: Certain themes pick up elements. The two projects are 15 years apart. There are differences so it will be modified.

Tom Z: Planning has no issues with street connections?

L&H: Community drive is the plan. County planning would prefer a private street as oppose to a public street because:

1- Less cost to County,

2-Current administration likes gated community

Greg Thach: Supervisor Peters and DOT are being consulted, did not get a feedback regarding a 4 way stop at the intersection on Fair Oaks Bl.

Tricia S: County DOT prefers to see through streets. Saw that there is a lot of difficulty. They are neutral, but not opposed to a private drive.

RC: Because of private drive.

Harry A: Disclosure: I live in an L&H built community. Question: Is there a rep from the lot located to the West of the propped subdivision?

Greg Vincent (Rep for the Lot to the West): We have the 3 acres to the west. Has been in process of formulating a plan and have asked L&H Homes to cooperate on access road and utility lines etc., but they have not been cooperating. We asked for, but have not had a meeting with Mr. Santiago at the Sacramento County to discuss our situation.

This cul-de-sac will be 300 feet either way. We have not submitted because of their (L&H) plans. We are concerned about grading and access.

County can't ask for access. They asking for special development permit. County does have the right to ask L&H Homes to meet certain standards.

Gene proposed 13 subdivided properties. Why not goes the natural access way. Poor neighborhood.

Their design is connecting to Traditions II property with a gate to Eastcliff Rd., but still have the cul de sac . On Buena Vista have dead ends with 1000 feet access. Their drainage dumps into Genes' property. We agreed to put an overland drainage.

Also at the border of two lots, a 7 foot cut and fill set backs are concerning to us.

Standard is not met. -----

No access from Lavana.

Elise S: Question: Do you have a pending TSM?

Greg Vincent: We have our application- were told to meet Santiago and Surindar Singh, and have to adjust our map to L&H Homes plan.

Harry A: Why no access from Eascliff?

Greg Vincent: No access from Sunrise is desired by the neighbors.

Tom Z: What would you do if Traditions II never developed?

Greg Vincent: I would wait. Or they (L&H) could acquire the property to the West.

Tom Z: Say they build multiple units like apartments as they can.

If public road

Greg Vincent: If they do not do it then I have to flip the cul de sac and go the other way.

RC: Public comments:

Anna Westery : Owner of the property along the property, adjacent is the dead end. Eastcliff is a small street that 3 houses on one side and one on the other house. It is a small street not meant for two way street - not meant for thoroughfare. I do not want that part of Eascliff open. Please do not open Eastcliff. Would like that to remain quiet.

Andrea Alonzo: across from Anna, secluded – secure. Opening that street up to have a solution should not be to disrupt the existing. We moved in because of the quiet street. You would be taking away what we have,

Doug McAddams: I came to the introductory meeting and asked for 1 story, which they did , but I like that they saved the oak trees. They have a right to propose. The adjacent property should they have no options. They could tear the house down and go down to Lavana.

Theresa delBiaggio: I have an autistic son 16 years old, one reason we moved to that house is the seclusion. 23ft wide street is a blind corner. Via Roma is 37' wide I don't care what the squabble is for. There is no sidewalks, but pedestrians safety on Livorna would be an issue if a through street. Is open to Fair Oaks bl, but not by cars. To cram 20 houses and expect that they come through Livorna is unrealistic. Fatality on Fair Oaks bl occurs and we do not want. Traffic should be coming through Fair Oaks Bl., and not from Sunrise.

Randy Burleson: Live in one of the 65 households that access from Via Roma to Sunrise. Sounds like the County BOS instructed the two developers to work together. Because those people are being pushed into recommend that the two developers work with the County for a 3 month delay so the developers can work together. They have been working in parallel, and not together, and the L&H Homes developer got to the County first. To go along with Greg Vincent: Plumeria is 23' wide and Eastcliff is 23' wide. Can not take on the traffic.

Tricia S: Just to clarify; the two County staff members suggested that the two developers work together, and not Board of Supervisors (BOS) .

Glen Lutz: I don't want more traffic. I'd like to see Eastcliff stay closed.

Diane Nye - Opposes the project and left the meeting before got a chance to speak.

Michelle Hubbord: Huge impact of noise and traffic on Livorna if it is a public street and opposes the proposed projects.

Marion Long: Owner on Livorna: Lived there since 60's. The two developers come to agreement to develop together or none. There are two buyers, and my mom(original owner of the West side lot) and Mrs Muir (original owner of the East side lot) would not be happy if they do not work together. For some reason one got into County first. And not the first the guy that buy first.

Why the two developers cannot work together? Community deserves a right to have a common water flow and traffic study.

Recently, I found about "impervious factor" of the development. The Traditions II has an impervious factor close to apartment complex. Also Greg Vincent plan is not as dense a project and will not make as much money. Traditions II is a very high intense development.

RC: Long has lived in the flag lot since the 60's and bought the lot to raise goat. This is FO we do not want to get the densest possible.

Kim Hudson: (Archer Ave resident) Originally a wall is proposed by Archer?

RC: Low masonry wall beyond the right of way.

Kim Hudson: How much allowable stacking space is there for vehicles on Fair Oaks Bl?

L&H Engineer: The length for stacking meets the standards of the Fire Dept.. Double stacking on both lanes.

Kim: Is there room for one, two, or 3 cars? If there is not sufficient stacking then it could be a problem on Fair Oaks. I live on Archer, and there is problem making a left turn. This is real workday situation on FO..

Elise S: Do you want a 4 way stop for the development access road?

Kim Hudson: I just heard about it. The time it takes to clear right turn, Can't make right turn on FO in the morning either, due to the speed of South bound cars on Fair Oaks Bl. Sometimes have to wait 5 minutes before a gap is available coming from the stop sign on Fair Oaks and Sunset. This addition of the development drive would be exacerbating the problem.

Other problem; can not make left hand turn from the development road, so they will turn right and will turn on Archer Av and Orange in order to make a detour.

Justification letter read by Kim Hudson, and appreciates the change. And also concerned their target for selling these homes is single woman. Single women need houses with 3-4 bedroom? with small setbacks, lots would be all buildings. Related to the garages, in an era where we are trying to use public transit, I am concerned about 3 car garaged and promoting use of cars.

Also the drainage issues: Mr. Hudson (Kim's husband): The creek comes through our property . presently it is natural drainage and feeds the frog habitat. The dirty water from the road drainage will kill the frogs.

Marshal Ranger: Lives off of Amalfi,, young kids that play on that. When hearing both sides of the developers. One (L&H) is building for one set of people, and another (Greg Vincent) is taking into consideration the people that live there. If you get out on Sunset Ave, adding added traffic. One developer wants to work in concert with other. 4 way stop would alleviate the traffic. Appreciate that Long wants to work with the public.

Elise S: We are working with the task at hand. This project is proposed to the County.

Beverly Odom: Livorno Was not designed to go all the way to Fair Oaks bl. If do that she would She has asked for 20 years for speed bumps on Fair Oaks bl section. Do a traffic circle and leave the crowd on Sunrise. The development is too dense. Flooding: her house has been flooded on Livorna. It is not ready for development. We do not even know what this will do. There are no sidewalks on Fair Oaks bl.

Dan Wisner: Lives on Amalfi, concern not to have thoroughfare by their houses. Reason he bought there so there should not be thru roads. Emergency equipment can easily come from Fair Oaks bl.

Mary Gaspari: Just moved there 6 weeks ago. Quiet, nestled, no pedestrians, love the goats. Even asked before purchase the said not much they can add. Roads not able to take additional traffic.

Karen Koelker: Water shortage, how much water are they going to be using. Why no moratorium until there is a solution to water shortage.

RC: Well served the letter.

Trica S: Across the state has not been moratorium. New homes have to put in water saving plants.

Cindy Coughlin: We do have that easement on Plumeria Ave. , why not use that? Why gates?, why not put gates on our properties?

RC: When you own a land you can have a private street.”

Mr Russel Hudson two property on Archer, is concerned about drainage. Archer is narrower that all of them. They cut back through Archer and drainage is going through and if it goes to North-west corner, where does it go from there?

Judy Steele: Lives on the corner. A lot of people not here tonight. The main house is on Archer ave. 8089 Archer ave. Most notices went to the apartments across st.

RC: Notifications went to 500 ‘ radius.

Judy Steele: Why don't they want to enter through Fair Oaks bl? But this place has been known as -----since 1962. Do what the two deceased people want to do. And say it was on Archer alley.

RC: Close public comments and open to CPAC.

TZ: Let us hear the applicant again.

RON Higgins: 2 sides to every story; We have provide plans to Greg Vincent, and got plans from Greg. 50 foot wide lot having 3 car garage it will have little room left after 5 setback. If you want 2

story homes we can be narrow. Flexibility is our goal, not cookie-cutter like the other subdivisions. A lot of people have storage, for the 3rd garage.

RC: Address issue of drainage offsite,

L&H Engineer: Topographic matching, some drainage goes to Fair Oaks Bl. and the rest goes to North-West corner. We are required by water resources to discharge to where it naturally drains. Overland relief issue would run through his lots he agreed to provide relief through down to road. We do not go down 500 feet to provide drainage.

Russel Hudson: That drainage goes through his property and goes into winding way.

L& H Engineer: County will do a master plan and will size it for drainage.

RC: Do you have storm water retention and detention.

L& H Engineer: Just through the grass to remove the silts. We have met with Mark Rains of County water resources regarding this.

Russel Hudson: only two culverts on behind alleyway and other culvert underneath Archer and during hi rain, it spills goes over Archer and goes into his property.

RC: Perhaps flag the drainage issue to the County engineers again.

Becky Wood: Low impact development was not required, but there are a lot that could be done so they do not become mosquito pits. Those help improve the water quality.

Elise S: Speed bumps and tables, on Fair Oaks Blvd can help as we were told traffic was bad. Can we suggest that?

RC: We can request.

Elise S: if both parties worked together and sharing topography, is that possible that potentially this project can be modified?

Greg Thach: Yes can be modified, the point of contention is the road. L&H is designed to be self-contained. Other changes may be incorporating that may not work.

RC: As much as we want to have comprehensive plan, we can not force a developer to do something they do not want to do. County transportation is happy with the street plan.

Tricia S: The decision is ultimately on County Planning Commission. They can direct that be something else. If CPAC council thinks it be a through street. It Can be .

Elise S: How about extend Arched widening alley and access along the development?

Tom Z: collecting thoughts.

1- Merits of the subdivision.

2- Merits of the circulation. Could possibly be one of the most attractive subdivisions and most people would hate it. We are supposed to represent the community, and also approve a project on its merit. I personally think having a supper long cul de sac will create long term problem. The new owners will not want the long road. You could have 100 homes serving the long property. We

are accustomed to half that number. There is a house at Amalfi that squeezes the road. If there was a full street there, that may justify that plan.

RC: Driveways probably should be permeable material, otherwise the architecture and oak trees are okay to approve. Having said that it is better the developers to work together. Is there anyway for you guys to work together to meld the concepts so they can work together?

Harry A: Overall planning for the future compels me to recommend a thorough street connecting Fair Oaks Bl to Sunrise, as much as it may be unpopular idea. In May 2015 CPAC meeting we saw a project proposed at 5151 Kenneth that was in the middle of 7 dead end private drives coming into a 4 acre area with no comprehensive overall plan for the future of the traffic flow.

Ron Higgins: No traffic issues were foreseen to Fair Oaks Bl. , the other project to the West has minimal effect to Sunrise. We feel this is a consistent solution to the problem.

Becky Lund: I like the interest, but conflicted because of community. The access in and out of Sunrise. There has to be more communication between the two developers. Too early to make a decision.

Tom Z: We have to block the other subdivision and what choice we have, but to I look at this and I see that I am attracted to this . Based on what we see there this is a good project.

RC: Unfair to throw this on the lap of the Planning Commission. As much as I like seeing Greg Vincent and L&H Homes work together.

Tom Z: As much as circulation traffic control, recommend that they include traffic speed control and intersection control.

RC: We could put a lot of controls on traffic and drainage. Throw it back on traffic department to decide whether they want a standard flow of traffic.

Becky Lund: it is hard to move forward, we have a strong opinions, and before we move to vote. It is hard to separate the two developments .

RC: What about all the projects we do not know about. How much can we project this into future? Maybe transportation has a master plan.

You can ask them, you know they don't have to . The reduction of the street on Eastclif. They may have a street agreement. To make it safer. Investigate for DOT continuance.

RC: Let's put our heads together and DOT investigation before moving.

Tom Z: SRC gets this. It is technically correct maybe they can come up with an alternative. EIS is not present.

Harry A: Question to Greg Vincent: How long for subdivision TSM put in for review by the County?

Greg Vincent: One month.

RC: One month continuation would get him a chance.

L&H Engineer: DOT, when learned there is issues with circulation go to traffic. He asked Pete, he said " we are not going to require that." Only input from neighbor is required. Thru Eastclif, make

that all the way through. Eng . said that neighbors will not go for that. DOT comment is streets to go through. It is really up to the planning commission. Not DOT.

Tricia S to Tom Z: What do you want information on? Technical issues with Greg's project to sunrise- And recommendations?

Elise S: Motion- starting point: refer this project to the Planning Commission and compile the community input as caveat.

RC: We should approve, deny or approve with recommendation.

Motion Tom Z: Approve the project and the entitlements on its own merit with but require D.O.T. to provide the commission a comprehensive traffic study for circulation of the 2nd subdivision out to Sunrise blvd.

2nd Elise S: Amend: comprehensive traffic analysis for the area bounded by Sunrise, Sunset, Fair Oaks Bl. and Orange Ave.

Tom 2nd Elise S amendment.

For the purpose of inform forming the planning division if there is not adequate circulation in the area. Pushes the DOT to provide a study of the traffic flow patterns and advise.

Becky Wood: Look to offside drainage and possibility of more permeable surfaces.

Elise: deviation from the setback came from 1 story design.

RC all houses abutting Archer to be 1 story. Incorporate the big oaks including the one on lot 18.

Vote results: 4 yes, 2 abstain, 0 no.

ITEM 2: PLNP 2015-00074

APN# 244-0163-032 CRESTLINE AVENUE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP

Applicant / Owner: Exquisite Equity Investments LLC
Tami Mellor
9119 Trumbauer Way, Elk Grove, CA 95758

Engineer: Wong & Associates
Attention: Gary Timothy **Wong**
2730 Arden Way, Suite 232, Sacramento, CA 95825

County Project Manager: Thomas Vogt

The project site is located at 4240 Crestline Avenue, approximately 500 feet north of California Avenue on the east side of Crestline Avenue in the Fair Oaks community.

Request:

A Tentative Parcel Map for a three lot split on approximately 0.55 acres in the Fair Oaks community. The two proposed single-family residential units will be serviced by three driveways to Crestline Avenue. The existing residential unit will remain on the property.

Tami Mellor : The project is located in the old Fair Oaks Village area. We intend to remodel the front existing building and form two flag lots in the back and build a home in each. This is in accordance with what the community would like. County zoning allows up to 10 condos in the location. However, we are not building that many units.

No McMansions will be built here. The architectural plans adhere to the village community. The back houses will be approximately 2100 SF. Front existing home will be remodeled and will be using the Next Generation Home concept, incorporating an in-law quarter. The driveways and buildings will curve around, so as to leave the oak trees protected.

RC: Do the curb and gutter match the ones to the South of the project?

Tami: Yes. After meeting with county staff regarding the protected trees, minor changes to the plans curb and gutter were made. The front sidewalk will be curved to protect the tree in the front to save it. The driveway is positioned to keep the trees.

RC: What trees are to be removed? Are the arborists able to save tree number 63?

Tami: There is not too much construction in the drip line of the protected trees. Some trees to the south, the driveways are being modified to protect the trees.

RC: Tree coordinator suggestions?

Tami: Tree coordinator will provide mitigation so the driveway to impact the tree least amount.

Public comment: Drainage direction to not flood the trees that will remain?

Wong: Drainage is designed to the street, so it will not flood the trees.

BW: Finding that that area was zoned for multifamily, this is preferred. The tree coordinator to work with owner, to install open lattice brick or pervious concrete.

TZ & HA Have no questions.

BL : what zoning?

Tami SPQ

Tricia S: Some multiple family

BL: Would work with the plan.

RC: No problems with the plan. Motion should flag that the driveway be permeable.

Becky Wood: Motion: To approve w/ request that the driveway to the south be made permeable under the blue oak tree.

Becky Lund: Seconded the motion

Unanimous: 6 Yea, Zero Nay, One absent/resigned.

ITEM 3: PLNP 2015-00080

APN# 242-0274-008 HENEY RESIDENTIAL ACCESSORY DWELLING

Applicant / Owner: Lucinda Heney
7731 Campoy Street, Fair Oaks, CA 95628
916-337-5460, heney.cindy@gmail.com

Engineer: Wong & Associates
Attention: Gary Timothy **Wong**
2730 Arden Way, Suite 232, Sacramento, CA 95825

County Project Manager: Thomas Vogt

Request: A Use Permit to allow an approximately 1,200 square foot accessory dwelling unit.

Applicant presentation by Alex Heney; Alex is the grandson of last owners. Grandparents have lived here since the 60's, and passed away two years ago. They left the home to their daughter Lucinda Heney, and Alex her son wants to live there in an accessory dwelling at the same lot. Plans are submitted as shown.

HA: to staff; Will this house ever be qualified as a rental?

Tricia S: Yes, it can be. CPAC may condition approval to always be Owner Occupant. However, the enforcement will not be possible for the County.

Alex Heney: That is not our plan. We have no plans for future rental of the accessory dwelling.

BL: What is the 2nd existing building? A house?

Alex Heney: No that is a barn/storage structure.

RC what is the extent of topography?

Alex: a few trees have to come out, and they are planning to add a few redwood trees.

RC: No protected oaks?

Tricia S: no

RC: .82 acres so it is big

Becky W: There are two oaks that are not in the plans.

TZ: Seems the county is pretty lenient in the application of the code for Accessory dwelling.

Tricia S: zoning code allows 400 SF by right, and up to 600 SF new is allowed.

However, a 1200 SF structure has to be approved by the CPAC.

TZ: what is the minimum size of lots to allow such accessory dwellings?

Tricia S: 10400 sf minimum lot . Proposing a sliding scale 6000 sf 400,

TZ: The house can support huge expansion.

RC: The only thing they can not do is subdivide.

Public: Doug McAdams: Being able to rent? Is there a legal mandate that you can force the rent ability or not?

RC: We can only recommend to the next official , zoning administrator

Tricia: there is a legal amenability to require that one be owner occupant.

Cindy Heney: The County staff has made a recommendation for street improvement, curb and gutter. Considerable expense will be required, and she is going to appeal that request. Can CPAC recommend that the curb and gutter not be required?

4 houses across the street and they had them put curb and gutter and there is no other.

TZ: Looks like there is a curb immediately to the east. 4 units. And the across the street we recommended curb gutter for that subdivision that has not been built yet.
The frontage sticks out to the street. If you are going to follow the logic and be consistent with future development, there has to be curb and gutter. CPAC recommended for curb and gutter.

RC; Can the County have a Street Agreement, and install it for them, and the owners will pay it back later as a tax or assessment?

Tricia S; Street agreement cash and repayment allows so the county can come and do it later.

RC: So what are the options?

Tricia S: 1-Waive the requirement, 2- Curb gutter and sidewalk installed by the owner, or 3- Cash Agreement so the owner pays for the work done by the county later.

Cindy Heney: There is a lot of trees and curb and gutter would change the esthetics of the property.

Elisa S: Agrees with TZ. Does not want to waive the curb and gutter requirement. Prefers to defer the costs to the owner, with a cash agreement if necessary, but still have the curb and gutter.

Becky W: Personally can understand the expense burdening the owner. I don't know the county requirement. I would be fine either way.

Harry A: I agree that the curb and gutter should be installed. To comply with the future of the street plans.

TZ: When the development across the street is built, we have to weigh that to the fact that we are adding traffic of a street that is not designed for it. We are trying to reduce the overall cost, and the curb and gutter sidewalk should be added to the recommendations

We can defer the costs with a Cash Agreement for the county for the improvements.

Becky W: If we put a restriction that at least one unit be Owner occupied, can they come back at a later date and ask for an exemption from that ?

RC: They (Accessory Dwellings) do provide a place for the elderly and the young to be able to afford housing in a neighborhood that maybe outside of their affordability. Therefore encouraged. Also I agree that ultimately having a curb and gutter make for better street design and usability.

Harry Azar Motion: Move to approve with the option to recommend for curb and gutter.

Becky L: how about renting restrictions?

Tricia S: unable to enforce by County.

Becky L: Second the motion.

Approved; 6 Yea, Zero Nay, One absent/resigned.

Other business: Neighborhood Livability Initiative Update - Kevin Shriver

Was presented last meeting on June 3rd, 2015 topics about Code Enforcement, Use of 311, and busy season coinciding with marijuana violations and other criminal activities caused by the coming harvest season.

Disclaimer: this Minutes of the meeting is non requirement to the CPAC and The secretary has done his best to reflect what was said. To be held harmless of any omission, errors that may have occurred.