

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
 Regular Meeting, 2 p.m.
 Wednesday, February 15, 2006
 Caldwell Park Conference Room, City Hall
 777 Cypress Avenue
 Redding, California 96001

M I N U T E S

Chairman Gary Brickwood called the meeting to order at 2 p.m., with Senior Planner Terri Thesken, Associate Civil Engineer Rich Cutforth, Senior Planner Lily Toy, Associate Planner Linda Burke, and Executive Assistant II Anita Felion present.

PUBLIC HEARING - SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION SDP-26-05, by Wee Ley Yee, Jr., and Hing Yee, requesting approval to construct a one-story triplex on property located at 1143 and 1148 North Court Street in a "GC-VR" General Commercial-Visitor/Retail District. Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt. Staff Recommendation: Approval.
 L-010-390-700

Senior Planner Lily Toy summarized the staff report. She noted that the project site was currently undeveloped and consisted of two parcels totaling approximately 13,068 square feet. She stated that the applicant had submitted a property-line-adjustment application requesting a merger of the two parcels and that the two parcels would need to be merged prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Ms. Toy discussed density, noting that the applicant was proposing ten units per acre, which was well below the base density of the "RM-15" District. She described the proposed one-story multiple-family triplex and observed that it would be developed with six open parking spaces and a grassy common area for the tenants at the rear of the triplex.

Ms. Toy continued that the property just south of the site was developed with an office and was zoned for office use. She advised that typically, when commercially zoned developments were adjacent to each other, buffer-yard setbacks, landscape, and a masonry wall were not required. She explained that the Zoning Code placed the main responsibility for the buffer-yard criteria with the more intensive use; however, it did not exclude the need for buffer yards with residential development. She said in these cases, the buffer yard was the responsibility of the residential development. Ms. Toy pointed out that in this case, it would be impractical to require full buffer-yard treatments along the south property line, which served as a backyard/patio for the triplex units and required parking areas. She indicated that the applicant was proposing to replicate this development on the north adjacent parcel with another triplex development, which would require a separate site development permit. She mentioned that the applicant was also proposing to utilize the same driveway and pedestrian path provided on the project site for the future development on the north adjacent parcel and to provide a reciprocal-driveway and pedestrian-access easement to the north adjacent parcel at this time. She said staff recommended that the Board of Administrative Review approve Site Development Permit Application SDP-26-05 subject to the conditions of approval, which she reviewed. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 2:10 p.m.

Senior Planner Terri Thesken discussed Condition 9, which addressed the reciprocal-driveway easement and the fence that crossed the property.

Wee Ley Yee, Jr., advised that the fence was going to be removed.

Chairman Gary Brickwood asked what would happen if the applicant did not develop the north parcel and sold it instead. Ms. Toy advised that the reciprocal easement went with the property. She continued that the zoning on the parcel was Residential Multiple Family, so the party would not be required to provide any type of buffer. A discussion ensued regarding the requirement for the reciprocal driveway. Ms. Thesken concluded that a reciprocal-driveway easement was not required and suggested eliminating Condition 9. She explained that the development on the southerly parcel was being considered and that staff could not require the reciprocal driveway if the project did not need it.

Mr. Yee stated that the idea behind the project was to promote something a little better and of some value to the City as well as to himself. He noted that once he acquired property, he usually did not

sell. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 2:17 p.m.

Motion: Senior Planner Terri Thesken moved that the project be found categorically exempt under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and that, based upon the testimony presented by staff, the Board of Administrative Review determine that the necessary findings for approval as identified in Section 18.13.090 of the Redding Municipal Code are in evidence and that the permit be granted subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, including the deletion of Condition 9.

Second: Associate Civil Engineer Rich Cutforth.

Ayes: Senior Planner Thesken, Associate Civil Engineer Cutforth, Chairman Brickwood.

Noes: None.

PUBLIC HEARING - SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION SDP-28-05, by Keller Supply Company, requesting approval to construct an 18,000-square-foot warehouse building with related outdoor storage on property located at 3055 Crossroads Drive in an "HC" Heavy Commercial District. Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt. Staff Recommendation: Approval. L-010-390-700

Associate Planner Linda Burke summarized the staff report. She noted that the building would include a four-foot-high slate-rock wainscot along the front elevation facing Crossroads Drive. She said a similar treatment was planned on the south side of the building, through the office portion and along the north side of the building, extending a distance of approximately 50 feet, or a distance to match the fence on the north property line. Ms. Burke stated that the building included a pedestrian-height roof overhang supported by matching slate-rock columns along the southwest corner of the building and wrapping around to the office portion of the building. She pointed out that the treatments provided interest in an otherwise very plain industrial metal building and were consistent with the City's Design Guidelines. She mentioned that the office was centrally located in the building, as opposed to being put on the end toward the street.

Ms. Burke discussed storm-water detention, noting that staff had concerns about the aesthetics of the basin, which was located within full view of the street. She said the basin would be landscaped and irrigated such that it would be an attractive part of the landscape and not become an eyesore or full of weeds. She said staff recommended that the Board of Administrative Review approve Site Development Permit Application SDP-28-05 subject to the conditions of approval, which she reviewed.

Senior Planner Terri Thesken stated that staff had worked with the applicant in trying to get the building articulated, such as including the wainscoting and the covered walkway. She pointed out that most of the other buildings in the area had some kind of structural elevation and roof-line changes, and she was not sure if this building provided adequate articulation. She mentioned that a condition could be added to go through a final plan review if staff felt strongly enough that a roof-line change was needed. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 2:25 p.m.

Howard Taylor, applicant's representative, described the overhang and the addition of several columns and false windows. He believed the building would be very decorative compared to the other buildings in the area. He indicated that the building was not going to be just one color. Mr. Taylor noted that a sliding gate would close off the driveway at night.

Ms. Burke pointed out that Condition 6 required that final development plans be approved by the Planning Division prior to issuance of a building permit. Ms. Thesken voiced satisfaction with the requirement. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 2:30 p.m.

Motion: Senior Planner Terri Thesken moved that the project be found categorically exempt under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and that, based upon the testimony presented by staff, the Board of Administrative Review determine that the necessary findings for approval as identified in Section 18.13.090 of the Redding Municipal Code are in evidence and that the permit be granted subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff.

Second: Associate Civil Engineer Rich Cutforth.

Ayes: Senior Planner Thesken, Associate Civil Engineer Cutforth, Chairman Brickwood.

Noes: None.

PUBLIC HEARING - PARCEL MAP APPLICATION PM-18-05, by Rex and Lisa Emmett, requesting approval to divide approximately 17 acres into 4 single-family residential lots on property located at 12850 Akrich Street in an "RE-2" Residential Estate District. Environmental Determination: Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Approval. L-010-150

Associate Planner Linda Burke summarized the staff report. She noted that the major issues that were discussed during the processing of the parcel map application were those pertaining to traffic and circulation. She mentioned that the realignment of Akrich Street—or Pine Grove Avenue—from Oasis Road to Interstate 5 was identified through the southern half of this property on the City of Shasta Lake General Plan Land Use and Circulation Diagram. Ms. Burke observed that the realignment was also identified on the City's General Plan Diagram, but at a location south of this property. She advised that staff met with the Development Services Director of the City of Shasta Lake and the project traffic engineer to discuss the potential need to provide for the realignment through the property with this parcel map application. She said the discussion concluded that it was not necessary for Akrich Street to be realigned through this property.

Driveway locations were discussed by Ms. Burke as they related to providing adequate sight distance due to the curve in the road along the parcel frontage of Akrich Street. She mentioned that the applicant's traffic engineer disagreed with staff's engineer for the driveway location on Parcel 4. She noted that Condition 6c regarding access to Parcel 4 had been added to include the words "or a location approved by the City Engineer" in order to give the applicant flexibility when the design work was being done. She said the applicant had also questioned the conditions requiring frontage improvements along Akrich Street; each parcel had approximately 300 to 400 feet of frontage, so it would be very costly. Ms. Burke explained that each parcel owner was required to install curb, gutter, and sidewalk and paving for the street section upon development of the parcel. She pointed out that any request for a deferred improvement agreement could be applied for; however, it would be a separate process to be approved by the City Engineer, so staff recommended leaving the condition as drafted. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 2:41 p.m.

Rex Emmett, co-applicant, thanked Ms. Burke and staff for their hard work. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 2:42 p.m.

Motion: Senior Planner Terri Thesken moved that the Board of Administrative Review adopt the Negative Declaration and that, based upon the testimony presented by staff, the Board find and declare that, as set forth in the Government Code of the State of California, Section 66474, none of the conditions as listed in (a) through (g) exists with regard to this proposed subdivision. She further moved that the Board find that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Redding General Plan and applicable specific plans and that the parcel map be approved subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff.

Second: Associate Civil Engineer Rich Cutforth.

Ayes: Senior Planner Thesken, Associate Civil Engineer Cutforth, Chairman Brickwood.

Noes: None.

SUBDIVISION REVIEW

TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATIONS-21-04 AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PLAN PD-6-04, THE COTTAGES AT BEL AIR, by Ochoa & Shehan Inc., requesting approval to divide approximately 24.1 acres into 55 lots for development of single-family homes on property located adjacent to the south side of Quartz Hill Road, east of River Ridge Drive and west of Terra Nova Drive. The property is a portion of a larger 71-acre parcel addressed as 350 Quartz Hill Road in an "RM-9-PD" Residential Multiple Family District with a Planned Development Overlay District. Environmental Determination: Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Refer to Planning Commission. S-101-085

Associate Planner Linda Burke summarized the staff report. She noted that access to Neighborhood "A" would be provided from Bel Air Drive, which would be constructed with Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Unit 1, while Neighborhoods "B" and "C" would take access from Quartz Hill Road, directly opposite Sensation Drive, to be constructed with The Vistas Subdivision, Unit 3, and an unnamed street to be constructed with The Vistas Subdivision, Unit 4.

Ms. Burke continued that the applicants owned both the Bel Air Estates Subdivision and The Cottages at Bel Air project sites; however, the subject application would be a distinct entitlement. She advised that The Cottages at Bel Air project was dependent upon the construction of certain off-site improvements necessary to serve the subject project, such as improvements to Quartz Hill Road, extension of sanitary sewer service, and provision of storm-water detention, which were either completed or under construction currently with the larger subdivision. Ms. Burke stated that the underlying objective of the planned development proposal was to create a single-family neighborhood environment with a moderate density and common recreational amenities, with quality ensured through a homeowners' association.

The Planned Development Plan was also discussed by Ms. Burke, who noted that a central landscape island was provided within each neighborhood cluster of homes, the largest in Neighborhood "B," which would provide a gathering area and shade or gazebo structure for the entire project. A pedestrian trail was also proposed to connect the neighborhoods through the open-space area, and a gazebo/sitting area along the trail would provide for relaxation and enjoyment of the views. Ms. Burke advised that conditions of approval were not available at the current time, but that the main purpose of today's meeting was to receive public comment on the environmental document and the project. She noted that no neighbors were present at the meeting. Ms. Burke said staff recommended that the Board of Administrative Review forward Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-21-04 and Planned Development Plan PD-6-04, The Cottages at Bel Air, to the Planning Commission. She added that when the conditions of approval were complete, a public hearing would be scheduled for the Planning Commission. She also mentioned that the environmental document was still out for public review and that she had received a call from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) regarding the larger subdivision but not specific to the subject subdivision. She advised that the issues mentioned by the ACOE were permitting issues but would not pertain to approval or denial of this tentative map. The Chairman opened public comment at 2:51 p.m.

Senior Planner Terri Thesken observed that minimal grading was being done for the project.

Tim MacLean, applicant's representative, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer Inc., agreed and noted that only nine acres were actually being developed. He felt it was a good project and would be a nice addition to Redding.

Bill Shehan, co-applicant, explained the history of the project. He complimented Mr. MacLean on the design of the project.

Bruce Becker, Fire Marshal, felt there could be a potential problem regarding parking on the interior side. A discussion ensued regarding the conditions for parking. Determining that no one else wished to speak, the Chairman closed public comment at 2:55 p.m.

Motion: Senior Planner Terri Thesken moved that the Board of Administrative Review refer Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-21-04 and Planned Development Plan PD-6-04, The Cottages at Bel Air, to the Planning Commission.

Second: Associate Civil Engineer Rich Cutforth.

Ayes: Senior Planner Thesken, Associate Civil Engineer Cutforth, Chairman Brickwood.

Noes: None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Gary Brickwood adjourned the meeting at 2:56 p.m.

Anita M. Felion, Executive Assistant II

Gary Brickwood, Chairman