

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 2010

2009-0672: Application for a Design Review to construct a new two story single family home with an attached garage totaling approximately 2,323 square feet with a Floor Area Ratio of 52% for a site at **693 W. McKinley Avenue** (APN: 165-12-059) SM (***Continued from April 12, 2010***)

Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He said this item was continued from the March 22, 2010 and April 12, 2010 Planning Commission meetings to allow additional time for the applicant to consider modifications to the design. He said the applicant modified the plans and staff supports the changes and recommends approval of the Design Review subject to the conditions in Attachment B.

Comm. Rowe discussed with staff the increased second floor west side setback and the changes to the roofline. She confirmed with staff that these were the only changes with the proposed project since it was previously considered.

Comm. Hungerford asked staff about the percentage ratio of the second floor to the first floor as the design guidelines recommend that the second floor should be no more than 35% of the first floor. Comm. Rowe added that the proposed changes are for a 19 square foot reduction for the second floor. **Trudi Ryan**, Planning Officer, said that the proposed second floor is about 58% of the first floor with the reduction being about 1.3% from the previous proposal.

Comm. Klein said that the March 22, 2010 report included more information on the design guidelines that seems to be disregarded in the current staff report. Ms. Ryan said that the current report focuses more on the minor modifications; however the design guidelines still apply. She said the previous report indicated the first to second floor ratio of 35% was not met, however staff thought that because the home is on a corner lot that the larger ratio could be recommended.

Chair Chang opened the public hearing.

Robert Ruiz, applicant, provided a PowerPoint presentation discussing examples of homes within one block of his house, including square footage information, Floor Area Ratios (FAR), second-floor setbacks, and other corner homes nearby. He said his proposed home is smaller than five nearby homes discussing side elevations and other second-story treatments. He said the proposed home has a lower FAR than several of the more recently built houses in the neighborhood and that the second-story massing has been addressed in a way similar to neighboring homes. He said he worked with staff and believes that the proposed home is consistent with the neighborhood.

Chair Chang closed the public hearing.

Comm. McKenna moved for Alternative 1, to approve the Design Review with the conditions in Attachment B. Comm. Sulser seconded the motion.

Comm. McKenna said the applicant heard the concerns of some of the Commissioners and by working with staff has provided modifications making the proposed project consistent with the neighborhood.

Comm. Sulser commended the applicant for making changes to address some of the Commission's concerns. He said he thinks the proposed project is less boxy and less busy than some of the nearby homes shown in the PowerPoint presentation.

Comm. Klein said he would reluctantly be supporting the motion. He expressed concern about the report not mentioning that the project goes outside of the design guidelines with the second-to-first-floor ratio being close to 60% rather than 35%. He said the modifications made by the applicant are minimal. Comm. Klein said he thinks this home will fit in with the neighborhood, that the home is attractive, and that it will not cause issues for the neighbors.

Comm. Hungerford said he would reluctantly be supporting the motion as he is concerned about the project not meeting the design guidelines regarding setbacks and the second story being much larger than the recommend 35%. He said with the home near downtown in a neighborhood that is more urban than suburban, that he thinks the neighborhood can handle a little more density. He said he likes the look of the house and being on a corner lot that this home would not crowd neighbors.

Comm. Rowe said she would reluctantly not be supporting the motion. She said the proposed house is attractive, however the home being on a corner concerns her more than her colleagues as this would be the first house seen when entering this street. She said she is concerned about the massiveness of the house on this lot and that the modifications were minimal.

Vice Chair Travis said he likes the changes made by the applicant, and that the one-foot additional setback makes a difference for him. He said he would be supporting the motion.

Chair Chang said he would be supporting the motion. He said the size of the house has been an issue; however the proposed project meets the criteria and character of the neighborhood.

ACTION: Comm. McKenna made a motion on 2009-0672 to approve the Design Review with the conditions in Attachment B. Comm. Sulser seconded. Motion carried 6-1, with Comm. Rowe dissenting.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This action is final unless appealed to the City Council no later than May 11, 2010.