

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

927 - 10th Street, Suite 300 -SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

| | | | |
|--------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| APPLICANT | Noel T. & Katheryn E. Goursolle; c/o Dillon & Cavanaugh, 926 'J' St., | | |
| OWNER | Noel T. & Katheryn E. Goursolle | Suite 402, Sacramento, CA 95814 | |
| PLANS BY | Mau & Mirza, 5660 Freeport Blvd., Sacramento, CA 95822 | | |
| FILING DATE | 1-31-84 | 50 DAY CPC ACTION DATE | REPORT BY: JP:bw |
| NEGATIVE DEC | Ex. 15303(c) | EIR | ASSESSOR'S PCL NO. 010-094-15 |

APPLICATION: Variance to waive the required six-foot high solid masonry wall between commercial and residential uses (Sec. 3-D-7-a)

LOCATION: 2009 'V' Street

PROJECT INFORMATION:

1974 General Plan Designation: Commercial and Offices
1980 Central City Community
Plan Designation: General Commercial
Existing Zoning of Site: C-2
Existing Land Use of Site: Cornet Photography Studio and Laboratory

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:

North: Office and Residential; C-2
South: Office and Parking; C-2
East: Residential; R-0
West: Residential and Offices; C-2 and C-4

Parking Required: 18 spaces
Parking Provided: 24 spaces
Parking Ratio: 1:500
Property Dimensions: Irregular
Property Area: 29,000± square feet
Square Footage of Buildings: 8,794±
Exterior Building Colors and
Materials of Photo Lab: Gray concrete block, with blue trim

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: On April 9, 1981 the Planning Commission approved a lot line merger to create the subject parcel (P-9346). At that time, a 2,378 square foot photo studio and two single family residences slated for removal were located on the site. On August 5, 1981 the Architectural Review Board approved plans for a 6,426 square foot photo laboratory on the subject site (ARB81-70). The staff report for this project mentioned that a six-foot high solid masonry wall would be required on the western property line between the existing residence and proposed commercial use as per Zoning Ordinance requirements and a condition of approval was that the masonry wall would be reviewed by ARB staff. In the winter of 1982 the two residential units were removed, and the photo lab was constructed on the subject site. Instead of the required masonry wall, however, a six-foot high redwood fence was constructed along the western property line. The applicant is now requesting a variance to waive the masonry wall requirement and to allow the redwood fence to remain.

STAFF EVALUATION: Staff has the following comments regarding this proposal:

1. The subject site is a 29,000± square foot parcel located in the General Commercial (C-2) zone. Adjacent uses include office buildings to the north and south of the site and residential uses to the east and west (Exhibit A).

While the residences to the east of the site are across 21st Street, the single family residences to the west are directly adjacent to the site. The Zoning Ordinance requires that a six-foot high solid masonry wall be erected between commercial and residential uses. This requirement applies to the western property line of the site (Exhibit B). The applicant, however, has constructed a six-foot high redwood fence along this property line (Exhibits C and D), and is requesting a variance to waive the masonry wall requirement.

2. The purpose of the solid masonry wall requirement is to provide a noise, visual and safety barrier for residents adjacent to a commercial use. Concrete material is required as it will withstand more physical abuse than other types of fencing material (such as wood) and is a more effective noise barrier. Although a wood fence has been erected at the subject site, this does not preclude the need for the masonry wall which is the more effective barrier. Residents adjacent to the subject site have stated that the existing redwood fence is an inadequate noise barrier and fear that it may be damaged by automobiles and natural elements (see Exhibit E).


There is no hardship or unusual circumstance that would prevent the applicant from constructing a six-foot high solid masonry wall along the western property line. Therefore, staff recommends denial of the variance request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends denial of the variance to waive the required six-foot high solid masonry wall, based on Findings of Fact which follow:

Findings of Fact

- a. The variance, if approved, would constitute a special privilege extended to one individual property owner in that no hardship can be found that would prevent the applicant from constructing the required masonry wall;
- b. The variance, if approved, would be injurious to the public welfare and to neighboring properties in that an adequate noise, visual and safety barrier would not be provided between the subject site and adjacent residential use to the west.

LOCATION MAP



R-5

C-3

C-2

R-4R

R-3A

C-3

C-2

C-2

C-2

R-5

C-1

C-2

R-0

R-0

R-0

subject site

C-2

C-2

C-2

R-3A

R-3A

C-4

R-1B

R-3A

R-1B

R-3A

C-2

C-2

C-2

R-0

R-3A

R-1B

C-2

R-0

R-OC2

R-1B

R-3A

C-2

R-3A

R-0

R-3A

R-3A

C-2

GUINN AVE.

C-2

R-0

C-2

C-4

R-0

C-2

BROADWAY

P84-064

3-8-84

No. 17

SHEET INDEX

| | |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| 001 | GENERAL |
| 01 | TITLE SHEET, SITE PLAN & INDEX |
| 02 | SITE PLAN, SITE DEVELOPMENT |
| 03 | PLUMBING PLAN & SANITARY SCHEDULES |
| 04 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 05 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 06 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 07 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 08 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 09 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 10 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 11 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 12 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 13 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 14 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 15 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 16 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 17 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |

| | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|
| 201 | STRUCTURAL |
| 21 | STANDARD DETAILS |
| 22 | FOUNDATION PLAN & STRUCTURAL DETAILS |
| 23 | FLOOR FINISHING & SECTIONS |
| 24 | CEILING FINISHING |
| 25 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 26 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 27 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 28 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 29 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 30 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |

| | |
|-----|---------------------------|
| 301 | MECHANICAL |
| 31 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 32 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 33 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 34 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 35 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 36 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 37 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 38 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 39 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 40 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |

| | |
|-----|---------------------------|
| 401 | MECHANICAL |
| 41 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 42 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 43 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 44 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 45 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 46 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 47 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 48 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 49 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 50 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |

| | |
|-----|---------------------------|
| 501 | MECHANICAL |
| 51 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 52 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 53 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 54 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 55 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 56 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 57 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 58 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 59 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 60 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |

| | |
|-----|---------------------------|
| 601 | MECHANICAL |
| 61 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 62 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 63 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 64 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 65 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 66 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 67 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 68 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 69 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 70 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |

| | |
|-----|---------------------------|
| 701 | MECHANICAL |
| 71 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 72 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 73 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 74 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 75 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 76 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 77 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 78 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 79 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 80 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |


| | |
|-----|---------------------------|
| 801 | MECHANICAL |
| 81 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 82 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 83 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 84 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 85 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 86 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 87 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 88 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |
| 89 | MECHANICAL PLAN & DETAILS |
| 90 | MECHANICAL SCHEDULE |

EXHIBIT B



VIEW FROM V STREET

CONCRETE PHOTO LAB
 1111 V STREET, S.W.
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004
 DATE: 01/17/84
 DRAWN BY: [Signature]
 CHECKED BY: [Signature]



SITE PLAN SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"

CONCRETE PHOTO LAB

Masonry Wall Required Along Property Line

P 84064

3-8-84

No. 17

EXHIBIT C




EXHIBIT D




EXHIBIT E

CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

FEB 29 1984

RECEIVED

2007 V Street
Sacramento, CA 95818
February 27, 1984

Joy Patterson, Planner
Sacramento City Planning Department
927 10th Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Patterson:

As adjacent neighbors to Coronet Studio at 2009 V Street, we are opposed to a variance allowing a non-code fence.

Our first reason is that the fence serves a dual purpose as a retaining wall to the one foot difference in elevation between our lots. The parking lot was graded so that it would drain centrally and, as a result, the western edge of the lot is a full 12 inches above the eastern edge of our lot. The base of the present wood fence is a 1 x 12" redwood plank. We feel that this is inadequate when compared to the life of other improvements.

Also, we feel that a wood fence is too weak when considering that vehicles are in close proximity all the time. One may examine the fence on the east side of Coronet to see the kind of abuse it must stand up to. In point of fact, any single one of the collisions to that eastern fence would have knocked it down if it were not masonry. Coronet's fence could easily be toppled if a long-bedded truck backed up. If their fence is to be the common boundary, we want more security.

Additionally, a wooden fence is not fireproof. There has already been what appeared to be a fire in a car engine next door, and the parking lot has been open less than a year.

Local newspapers have reported that only masonry walls cut the noise beside freeways; so for this reason, we also want a fence that meets the zoning code. Dealing with schools, the photography studio has mass orders and many deadlines requiring late hours. We have seen employees leave at 11 p.m. and 3 a.m. With the involvement of this kind of an operation, we feel justified in asking for the maximum noise protection.

Our neighbors have brought up the topic of the fence serving as an impediment to access to our present sewer line. However, we told his attorney that the asphalt over it and the exterior baselite structure built at its juncture to the city main were sufficient to cause us to buy a building permit to reroute our line.

Yours truly,

Phyllis Ehlert Blegen

Phyllis Ehlert Blegen

Dennis A. Blegen

Dennis A. Blegen


City Planning Commission
Sacramento, California

Members in Session:

Subject: Various requests for 4200 Stockton Boulevard (P84-067)

The applicant requests that this item be continued to the March 22, 1984
Commission meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



Suzanne Glimstad,
Sec. to Planning Commission

sg

