

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
1231 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Permit No: 0011730
Insp Area: 2
Thos Bros: 316-G6

Site Address: 6224 NORTH POINT WY SAC
Parcel No. 030-0840-025 RIVER FRONT ESTATES 2 LOT 1
N

Sub-Type: NSI'R
Housing (Y/N):

CONTRACTOR
NEW CASTLE HOMES
PO BOX 990
DAVIS CA 95617

OWNER
NEW CASTLE HOMES
PO BOX 990
DAVIS CA 95617

ARCHITECT

Nature of Work: NSFR 2 STORY 9 RMS - 2550 SF LVNG(2321 1ST, 229 2ND), 844
SF ATTCHD GAR, 552 SF DECK/PATIO(434 1ST, 118 2ND)

CONSTRUCTION LENDING AGENCY: I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury that there is a construction lending agency for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued (Sec. 3997, Civ. Code)

Lender's Name _____ Lender's Address _____

LICENSED CONTRACTORS DECLARATION: I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury that I am licensed under provisions of Chapter 9 commencing with section 7000 of Division 8 of the Business and Professions Code and my license is in full force and effect.

License Class B License Number 252759 Date 3/6/01 Contractor Signature Brian L. Guep

OWNER-BUILDER DECLARATION: I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury that I am exempt from the contractor's license law for the following reason (Sec. 7031.5, Business and Professions Code, any city or county which requires a permit to construct, alter, improve, demolish, or repair any structure, prior to its issuance, also requires the applicant for such permit to file a signed statement that he or she is licensed pursuant to the provisions of the Contractors License Law (Chapter 9 commencing with Section 7000) of Division 8 of the Business and Professions Code) or that he or she is exempt herefrom and the basis for the alleged exemption: Any violation of Section 7031.5 by any applicant for a permit subjects the applicant to a civil penalty of no more than five hundred dollars (\$500.00)

I, as a owner of the property, or my employees with wages as their sole compensation, will do the work, and the structure is not intended or offered for sale (Sec. 7044, Business and Professions Code). The Contractors License Law does not apply to an owner of property who builds or improves thereon, and who does such work himself or herself or through his/her own employees, provided that such improvements are not intended or offered for sale. If, however, the building or improvement is sold within one year of completion, the owner-builder will have the burden of proving that he/she did not build or improve for the purpose of sale.

I, as owner of the property, am exclusively contracting with licensed contractors to construct project (Sec. 7044, Business and Professions Code). The Contractors License Law does not apply to an owner of property who builds or improves thereon, and who contracts for such projects with a contractor(s) licensed pursuant to the Contractors License Law.

I am exempt under Sec. _____ B & P for this reason _____
Date _____ Civic Signature _____

IN ISSUING THIS BUILDING PERMIT, the applicant represents, and the city represents on behalf of the applicant, that the applicant verified all measurements and locations shown on the application or accompanying drawings and that the construction to be constructed does not violate any law or private agreement relating to permissible or prohibited locations for such improvements. This building permit does not authorize any illegal location of any improvement or the violation of any private agreement relating to location of improvements.

I certify that I have read this application and state that all information is correct. I agree to comply with all city and county ordinances and state laws relating to building construction and hereby authorize representative(s) of this city to enter upon the abovementioned property for inspection purposes.
Date 3/6/01 Applicant/Agent Signature Brian L. Guep

WORKER'S COMPENSATION DECLARATION: I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury one of the following declarations:
I have and will maintain a certificate of consent to self-insure for workers' compensation as provided for by Section 3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of work for which the permit is issued.
I have and will maintain workers' compensation insurance, as required by Section 3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued. My workers' compensation insurance carrier and policy number are:

Carrier Exempt Policy Number _____ Exp Date _____

(This section need not be completed if the permit is for \$100 or less) I certify that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued, I shall not employ any person in any manner so as to become subject to the workers' compensation laws of California and agree that if I should become subject to the workers' compensation provisions of Section 3700 of the Labor Code, I shall forthwith comply with those provisions.

Date 3/6/01 Applicant Signature Brian L. Guep

WARNING: FAILURE TO SECURE WORKER'S COMPENSATION COVERAGE IS UNLAWFUL AND SHALL SUBJECT AN EMPLOYER TO CRIMINAL PENALTIES AND CIVIL FINES UP TO ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$100,000) IN ADDITION TO THE COST OF COMPENSATION, DAMAGES AS PROVIDED FOR IN SECTION 3706 OF THE LABOR CODE, INTEREST AND ATTORNEY'S FEE.

THIS PERMIT SHALL EXPIRE BY LIMITATION IF WORK IS NOT COMMENCED WITHIN 180 DAYS.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO

120 DAY TEMPORARY
Certificate of Occupancy
For Information Contact (916) 264-5716

Building Address: 6224 NORTHPOINT WY Permit No. 0011730

Building Use: RESIDENTIAL HOME Occupancy: R1

Building Owner: JOHN & MONICA BERTKE Construction Type: _____

Owner Address: 6265 GRANGERS DAIRY SAC. Sprinkled? [] Yes [] No

Portion of Building Occupied: ENTIRE Area: 2550 Sq. Ft.

Specific purpose for temporary occupancy and/or conditions/limitations of temporary occupancy:

5/24/02 Ron Yasui Ron Yasui DENNIS RICHARDSON
Date By:Print Sign CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL

[TCO approvals:RY]

BC 109.4 TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE

If the Chief Building Official finds that no substantial hazard will result from occupancy of any building or portion thereof before the same is completed, a temporary Certificate of Occupancy may be issued for the use of a portion or portions of a building or structure prior to the completion for the entire building or structure.

POST IN A CONSPICUOUS PLACE

JOHN & MONIKA BERTKE
8265 GRANGER'S DAIRY DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95831
HOME PH & FAX: (916) 399-0179
E-MAIL: MBK92@AOL.COM

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Ron Yasui	John Bertke
COMPANY:	DATE:
City of Sacto- Building Inspection	5/13/02
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
(916) 808-8370	2
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
(916) 808-1937	
RE:	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:
6224 Northpoint Way	

Lot #1

- URGENT FOR REVIEW PLEASE COMMENT PLEASE REPLY PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

Attached is a copy of the notice to correct faxed to NewCastle Homes. As of Friday, 5/10/02, the flashing installed does not go deep enough to protect the wood members of the house, and the space where the flashing was installed is now covered with rock. View of the areas underneath the house also show that the flashing in this area is above the sill-plate, and as installed, will not properly protect the wood members.

As per my phone message to you, and my conversations with Newcastle Homes, I would like to be notified of the date and time of the re-inspection prior to the actual inspection. My phone number is (530) 308-6728.

Thank you.

6265 Granger's Dairy Drive
Sacramento, CA 95831
Phone: 916 399-0179

May 9, 2002

Via Fax: (916) 394-9700

Mr. Brian Guynn
Newcastle Homes
372 Florin Road, PMB #270
Sacramento, CA 95831

Ref. 6224 Northpoint, Sacto.

NOTICE TO CORRECT

As indicated in article 17, sections 1 and 2 of our contract with Newcastle Homes, this is written notice to Newcastle to correct the improper flashing between the raised concrete decks and wood exteriors of home.



As of today, the flashing installed at the rear of the house is not in conformance with applicable building code.

Sincerely,




Mr. and Mrs. John Bertke

SOLARIUM



OTHER



1 8
5 3/4
1 1/2

8 3/8

Certification of Compliance
School District Development

Part I--To be completed by the APPLICANT

Owner's Name/Address John & Jane Smith
Project Address 6224 North Point Way
Parcel Number _____ Lot No. 1
Subdivision Name Riverview Estates No. of Units 1
Applicant's Signature _____ Title Owner
Phone No. 503-257-7111 Date 4/27/01

Notice to Applicant: Pursuant to Government Code Section 66020(d), this will serve to notify you that the 90-day approval period in which you may protest the fees or other payment identified above will begin to run on the date in which the building or installation permit for this project is issued or on which they are paid to the district(s) or to another public entity authorized to collect them on behalf of the district(s), whichever is earlier.

Part II--To be completed by the BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Plan Identification Number _____
Building Type (check one) Residential Apartment/Condominium Commercial/Industrial
Square Feet of Chargeable Building Area 11,000
Signature/Title _____ Date 4/27/01

Part III--To be completed by the SCHOOL DISTRICT

School District White & Canary Certificate No. 200071
 Exempt Comments _____
Residential/Apartment/etc. _____ Square ft. x \$ 12 = \$ 43,860
Commercial/Industrial _____ Square ft. x \$ _____ = \$ _____
Total fees collected..... = \$ 43,860 -

This certification covers only the amount of square footage indicated above. Any additions or corrections to the square footage for this project will require an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance.

As the authorized school official, I hereby certify that the requirements of Government Code Section 65995 and any other authorized requirements have been complied with by the above signed applicant.

Signature _____ Date 4-27-01

INSULATION CERTIFICATE

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT INSULATION HAS BEEN INSTALLED IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE CURRENT ENERGY REGULATIONS, CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATION CODE, TITLE 24, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, IN THE BUILDING LOCATED AT:

SITE ADDRESS 6224 NORTHPOINTE DRIVE SACRAMENTO CA
NUMBER CITY STATE

CEILING:

BLOW: MANUFACTURER GREENSTONE THICKNESS 10.3" R/VALUE 38
SQUARE FEET 1409 #BAGS/LBS PER BAGS 72

BATTS: MANUFACTURER JOHNS MANVILLE THICKNESS 13" R-VALUE 38
JOHNS MANVILLE

EXTERIOR WALLS:

MANUFACTURER JOHNS MANVILLE THICKNESS 6.5" R/VALUE 19
JOHNS MANVILLE

FLOOR INSULATION:

MANUFACTURER JOHNS MANVILLE THICKNESS 6.5" R/VALUE 19

AIR INFILTRATION: (TITLE 24)

YES XX NO _____

OTHER: _____

GENERAL CONTRACTOR: NEWCASTLE HOMES LICENSE # _____

BY: _____ TITLE _____ DATE _____

INSULATION CONTRACTOR: WESTERN INSULATION LP LICENSE # 794484

BY: Jamie Blair TITLE AUTH. AGENT DATE 4/4/2002
JAMIE BLAIR

File year records
Newcastle Homes
LOT 1

OMEGA PRODUCTS CORP.

DIAMOND WALL INSULATING STUCCO SYSTEM

ICBO Report #1006

JOB ADDRESS:

LOT 1 RIVER FRONT ESTATES #2

PLASTERING CONTRACTOR:

Name: GONZALES PLASTERING

Address: 229 ST. TROPEZ LN

Telephone No: (916) 645-0784

Contractor Number of Diamond Wall System 3440

This is to certify that the exterior coating system on the building exterior at the above address has been installed in accordance with the evaluation report specified above and the manufacturer's instructions.

1 APR 02
Date

Signature of authorized representative of
Plastering Contractor

This installation card must be presented to the building inspector after completion of work and before final inspection.

Date of Job Completion 1 APR 02

P00-102 - Riverfront Estates #2

REQUEST: Entitlements to construct 3 homes on 3 parcels totaling 0.57± net acres in the Standard Single Family (R-1-R) review zone.

A. **Environmental Determination:** Prior Negative Declaration;

B. **Plan Review** for construction of 3 homes on 3 parcels totaling 0.57± net acres in the Standard Single Family (R-1-R) review zone.

LOCATION: East side of North Point way
APN: 030-0041-045 & 030-0840-003
Pocket Community Plan Area
Sacramento City Unified School District
Council District 7

APPLICANT:	Robert DelPonte L & P Development, 399-9096 7757 Dutra Bend Dr. Sacramento, CA 95831
OWNER:	Robert DelPonte L & P Development 7757 Dutra Bend Dr. Sacramento, CA 95831
APPLICATION FILED:	July 24, 2000
APPLICATION COMPLETED:	October 3, 2000
STAFF CONTACT:	Brad Shirhall, 916-264-7483

SUMMARY: The applicant is requesting a Plan Review of three single family homes on three separate parcels. The basic issues include design and adherence to the City's Single Family Residential Design Principles.

Date of Request: _____
By: _____

**CITY OF SACRAMENTO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION
PLANNING AND ZONING INFORMATION REQUEST**

Project Address: 0224 North First Way

Assessor's Parcel Number: 030-0040-025?

Previous Use: VACANT

Description of Request/Proposed Use: New Construction SFR

Is This a Change of Use? No

Prior Applications for Project Site(P#, Z#, DRPB#): _____
Zoning Designation: R1-R
Needs DR application

Comments: 5-801 See P00-142
and or P00-102
M May 5/8/01

Are There Any Planning Issues?: (circle one) YES NO

- * Staff Site Plan Check Required? (Circle one) YES NO
- * Field Inspection Required? (Circle one) YES NO
- * Design Review/Preservation Required?: (Circle one) YES NO Needs DR.

Planning Review by/Date: [Signature] 10-2-00

A list of items that must be reviewed by Planning is provided on the reverse side of this form.

MICROFILM AFTER FINAL

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the project as conditioned. The project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements and with the Single Family Residential Design Principles.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential
 Community Plan Designation: Residential (3-6 du/acre)
 Existing Land Use of Site: Vacant
 Existing Zoning of Site: Standard Single Family Review (R-1-R)

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:

North: City Park; Agriculture (A) zone
 South: Elks Lodge; Agriculture (A) zone
 East: Single Family Residential; Single Family Alternative Review (R-1A-R) zone
 West: Single Family Residential; Standard Single Family (R-1) zone

Setbacks:	Required	Provided		
		Lot 2	Lot 7	Lot 9
Front:	25'	25'	25'	35½'
Side(St):	12½'	N/A	N/A	N/A
Side(Int):	5'	5'	5'	7½'
Rear:	15'	19'	18½'	25'

Property Dimensions: Approximately 110' x 75' per lot
 Property Area: Approximately 0.19± net acres per lot
 Density of Development: 4.3 dwelling units per net acre
 Square Footage of Buildings: 2,587 to 4,243 square feet
 Maximum Height of Buildings: 36 feet, 2 stories
 Exterior Building Materials: Stucco, brick veneer
 Roof Material: Tile
 Topography: Flat
 Street Improvements: Existing
 Utilities: Existing

OTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED: In addition to the entitlements requested, the applicant will also need to obtain the following permits or approvals, including, but not limited to:

<u>Permit</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Building Permit	Building Division
Final Map	Department of Public Works
Reclamation Board Permit	Reclamation Board, State of California

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: On July 12, 1990, the City Planning Commission recommended approval of the necessary entitlements to allow development of a 19-unit subdivision, on approximately 6.5± acres, along the west side of North Point Way (River Front Estates #1, P90-158). On August 21, 1990, the City Council approved: the General and Community Plan Amendments (re-designating 6.5± acres from Public/Quasi Public and Open Space land use to Low Density Residential land use); a Rezone from Agriculture (A) to Standard Single Family Residential (R-1); a Tentative Map (subdividing the site into 19 single family lots, Lot A, and Lot B); and a Subdivision Modification (allowing a cul-de-sac in excess of 500 feet). A Negative Declaration was prepared and ratified for the project which included the 6.5± acre site, as well as the 2.44± acre site (which includes the current proposal) located to the east to be subdivided in the future into additional single family residential units (9 additional units were anticipated in a schematic subdivision map utilized for environmental review purposes). In August, 1999, the City Planning Commission approved a Tentative Map to create 10 single family residential parcels, and recommended approval of the General and Community Plan Amendments and Rezones to allow residential designations and zoning. On November 16, 1999 the City Council approved the Planning Commission recommendations. To ensure further review of individual development plans for each parcel, the City Council also modified the rezone request adding the Plan Review (R) designation. While Plan Review of single family homes would normally be conducted by the Zoning Administrator, this project was specifically conditioned for Planning Commission review to ensure an opportunity for the public to attend an evening hearing.

STAFF EVALUATION: Staff has the following comments:

A. Policy Considerations

General Plan

The subject site is designated as Low Density Residential by the General Plan. The applicant's proposal would not result in a change to the present or anticipated land use of the site.

Community Plan

The subject site is designated as Residential (16-29 DU/Net Acre) by the Pocket Area Community Plan. The proposed land use is consistent with the Pocket Area Community Plan land use designation.

Zoning Ordinance

The subject site is zoned Standard Single Family Review (R-1-R). This zone is intended to permit the establishment of single family residences on lots no smaller than 52 by 100 feet.

Plan Review Requirements

The Plan Review provision of the City's Zoning Ordinance allows the Planning Commission to ensure that a proposed project is compatible with surrounding development, and consistent with the General and Community Plan.

To conduct and complete a Plan Review, the Planning Commission shall consider the site layout, orientation and location of buildings, open spaces, construction materials, and other features as they relate to the physical characteristics of the site, and to surrounding properties. The Planning Commission cannot deny the Plan Review entitlement based solely on the proposed land use. However, if a project applicant cannot, or will not, meet conditions deemed reasonable and placed on the project by the Planning Commission, then the project can be denied.

Single Family Residential Design Principles

In September 2000, the City Council approved the Single Family Residential Design Principles. The principles illustrate the expectations of the Planning Commission and Design Review Board when they review single family residential developments. The proposed project was submitted prior to approval of the principles in September. Therefore, while staff chose to review the project using the principles, strict compliance on the part of the developer, was not considered mandatory.

C. Site Plan Design/Zoning Requirements

1. Setbacks

As indicated on page two of this report each structure will meet or exceed the minimum setback requirements specified by the Zoning Ordinance.

2. Lot Coverage

The Zoning Code specifies both lot coverage and front yard coverage requirements. Lot coverage is defined as the percentage of lot area covered by structure (house, gazebo, decks). Driveway space is not considered in the lot coverage calculation. However, driveway area is considered when calculating front yard coverage. The Zoning Code requires that not more than 40 percent of total lot area be covered by a structure or combination thereof. Similarly, driveways can not occupy more than 40 percent of a front yard setback area. A Variance to these requirements must be granted if a deviation is requested.

Lots 2 and 9 would have 38 and 27 percent lot coverage, respectively. Lot 7 would have 40 percent lot coverage. Therefore, property owners of lot 7 would be prohibited from adding accessory structures in the future.

Lots 2 and 7 would have 34 and 37 percent front yard setback area coverage would be 34 and 37 percent respectively. Lot 9 would have 40 percent coverage.

All of the proposals meet the lot coverage requirements.

3. Parking

The Zoning Code specifies that one parking space be provided for each single family dwelling unit. Each of the homes would exceed this requirement.

D. Building Design

Lot 2

The house plans for Lot 2 (Exhibits 1B and 1C) indicate a 2,587 sq. ft. single story home with a two car garage. The house would be stucco with brick veneer wainscoting and a concrete tile roof. The height of the house to the plateline would be 9½ feet. The overall height of the roof would 21½ feet. The front elevation features multiple divided light windows. The two larger windows include an arch shaped window on top. Of the three house plans reviewed with this application, this house does not follow the design principles because the garage protrudes from the face of the house. As mentioned previously, staff is not requiring strict compliance with the design principles. However, to break up the mass of the garage door, the project has been conditioned to add windows to the top section of the garage door. Window treatments are available that would closely match the window arches on the remainder of the house. Finally, to the left of the garage door an octagon window is indicated. This window seems out of place and leaves the elevation unbalanced. Staff has conditioned the project to place a standard window, matching that on the far right of the front elevation, instead of the octagon.

Lot 7

The house plans for Lot 7 (Exhibits 1D through 1F) indicate a 4,243 sq.ft. two story home with a four car garage. The house would be stucco with a concrete tile roof. The height of the house to the second story plateline would be 19 feet. The overall height of the roof would be 32 feet. The front elevation would feature several single plate windows on the bottom and upper story. A large porch with two cylindrical columns and a round window would define the front entrance which is placed at a 45 degree angle on the right corner of the house. The garage would be placed at the rear of the house, completely hidden from the street. Access to the garage would be via a long driveway on the right side of the house.

Lot 9

The house plans for Lot 9 (Exhibits 1G and 1H) indicate a 2,613 sq.ft. two story home with a three car garage. The house would be stucco with a concrete tile roof. The height of the house to the second story plateline would be 18 feet. The overall height of the roof would be 36 feet. The front elevation would feature several single plate windows on the bottom and upper story. A large porch with two cylindrical columns and a round window would define the front entrance. The single bay of the three car garage would extend two feet from the remainder of the front elevation. The second story of the house would be placed over the garage and would be setback from the front of the garage an average of 4½ feet. The design of the home complies with the design principles. However, the mass of the garage doors should be broken-up with placement of windows in the upper section. This has been incorporated as a condition of approval. Lot 9 and Lot 8 (which is not part of this project) have existing trees that are to be preserved. Fence and walkway details submitted by the applicant are insufficient for staff to determine if preservation can be assured. A condition of approval has been incorporated that requires the applicant to submit a tree preservation plan with appropriate drawings.

All three house designs would be compatible with the style and size of existing homes in the neighborhood.

PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS:A. Environmental Determination

On November 16, 1999 the City Council adopted an addendum to a previously approved Negative Declaration for the originally proposed project (P90-158). Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that an additional Negative Declaration need not be prepared unless subsequent changes are proposed in the project, substantial changes occur with respect to the project circumstances, or new information of substantial importance to the project becomes known or available. None of these conditions exist; therefore, a new Negative Declaration is not required.

B. Public/Neighborhood/Business Association Comments

Staff requested comments from the following individuals and neighborhood associations:

Sacramento River Parkway Associates
Crestwater Gardens Homes Association
Lake Greenhaven Homeowners Association
Mr. Michael Vadnais

Written comments were received from Sacramento River Parkway Associates. Their comments were to remind staff of the Pocket Community Plan recommendation that development near the river should occur outside of a 40 foot buffer between the levee toe and the property line. They also stated that dedication of a "recreational easement" on top of the levee is required. Staff reviewed the previous City Council report for River Front Estates (P99-034) and found that a forty foot buffer has been provided as recommended by the Pocket Community Plan. The applicant cannot provide a recreational easement on top of the levee since he does not own the levee.

Mr. Michael Vadnais provided comments by phone. He did not voice any particular concerns about the project but was interested in whether the property owner had included any bicycle lane connections on any of the parcels. Staff reported that no connections had been provided. In November 1999, the City Council approved the tentative map, upon which this project is based, without any requirement for bicycle lane connections.

C. Summary of Agency Comments

The project has been reviewed by several City Departments and other agencies. The following summarizes the comments received:

1. Utilities Department

The Utilities Department requested their standard grading and erosion control condition. This has been incorporated as a condition of approval.

2. Public Works Department

The Public Works department noted that the driveway and garage combination on Lot 7 would not permit sufficient on-site vehicle maneuvering. They also requested that driveways be constructed per city code. The applicant revised the plan for lot 7 to provide adequate maneuvering area. Public Works' driveway condition has been incorporated.

3. State of California Reclamation Board


The Reclamation Board has indicated that a Board permit must be obtained "prior to start of any work, including excavation and construction activities, within the Sacramento River project floodway, its levees, and within 10 feet landward of the landside toes of the levees." A condition of approval has been incorporated requiring the project applicant to confirm with the Board that a permit is or is not required.

PROJECT APPROVAL PROCESS: Of the entitlements below, Planning Commission has the authority to approve or deny A and B. The Planning Commission action may be appealed to the City Council. The appeal must occur within 10 days of the Planning Commission action.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the Planning Commission take the following actions:


- A. Finds that a previous Environmental Document was prepared and ratified;
- B. Adopt the attached Notice of Decision and Findings of Fact approving the Plan Review for construction of 3 homes on 3 parcels totaling 0.57± net acres in the Standard Single Family (R-1-R) review zone.

Report Prepared By,



Brad Shirhall, Associate Planner

Report Reviewed By,



Thomas Pace, Senior Planner

Attachments

- | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| Attachment 1 | Notice of Decision & Findings of Fact |
| Exhibit 1A | Site Plan |
| Exhibit 1B | Lot 2 Elevations |
| Exhibit 1C | Lot 2 Floor Plan |
| Exhibit 1D | Lot 7 Elevations |
| Exhibit 1E | Lot 7 Elevations |
| Exhibit 1F | Lot 7 Floor Plan |
| Exhibit 1G | Lot 9 Elevations |
| Exhibit 1H | Lot 9 Floor Plan |
| Attachment 2 | Vicinity Map |
| Attachment 3 | Land Use & Zoning Map |

**NOTICE OF DECISION AND FINDINGS OF FACT FOR RIVERFRONT ESTATES #2,
LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF NORTH POINT WAY,
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA IN THE
STANDARD SINGLE FAMILY REVIEW (R-1-R) ZONE. (P00-102)**

At the regular meeting of February 8, 2001, the City Planning Commission heard and considered evidence in the above entitled matter. Based on verbal and documentary evidence at said hearing, the Planning Commission took the following actions for the location listed above:

- A. Environmental Determination:** Prior Negative Declaration;
- B. Approved a Plan Review** for construction of 3 homes on 3 parcels totaling 0.57± net acres in the Standard Single Family (R-1-R) review zone.

These actions were made based upon the following findings of fact and subject to the following conditions:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- A. Prior Environmental Document Prepared: The City Planning Commission finds that a previous Environmental Document was prepared and ratified.
- B. Plan Review. The Plan Review for construction of 3 homes on 3 parcels totaling 0.57± net acres in the Standard Single Family (R-1-R) review zone is approved based on the following findings of fact:
 - 1. The proposed development, including but not limited to the density of a proposed residential development, is consistent with the general plan and any applicable community or specific plan;
 - 2. Facilities, including utilities, access roads, sanitation and drainage are adequate and consistent with city standards, and the proposed improvements are properly related to existing and proposed streets and highways;
 - 3. The property involved is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the proposed use and required yard, building coverage, setback, parking area and other requirements of this title; and;
 - 4. Approval of the plan review will not be contrary to the public health or safety or injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- B. The Plan Review for construction of 3 homes on 3 parcels totaling 0.57± net acres in the Standard Single Family (R-1-R) review zone is hereby approved subject to the following conditions of approval:
- B1. The applicant shall obtain all necessary building permits prior to construction.
 - B2. Any modification to the project shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division staff prior to issuance of building permits.
 - B3. Prior to issuance of any building permits for Lot 9, applicant shall submit a tree preservation plan with detailed fence and walkway plans that indicate measures taken to preserve existing trees located on Lot 9 and Lot 8. Plans shall be reviewed and approved by Planning Staff and the City Arborist.
 - B4. Prior to issuance of any building permits, applicant shall contact the State of California, Reclamation Board to confirm whether a Reclamation Board Permit is required prior to any construction activities.
 - B5. Prior to issuance of building permits for Lot 2, the applicant shall submit for review and approval by Planning Division staff, revised elevation plans for Lot 2 which indicate the omission of the octagon window left of the garage, and replacement with a window matching that on the far right side of the front elevation. Revised plan for Lot 2 shall also indicate windows, arranged in an arch pattern, in the top section of the garage door.
 - B6. Prior to issuance of building permits for Lot 9, the applicant shall submit for review and approval by Planning Division staff, revised elevation plans for Lot 9 which indicate windows in the top section of the garage door.

Public Works Conditions

- B7. Applicant shall construct all driveways in accordance with provisions in the City Code and ADA requirements.

Utilities Conditions

- B8. The applicant must comply with the City of Sacramento's, Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. This ordinance will require the applicant to prepare erosion and sediment control plans for both during and after construction of the proposed project, prepare preliminary and final grading plans, and prepare plans to control urban runoff pollution from the project site during construction.

Advisory Notes:

1. The proposed project is located in the 100-year floodplain, designated as an A-99 zone on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Federal Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) that have been revised by a Letter of Map Revision effective May 22, 2000. Within the A-99 zone, there are no requirements to elevate or flood proof. Please contact Department of Utilities at 264-1400 prior to building design for an up-to-date status of the flood zone.

2. Payment of additional sewer impact fees may be required before developing this property. Contact the fee quote desk (875-6679) at the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District for further information.



 CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:





 SECRETARY TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

2-8-01
 DATE (P00-102)

- Exhibit 1A Site Plan
- Exhibit 1B Lot 2 Elevations
- Exhibit 1C Lot 2 Floor Plan
- Exhibit 1D Lot 7 Elevations
- Exhibit 1E Lot 7 Elevations
- Exhibit 1F Lot 7 Floor Plan
- Exhibit 1G Lot 9 Elevations
- Exhibit 1H Lot 9 Floor Plan

Exhibit 1A - Site Plan



SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1"=30'-0"



Exhibit 1B - Lot 2 Elevations




Exhibit 1C - Lot 2 Floor Plan

REVISIONS	 NORTH ARROW NORTH NORTH ARROW NORTH	P00-102 Rec'd 7/24/00 ROBERT DELPONTE CIVIL ENGINEER, S.E. 1000 S. W. 10TH AVENUE, SUITE 200 MIAMI, FL 33135	2 SHEET NO. OF 4
-----------	---	---	------------------------




Exhibit 1D - Lot 7 Elevations

NO.	REVISIONS

KEVIN FONG
DESIGN
ARCHITECTS
1000 RIVERVIEW BLVD
SUITE 200
SACRAMENTO, CALIF. 95811
TEL: (916) 441-1111
FAX: (916) 441-1112
WWW.KFARCHITECTS.COM

MR. AND MRS. PETER WAN
1000 RIVERVIEW BLVD
SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

3





Exhibit 1E - Lot 7 Elevations Cont.

NO.	
REVISION	



1. LICENSE NO. 10012
 MR. AND MRS. PETER WAN
 LOT 7 NORTH POINT
 SACRAMENTO, CALIF.


NO.	4
DATE	
BY	
SCALE	
PROJECT	
SHEET	



REAR ELEVATION

LEFT-SIDE ELEVATION


Exhibit 1F - Lot 7 Floor Plan





ROBERT DELPONTE
LOT 9 NORTH POINT VAL
SUNNINGDALE, CALIFORNIA


Exhibit 1G - Lot 9 Elevations







ROBERT DELPONTE
17018 NORTH FORT WAY
MORNING HILLS, CALIFORNIA

Exhibit 1H - Lot 9 Floor Plan



Attachment 2





Planning & Building
Department

Geographic
Information
System

Land Use & Zoning
P00-102

