CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

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

APPLICANT S. D. Graham (Rainbow Developers), P.O. Box 667, Shingle Springs, CA 95682	
OWNER Martin L. & Karol L. Mehan, 2147 Ocaso Camino, Fremont, CA 94539	
PLANS BY S. D. Graham, P.O. Box 667, Shingle Springs, CA 95682	Di abu
FUING DATE 4-13-84 50 DAY CPC ACTION DATE	REPORT BY: RL:bw
FILING DATE 4-13-84 50 DAY CPC ACTION DATE REPORT BY: RL:DW EX. 15303(C) 15305(a) EIR ASSESSOR'S PCL NO.007-025-01 (portion of)	

APPLICATION: Variance to reduce rear yard setback from 15 to 6.5 feet (Sec. 3-B-4a) (P84-105)

LOCATION: East side of 23rd Street; north side of alley between 'H' and 'I' Streets

PROPOSAL: The applicant is requesting the necessary entitlement to develop a two-story duplex structure on a 3,200 square foot lot.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

1974 General Plan Designation:Residential1980 Central City CommunityPlan Designation:Multi-FamilyExisting Zoning of Site:R-3AR-3AExisting Land Use of Site:Vacant

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:

North: Single Family, Multiple Family; R-3A South: Multiple Family; R-3A East: Multiple Family; R-3A West: Single Family; Multiple Family; R-3A

Parking Required: Parking Proposed: Parking Ratio: Property Dimensions: Property Area: Density of Development: Square Footage of Units: Height of Structure: Street Improvements: Utilities: Exterior Building Colors/ Materials: 2 spaces 2 spaces 1 space per unit 80' x 40' 3,200 sq. ft. 27 units per acre equivalent; 36.3 permitted 900' 26 feet (2 stories) Full improvements on 23rd St.; paved alley Available to site Gold/8 inch shiplap wood siding;

Brown trim; Brown compo shingle roof

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: On May 26, 1983, the Commission approved a tentative map (P83-120) dividing a 79' x 160' parcel into three smaller lots. One of those lots is a 80-foot wide by 40 foot deep parcel on which the applicant is presently requesting a variance of the rear yard setback requirement. $(10) \ge 4 \ge 2$

At the time that the subject site was created, there was an existing duplex structure located on the south side of the site. It was subsequently destroyed by fire. Although that structure had zero setbacks on the front, rear and alley, the applicant could legally replicate the structure without having to apply for variances. However, the applicant proposes to replace the units with a new design and placement of the structure. As such, all provisions of the Zoning Ordinance are applicable.

APPLE NO. P84-105

MEETING DATE April 26, 1924

CPULLINNO 26

STAFF EVALUATION: Staff has the following comments regarding the proposed project:

- 1. The subject property was created with a substandard depth. Therefore, development with standard setbacks would be difficult and would result in a smaller, longer and narrower structure. Staff has no objection to the reduction of the rear (east) setback from 15 feet to six and one-half feet.
- 2. The elevations (see Exhibit B) are greatly improved over those initially submitted with the application. Staff has no objection to the building design.
- 3. Open parking is proposed off the alley. Planting between the parking and the street is made only as a general reference on the site plan (see Exhibit A). Staff suggests that a five-foot wood screen be provided (per staff's comment on Exhibit A) as an effective means of buffering parked vehicles from public view.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: The proposed project is exempt from environmental review, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15303(c), and 15305(a)).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the variance, subject to a condition and based on the Findings of Fact that follow.

Condition - Variance

A five-foot wood screen with shrubs in front of the screen shall be provided between the parking area and the public right-of-way as shown on Exhibit A. The design of the screen shall be subject to staff review and approval.

Findings of Fact

- a. The variance is not a special privilege granted to one individual property owner. It could be granted to other property owners facing similar circumstances where the lot has a substandard depth of 40 feet;
- b. The project is not a use variance in that the duplex is permitted in the R-3A zoned lot;
- . c. The project, as conditioned, will not be injurious to the public welfare, nor property in the vicinity, in that:
 - the design of the structure is compatible with one and two-family structures in the area;
- d. The project is in harmony with the 1980 Central City Plan in that the site is designated for residential.

002423

P84-105

April 26, 1984

Item No. 26

