

City Planning Commission
Sacramento, California

Members in Session:

- Subject: 1. Special Permit to Convert Residential Structure into an Office in the R-O Zone.
2. Variance to Allow Four Back-Out Parking Spaces.
3. Variance to Waive Required Six-Foot High Masonry Wall.

Location: 3020 "E" Street

Background: The subject project was originally scheduled for the February 26, 1981 Commission hearing. The applicant however, requested the item be continued so that additional study could be made relative to locating parking to the rear of the structure. Subsequently, the applicant submitted alternate plans A and B. Plan A is a modified plan for back-out parking and Plan B is a drive-around design where the four parking spaces are located to the rear of the property.

Staff Evaluation: Staff has the following comments and concerns:

1. Subject site is located in a predominantly residential neighborhood. The subject property and surrounding area were rezoned from Multiple Family to Residential-Office (R-O) zone as the result of the 1980 Central City Plan adoption. The staff has no objection to the proposed office use in that (a) the Community Plan designates the site for residential-office use, (b) the applicant proposes to retain the residential character of the structure and (c) parking could physically be provided to the rear of the structure.
2. The City Traffic Engineering has re-evaluated both Plans A and B and has determined that either plan would be appropriate providing that no further expansion of the office or additional employees be allowed.
3. Staff cannot justify the variance to allow back-out parking. There are no hardships involved. Also, the back-out parking could create hazardous conditions. As indicated by Plan "B" the required parking can be designed and comply with the parking regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. Plan "B" is staff's modified design of the applicant's proposal. This plan improves the circulation, maneuvering and provides planting areas in the parking area.

4. Staff cannot justify the variance to waive the required six-foot high masonry wall on the perimeter of the property. The adjacent property to the rear (south) contains a 2-story apartment that is set back approximately 5 feet from the property. The wood fence that separates the properties is approximately 5 feet in height. The properties to the east and west of the subject site contain single family dwellings and wooden fences 5 to 6 feet in height. The 6 foot masonry wall would reduce noise from vehicles and eliminate light glare from vehicles.
5. From field observation, it appeared the rear yard area had adequate shade to comply with the 50 percent parking area shading requirement. However, the applicant should submit a shading diagram to staff for review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the following actions:

1. Ratification of the Negative Declaration.
- *2. Approval of the Special Permit subject to conditions and based on findings of fact which follow: *(CPC approved subject to conditions below)*
3. Denial of the Variance to allow back-out parking spaces based on findings of fact which follow: *(CPC approved based on find. of fact due 4-23)*
4. Denial of the Variance to waive the required 6 foot masonry wall based on findings of fact which follow: *(CPC approved based on find. of fact due 4-23-81)*

*Conditions - Special Permit:

1. Applicant shall provide the required parking to the rear of the structure as indicated by Plan "B". *(deleted by CPC)*
2. A landscaping plan per parking design Plan "B" shall be submitted to staff for review and approval. *(deleted by CPC)*

Findings of Fact - Special Permit

1. The proposal is based upon sound principles of land use in that:
 - a. The proposal will not alter the character of the area because the residential structure will be retained.
 2. The proposed project is not injurious to the general public nor to surrounding properties in that:
 - a. Adequate on-site parking will be provided to the rear of the structure.
 - b. The on-site parking would reduce the demand for on-street parking.
 - c. The parking area will be enclosed by a 6 foot masonry wall.
- *Conditions - Special Permit (as added by CPC):
1. Permit to expire in two years.
 2. Signage not to exceed 14" x 20", flush against the building.

3. The proposal is consistent with the 1974 General Plan and the 1980 Central City Plan which designate the property for commercial-office and residential-office use respectively.

Findings of Fact - Variances

1. The proposal would be injurious to the general public and surrounding properties in that:
 - a. The back-out parking would disrupt circulation along "E" Street.
 - b. The back-out parking would create a public hazard.
 - c. The waiver of the wall will not reduce the noise levels of vehicles entering and exiting or eliminate excessive lights from vehicles.
2. The subject project is not consistent with the following policy of the Central City Plan:

Provide adequate off-street parking to the needs of shoppers, visitors and residents.

HY:WW:mm