

Comments provided by Board on 9-16-98; RL:rl 10-14-98

DESIGN REVIEW AND PRESERVATION BOARD
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

ITEM NO. 7
September 16, 1998

MEMBERS IN SESSION:

PB98-043

RK Development Partners ---13th & F Streets

REQUEST: Review of a proposed 10 unit single-family detached residential development.

LOCATION: 1222-26 F Street (SW corner 13th/F)
10 Single-family dwellings - New Construction
Washington District Preservation Area
Council District 1
APN: 002-0161-005, 006, and 021

APPLICANT:	Anderson-Krambs, LLC Michael Krambs, (444-0599) 2115 J Street, Suite 210, Sacramento, CA 95816
OWNER:	Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) 630 I Street, F12, Sacramento, CA 95814-2404
PLANS BY:	Howard R. Perkins, A.I.A. (441-2603) 2304 N Street. Sacramento, CA 95816
APPLICATION FILED:	August 13, 1998
STAFF CONTACT:	Randolph Lum, 264-5896

SUMMARY: The proposed project is being brought to the Board for review and comment. The applicant will then present the design to the Alkali Flat PAC on September 23rd and will return to the DRPB on October 21st. A concurrent application for planning entitlements has been submitted to the City Planning Commission (P98-088). The CPC hearing date has not been set.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board hear testimony from the applicant and the public, discuss the project design, provide comments and direction to the applicant in the form of a Board motion, and continue the Board hearing to October 21, 1998.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Existing Land Use of Site: Vacant
Existing Zoning of Site: R-3A

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:

North: Residential (across F Street); R-3A
 South: Residential (across alley); R-3A
 East: Residential (across 13th St.); R-3A
 West: Residential, auto repair (adj.); R-3A

Setbacks:	Zoning Ordinance Reqt.	Proposed**
Front:	25'-0"	5'-0"
Side(Street):	12'-6"	5'-0"
Side(Interior):	5'-0"	zero
Rear:	15'-0"	3'-0"

*(25'-0", or average of two nearest buildings on same side of street and same block)

Property Dimensions:	160' x 160'
Property Area:	0.58 acres
Density of Development:	17.02 du/net acre
# of Units Type/Sq. Ft. per Unit:	Plan A: 8 x 1625 s.f. Plan B: 1 x 1390 s.f. Plan C: 1 x 1337 s.f.
Height of Building:	30'-0"(ridge); two-story, with raised foundation
Exterior Building Materials:	Horizontal (Hardie Board) siding; aluminum single-hung windows; wood framed columns; wood trim; splitface concrete block raised foundation; concrete steps and porches.
Roof Material(s):	Dimensional composition shingles; ("architectural grade asphalt shingles")
Parking Proposed:	10 two-car garages; two guest spaces
Parking Required:	11 (one per unit and one guest space)
Significant Features of the Site:	Location in Washington District Preservation Area
Street Improvements:	F and 13th Streets---both two-way, with onstreet parking. Improved east-west alley.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Planning and Preservation staff members have met previously with the applicant to discuss preliminary design elements of the project. Based on those discussions, modifications have been made with the intention to improve project, both as a single design entity and as a component of the neighborhood and Preservation Area.

A concurrent application to the Planning Commission has been filed (P98-088); No hearing date has been set. The City staff TRC (Technical Review Committee) is scheduled to review the project and the application to the Planning Commission on September 17, 1998. Planning and other City entitlements/requirements will be discussed at that time.

STAFF EVALUATION: Staff has the following comments:

Specific Preservation Area Plan goals that particularly apply to this project include:

III. B. Goals

- 1.a. To encourage new construction, new design and rehabilitation that is integrated and compatible with the character of Preservation Areas.*
- 1.d. To coordinate exterior building design on all elevations with regard to color, materials, architectural form, style and detailing to achieve design harmony and enhance the existing Preservation Area.*
- 2.a. To encourage... landscaping that harmonizes with the building design and that harmonizes with the building design and that of the surrounding area.*

Several Preservation Area Plan guidelines that particularly apply to this project include:

IV. Guidelines for Architectural Review

- B.1.b. Colors used should contrast or blend harmoniously with neighboring structures.
Wall colors should be in harmony with the streetscape.*
- B.1.d. To maintain a street's unity, structures should respect the height and scale of neighboring buildings...*
- D.1.a. Rooflines should be compatible with adjacent roof styles or to the surrounding neighborhood character.*
- D.1.c. Exterior treatment of new construction should respect the treatment of existing Supportive and Listed Structures in terms of materials and textures.*
- D.2. Provisions for parking on the site and for housing of necessary utility and service equipment should be made in a manner harmonious with the total character of the area.*

V. B.1. Landscape and Site Guidelines

- B.1.a. Areas not utilized for parking and storage should be landscaped with plant materials. Where there are small areas between buildings and property lines, the use of climbers, vines and/or ground cover is recommended.*
- B.1.e. Grades of walks, parking spaces...and other paved areas shall provide an inviting and stable appearances for walking...*
- B.1.h. When parking areas are located adjacent to an alley, planting material should be provided between the parking area and the alley.*

B.1.i. trees and planting areas shall be planted in parking lots in order to shade and cool parking areas and to make them more attractive.

A. Building Design- The proposed project appears to be in general conformity with Preservation Area Plan Design Guidelines.

1. **The Board may wish to consider commenting on the desirability of varying the treatment of the roofs** among the 8 type "A" units. Although variation in the standard plan of unit type "A" is achieved with use of alternative roof treatments over the front porches and over the square window bay of bedroom #2, a greater variety in roof lines and orientation would be more harmonious with the area. The proposed use of only side-facing gables for the main roof is contrary to the random pattern that is typical of most block faces in the immediate area. A front facing main gable on only one unit on each street frontage would provide a much greater visual variation than is provided by the small gables over the bedroom bays. Although the applicant provides a variation of 10" in ridge height between each pair of "A" units on each street frontage, a front facing gable on an "A" unit would have a ridge height about 3 feet lower than an adjacent "A" unit with its side-facing gable roof.

2. **The Board may also wish to consider commenting on several stylistic and detail elements to lend greater harmony within the project and enhance the area.**

- a. Per the staff request, the applicant has supplemented the plans with additional porch details and information about the concrete block sizing and pattern (A6.1). The split face block is a standard 8" x 8" x 16". A staff suggestion to the applicant was to provide a longer than standard block size.
- b. It would be beneficial to add windows to the south side of unit 10A to avoid a blank wall effect at the alley. The added mass of the large gable end above this wall would add further to the negative visual impact of a windowless facade visible to 13th Street.
- c. Dog-eared wood fencing between buildings reflects an incongruous mid-late 20th century style and gives an unfinished appearance. Even a simple top cap would be an enhancement.
- d. In response to staff comments, the applicant revised the street facing garage doors to include some glazing. However, several neighbors are concerned that this change---prompted by a staff suggestion that the garage doors not present a relatively blank surface---will encourage break-ins. The applicant will look for another means of addressing the staff concern.

- e. Staff would suggest consideration of a warmer color palette for the project, or more accent elements with complementary warm colors.

B. Site Design

The Board may wish to consider commenting on treatments to enhance the alley/drive/garage area. In the initial staff comments faxed to the applicant a suggestion was made to provide landscaping to enhance alley/garage areas, using available locations and short sections along walls for shrubs/vines. In response, the applicant indicates a willingness to provide enhanced hardscape to these areas, but not landscaping. *The fact that there is no common area involved in the proposed project was indicated as a factor that precludes the provision of landscape enhancements.* Staff, however, would suggest that the guideline specifically referring to the design of parking areas, and the overall desirability of landscaping in the urban environment and the significance of alleyways as part of that urban environment identified in various adopted City plans, justify landscape consideration beyond what is proposed along the street frontages and within the private spaces of the individual units. Recognizing that a cold water supply is likely to be provided to the rear yard of each property, the further extension of these lines would be appropriate not only for the irrigation of the suggested landscape areas but also for other uses in and around the garages such as an occasional carwash, etc.

C. Environmental Determination

SHRA prepared a Negative Declaration for both SHRA approvals and the City Planning applications. It was filed with the County Recorder on March 5, 1998.

D. Public/Neighborhood/Business Association Comments

Comments from residents received thus far include the following:

- Provide period street lights.
- The appropriateness of wood fencing in the manner proposed is questionable.
- The project lacks the variety in design and materials that would have occurred between buildings in this neighborhood.
- Do not provide windows in garage door facing the street. They encourage break-ins.

Comments to be provided by the Alkali Flat PAC at its upcoming meeting on September 23rd will be provided for the subsequent Board consideration of the project.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board hearing testimony from the applicant and the public, discuss the project design, provide comments and direction to the applicant in the form of a Board motion, and continue the hearing to October 21, 1998.

Report Prepared By,

Report Reviewed By,

Associate Planner

Preservation Director

Attachments