



Community Development Department – Planning Division
1600 First Street + P.O. Box 660
Napa, CA 94559-0660

(707) 257-9530

ATTACHMENT 8

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT
APRIL 20, 2023

AGENDA ITEM 7.A File No. PL22-0128 – REDWOOD ROAD SUBDIVISION

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

PROJECT SUMMARY: Request for a Design Review Permit and Tentative Subdivision Map for a 6-lot subdivision and 6 single family homes on a 1.56-acre site.

LOCATION OF PROPERTY: 2550, 2554 & 2552 Redwood Road
APN: 007-261-003

GENERAL PLAN: Low Density Residential (3 to 8 units per acre)

ZONING: Single-Family Residential (RS-7; 7,000 square foot lot minimum)

APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER: Montair Associates (Lou Baldacci) Phone: (925) 328-1000
12885 Alcosta Boulevard, Suite A
San Ramon, CA 94598

STAFF PLANNER: Michael Allen, Senior Planner Phone: (707) 257-9530

ATTACHMENTS: ATCH 1 – Draft Resolution
ATCH 2 – Tentative Subdivision Map
ATCH 3 – Plan 1 Elevation A (Traditional)
ATCH 4 – Plan 1 Elevation B (Agrarian)
ATCH 5 – Plan 2 Elevation A (Traditional)
ATCH 6 – Plan 2 Elevation B (Agrarian)
ATCH 7 – Proposed Landscape Plan/Materials
ATCH 8 – Public Comments

II. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council to adopt a resolution approving a Tentative Subdivision Map and Design Review Permit and determining that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 14, 2022, the Applicant, Montair Associates, submitted an application requesting approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map and Design Review Permit to subdivide a 1.56-acre parcel into 6 single family lots and to construct a single-family home on each lot at property located at 2550, 2554, and 2552 Redwood Road, shown below in **Figure 1**. Pursuant to Napa Municipal Code (NMC) Section 17.62.050, the project requires a design review permit for the design of the Tentative Subdivision Map and for the house designs.

The Tentative Subdivision Map is provided as **Attachment 2**, and the proposed elevations are provided as **Attachment 3** to **Attachment 6**.

The project includes the following entitlements:

1. Design Review Permit for house plans and the Tentative Subdivision Map; and
2. Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide the 1.56-acre property into six single-family residential lots.

FIGURE 1
Location Map



IV. SITE CONTEXT AND HISTORY

The 1.56-acre Project site is located along Redwood Road between Dry Creek Road and Argyle Street at the terminus of Ruston Lane. The site is also located within the “Linda Vista Neighborhood”, one of the twelve neighborhoods recognized in the General Plan. This area was composed of a variety of semi-rural residential uses, scattered subdivisions and along Solano Avenue, mobile home parks. Today, the area is primarily comprised of post-1970’s single family detached housing. The property currently contains three non-conforming homes which would be demolished to accommodate the 6 proposed units, each on their own lot.

The property appears to be the last of an old Walnut Orchard which still contains 16 English Walnut trees. There are several other trees remaining on the parcel, all but one would be removed to accommodate the development. One of the two Coast Live Oaks which are subject to the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance would be preserved. Consistent with the preservation ordinance, the Project would be conditioned to replace or pay a fee for the Coast Live Oak to be removed. Surrounding land uses include single-family homes to the north, south, east, and west. The Project would provide access via an extension of Ruston Lane from its current dead end through to Redwood Road.

V. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant proposes to create 6 single-family residential lots and construct 6 single-family homes, as further described below. The Project would also provide two travel lanes and parking, curb, gutter and sidewalk only on the Project side. The remainder of the street would be completed at the time the parcel to the east is developed. Other site improvements include extension of Ruston Lane, grading, retaining walls, fencing, landscaping, and underground utilities to support six new single family residential units.

A. Tentative Subdivision Map

As shown in **Attachment 2**, the Project proposes to create 6 single-family lots ranging in size from approximately 7,253 square feet to 10,927 square feet, with an average lot size of 8,265 square feet. Each lot would be a minimum of 60 feet in width and approximately 120 feet in depth.

B. Proposed House Plans

The Project proposes a single-story and two-story option, each with two elevations, as further described below.

Plan 1 – Single Story (Traditional)

As shown in **Attachment 3**, and in **Figure 2**, this model is a single-story home at a maximum height of approximately 25 feet and is approximately 2,308 square feet in size. This floor plan would consist of 4 bedrooms and 2.5 bathrooms, and a 2-car attached garage.

The "traditional" exterior on the Plan 1 model offers a stucco wall surface with a manufactured stone base that wraps around and beyond the front façade. A brick cap tops the stone veneer. Proposed roof materials are dimensional composition shingle presented in a variety of complementary colors. Garage doors are proposed to include a barn door style with the convenience of sectional roll-up doors and include "clear story" glass at the top of the doors.

FIGURE 2
Plan 1 – Single Story (Traditional)



Plan 1 – Single Story (Agrarian)

As shown in **Attachment 4**, and in **Figure 3**, this model is a single-story home at a maximum height of approximately 25 feet and is approximately 2,308 square feet in size. This floor plan would consist of 4 bedrooms and 2.5 bathrooms, and a 2-car attached garage. The "agrarian" exterior on the Plan 1 model offers a board and batten style on the front façade made from fiber cement construction. Horizontal fiber cement siding is provided on the side and rear elevations. Proposed roof materials are dimensional composition shingle presented in a variety of complementary colors. Garage doors are proposed to include a barn door style with the convenience of sectional roll-up doors and include "clear story" glass at the top of the doors.

FIGURE 3
Plan 1 – Single Story (Agrarian)



Plan 2 – Two Story (Traditional)

As shown in **Attachment 5**, and in **Figure 4**, this model is a single-story home at a maximum height of approximately 26 feet-6 inches and is approximately 2,943 square feet in size. This floor plan would consist of 3 bedrooms (optional 4th bedroom) and 3 bathrooms, and a 2-car attached garage.

The “traditional” elevation for the Plan 2 model provides a mix of stucco, shingle and horizontal siding with a manufactured stone base with a brick cap separating the stone veneer from the stucco. Proposed roof materials are dimensional composition shingle presented in a variety of complementary colors. Garage doors are proposed to include a barn door style with the convenience of sectional roll-up doors and include “clear story” glass at the top of the doors.

FIGURE 4
Plan 2 – Two Story (Traditional)



Plan 2 – Two Story (Agrarian)

As shown in **Attachment 6**, and in **Figure 5**, this model is a single-story home at a maximum height of approximately 26 feet-6 inches and is approximately 2,943 square feet in size. This floor plan would consist of 3 bedrooms (optional 4th bedroom) and 3 bathrooms, and a 2-car attached garage.

The “agrarian” exterior on the Plan 2 model offers a board and batten style on the front façade made from fiber cement construction. Horizontal fiber cement siding is provided on the side and rear elevations. Proposed roof materials are dimensional composition shingle presented in a variety of complementary colors. Garage doors are proposed to include a barn door style with the convenience of sectional roll-up doors and include “clear story” glass at the top of the doors.

FIGURE 5
Plan 2 – Two Story (Agrarian)



C. Setbacks

Each home would include a minimum front setback of at least 20 feet, side setbacks of 5 feet and 10 feet, and a rear yard setback of at least 39 feet. Although there are no plans for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as part of the Project, the size of the rear yards would be sufficient to accommodate an ADU.

D. Proposed Landscape

The Project proposes landscaping along the front yards of each home, as shown in **Attachment 7**. Each lot would include at least one (1) tree in the front yard, and some would include a tree at the sidewalk planter strip. As shown in **Attachment 7**, the Project would include a mix of low water trees and shrubs, including crape myrtles, Chinese Pistache, coyote bush, deer grass, and blue rush. Each lot would also include a 6-foot-high solid wood “good neighbor” fence in the side and rear yard.

E. Parking and Circulation

Access to the Project site would be provided via the partial completion of Ruston Lane, a public street, along Redwood Road. The Project would be conditioned to construct a portion of Ruston Lane which currently dead ends at the site.

The Project proposes to include a two-car garage and sufficient space for 2 vehicles in each driveway, providing 4 off-street spaces per home. In addition, each lot would have sufficient frontage for one additional vehicle on-street.

VI. ANALYSIS

A. General Plan

The property is located within the Low Density Residential General Plan Designation of the Napa 2040 General Plan (General Plan), which provides for densities ranging between 3 to 8 units per gross acre. On a 1.56-acre site, this would allow for 4 to 12 units. As such, the Project, which proposes six lots, is within the density range allowed by the General Plan. While this is at the lower end of the density range, the Applicant originally considered a seven-lot subdivision at this site; however, contended that the stormwater facilities which are contained primarily on Lot 1 required a larger sized lot which made it difficult to reduce lots to accommodate seven lots instead of six.

As proposed, the Project would be consistent with the following General Plan policies identified below:

Land Use and Community Design Element

- **Policy LUCD 1-1:** Focus urban development to be within the voter-approved Rural Urban Limit (RUL) to provide for the protection of the surrounding open space and agriculture uses.
- **Policy LUCD 1-2:** Promote efficient land use patterns to accommodate projected housing and job growth within the SOI, including by ensuring that development is within the stipulated (minimum and maximum) range.
- **Policy LUCD 3-5:** Support community and public realm design that reflects the community's diversity and meets the needs of persons of all ages and abilities.
- **Policy LUCD 10-2:** Provide balanced neighborhoods accommodating a variety of housing types and density ranges to meet the diverse demographic, economic and social needs of residents.

In summary, the Project meets the above policies in that it would be within the density range of the land use designation and is on an infill site that would provide housing for the City of Napa. Although the Project would not be at the higher end of the density range, Policies LUCD 1-2 and LUCD 10-2 allow for a variety of housing types and densities within the minimum and maximum density ranges.

B. Zoning

The property is located within the Single-Family Residential (RS-7) Zoning District which requires a minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet. RS areas include subdivisions typically with regular lot patterns, varied designs, and a limited mix of unit types. Single-family detached developments are permitted within the RS-7 Zoning District.

Table 1 below shows the Project's proposed development standards compared to the RS-7 development standards. As proposed, all lots would meet or exceed RS-7 development standards. Section 17.62.050 of the Zoning Ordinance requires City Council approval of a Design Review Permit for Tentative Subdivision Maps. Design review analysis is further discussed in Subsection VI.D. of this report.

TABLE 1
RS-7 Development Standards

Criteria	Standard	Lot 1	Lot 2	Lot 3	Lot 4	Lot 5	Lot 6
Lot Area (sq. ft.)	min. 7,000	10,927	7,253	7,253	7,253	7,253	9,653
Height (feet)	max. 30	25	26.5	26.5	25	26.5	25
Front Setback (feet)	min. 20	20	21	21	20	21	20
Side Yard	min. 5/10	10/35	5/10	5/10	5/10	5/10	13/15*
Side Setback *(corner lot -feet)	min. 15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15
Rear Yard (feet)	min. 20	39	44	44	39	44	39
Lot Coverage (percentage)	max. 45	27	33	33	39	33	30

C. Tentative Subdivision Map

The Project is requesting approval of a tentative subdivision map pursuant to NMC Chapter 16.20 for the creation of 6 lots. The findings for the tentative subdivision map are described as part of the resolution included as **Attachment 1** of this staff report.

D. Design Review Permit

This project is located within an "Evolving Infill Area" as specified in the City of Napa Residential Design Guidelines (November 2004). The Evolving Infill Area development guidelines look to achieve a mix of older houses, established landscapes, and scattered contemporary housing. In these areas, development should fit into the community by incorporating historic and natural features with an emphasis on pedestrian-friendly design. The following provides an evaluation of the applicable infill policies associated with this Project.

Design Guideline 2.21 Creating a Sense of Place. New projects in evolving neighborhoods should create a sense of place by using a strong organizational concept with a hierarchy of streets, parks and public facilities.

This project is not of a scale to require its own parks or street hierarchy. It fits into the existing neighborhood's organizational concept, development pattern and hierarchy of streets by completing the extension of Ruston Lane to Redwood Road and is built to an acceptable low density residential standard. The lots are an orderly continuation of the existing lots on Ruston Lane.

Design Guideline 2.22 Connections to the City. New development in evolving infill areas should be planned as part of an interconnected neighborhood of existing and future streets. They should be planned and designed as an extension of adjacent neighborhoods' auto, bicycle, pedestrian, and open space systems.

This site is an infill property that is located between the terminus of Ruston Lane and Redwood Road. The extension of Ruston Lane was obviously anticipated since the street was terminated with a dead end and not a cul-de-sac. This new development would complete the street connection thereby connecting neighborhoods. The street extension and sidewalk provide a pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular connection between the homes on Redwood Road and Ruston Lane.

Design Guideline 2.23 Creating Residential Streets. New infill development in evolving areas should be organized around pedestrian oriented residential streets rather than driveways and parking lots.

The development is oriented around the extended Ruston Lane with driveways servicing each home consistent with driveway standards approved by City of Napa's Public Works Department. The street design incorporates a sidewalk with the road extension promoting pedestrian access to the new units. The project site doesn't contain the entire width that would be needed to complete curb, gutter and sidewalks on both sides of the street extension, so the project will only provide a curb and gutter on the east side. A sidewalk on the east side would be required of any future development of the in-fill parcel to the east.

Design Guideline 2.24 Streetscape. Streetscape planting should be a unifying and defining feature of new residential neighborhood streets.

*The new street and driveway will be lined with White Crape Myrtle, Chinese Pistache and Western Redbud trees (see landscape plan, **Attachment 7**). These will provide a unifying and defining feature for the new street extension. All front yards and bio retention areas will be fully landscaped with a variety of plants.*

Based on Staff's review of the project, the general design of the Tentative Subdivision Map is reasonable given the shape of the property and the configuration of surrounding parcels. The project is consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines for "Evolving Infill Areas." Lot sizes and orientation are consistent with the variety of lot sizes existing within the neighborhood and as desired by the Guidelines. All lots provide an east west orientation thereby providing passive heating and cooling characteristics. Staff has determined that the creation of six single-family lots and detached single-family dwelling units will not have an adverse effect on public health, safety or welfare due to the fact the density is consistent with the General Plan density designation.

E. Design Review of Homes

The City of Napa Residential Design Guidelines (November 2004) address three design principles for single-family developments. The following are the three principles, followed by Staff's analysis of the Applicant's efforts to meet each principle.

Principle 1. Site Planning: New single-family housing and subdivisions should result in residential design and site planning that supports overall neighborhood design objectives and context.

The dwelling units are located so as to be compliant with required setbacks for the lots. The driveway will be paved and provide adequate access for vehicles from Ruston Lane. The housing is oriented towards the public street consistent with surrounding development. The orientation and design of the lots reduces the visibility of the garages which are set back a minimum of five feet from the front facade. The entrances, windows, and landscaping will dominate the front facades of the residences. The grading will limit the visual distinction between grading of existing neighborhood streets and surrounding neighborhoods. The subdivision is designed in a manner that is consistent with the surrounding single-family residential neighborhood.

Principle 2. Massing and Architectural Design: New single-family housing should be high quality architecture and provide a variety of styles and design within each block, respecting the neighborhood setting.

The architecture is intended to reflect a traditional residential aesthetic while appearing contextually consistent with the single-family homes in the surrounding neighborhood. The architecture adds a pleasing variety of homes to the neighborhood. Roof forms are consistent on all parts of the house and garage. The homes all provide a coherent architectural composition where the roof, walls and materials gracefully transition from front, sides, and rear elevations. The second stories of the two-story homes are subordinate in scale and do not project or overhang the first-floor footprint. The second stories are stepped back from the first floor. The varying roof heights, step backs, and changes in wall planes are used to break up the mass of the buildings.

Given recent desires by the Commission seeking more modern/updated architecture, Staff recommended the Applicant consider using more modern designs. They were advised to review recent Commission meeting discussions on architectural styles. However, the Applicant indicated they were satisfied with their designs and chose to move ahead with what they had originally proposed.

Principle 3. Materials and Color: The choice of materials and colors should provide an enduring quality and enhance architectural and massing concepts.

Exterior materials will be earth-toned and grey colored to include sandy brown and dark brown roofs in asphalt shingles, light colored cement plaster siding and horizontal cement siding, shingle siding, brown colored fiberglass front doors in various paint finishes, coachman style glazed garage doors in various gray- and stone-colored finishes that will mat. The Project will include fully landscaped front yards including trees, grass and shrubbery in each yard, and sidewalks to front porches. Each residence has a prominent front entry identified by a roofed porch or overhang. As designed, the hierarchy of fenestration treatment, detailing, and exterior wall materials provide visual interest and reduce the overall perceived bulk and height. The proposed elevations include three-dimensional elements that break up the wall surfaces, such as roof lines, trim details, decorative window frames and door placement, and material and color changes.

Each elevation will have the same quality as the front elevation to provide four-sided architecture.

VII. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the recommended action is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in accordance with Section 15332 (Categorical Exemptions; Class 32) of the CEQA Guidelines, which exempts in-fill development projects consistent with the applicable general plan designation and on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.

The exceptions to categorical exemptions identified in Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines are inapplicable because the land is in an urbanized area with no environmentally sensitive habitats or species of concern on the property, there has been no successive effort to intensify land uses in the area, and no unusual circumstances exist that would pose a reasonable possibility of having a significant effect on the environment, and the project does not negatively affect historic resources. Based on this analysis, no significant environmental effects would result from this project and the use of categorical exemptions is appropriate.

VIII. REQUIRED FINDINGS

Approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map for the Project is subject to the required findings established in NMC Section 16.20.070, Tentative Maps, and approval of the Design Review Permit is subject to the required findings established in NMC Section 17.62.080, Design Review Permits. These findings are provided in the draft resolution attached to this Staff Report (see **Attachment 1**).

IX. PUBLIC NOTICE

Notice that this application was received was provided by the City on December 5, 2022, and notice of the scheduled public hearing was provided on April 6, 2023, by US Postal Service to all property owners within a 500-foot radius of the subject property. Notice of the public hearing was also published in the Napa Valley Register on April 7, 2023, and provided to people previously requesting notice on the matter at the same time notice was provided to the newspaper for publication.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

As of this writing, four (4) public comments have been received, see Attachment 8.

Michael Allen

From: Bart Pense <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, February 26, 2023 5:09 PM
To: Michael Allen
Cc: Marsha Niemann; Richard Niemann
Subject: Redwood Road Subdivision (File No. PL22-0128)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Unverified Contact

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

Hello, Michael,

I am checking on the status of the above referenced project. Please provide an update.

I live at [REDACTED] Napa, CA 94558, and am opposed to this project.

Have there been or will there be public discussion?

Thank you,

Bart Pense
[REDACTED]

Michael Allen

From: Chloe Tyer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2022 12:14 PM
To: Michael Allen
Subject: Redwood Road Subdivision- Napa CA

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

Hello Mr. Allen -

I am requesting a copy of the project plan for 2550 Redwood Road and all documents submitted by John Glesener. I am a homeowner on Ruston Lane.

Additionally, what is our recourse as homeowners to not have the road pushed through onto Redwood Dr?

Thank you in advance for your time.

Best,
Chloe



Chloe Tyer
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
GUEST EXPERIENCE & MARKETING
[REDACTED]

Michael Allen

From: Kevin Sherburne <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 10:40 AM
To: Michael Allen
Subject: Fw: File No. PL22-128

Categories: Unverified Contact

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

Correction to email:

Mr. Allen,

I have received notification of a project proposed at 2550 Redwood Road, Napa, California (File No. PL22-0128).

We are opposed to any project that would extend Ruston Lane to Redwood Road. We have lived on Ruston Lane for nearly 20 years. We bought the house on Ruston Lane because the street was not a through street. Any project that extends Ruston Lane to Redwood Road would destroy the character of the neighborhood and have a negative impact on home values on the lane.

The City of Napa is estopped from extending Ruston Lane to Redwood Road. There is no evidence that, since the development of Redwood Village, the City of Napa has ever taken the position that Ruston Lane should extend to Redwood Road. The residents of Ruston Lane have relied on the City's position. For the City now to take a different position is unjustifiable, especially in light of a reasonable alternative -- placing the entrance to the proposed development on Redwood Road.

Further, the residents of Ruston Lane have relied on the negative easement that has historically existed with respect to the 1.5 acre parcel. Having failed over the past half-century to take any development action to extend Ruston Lane to Redwood Road has resulted in the vested right of residents of Ruston Lane to enjoy the peace and quiet of a dead-end lane.

Please deny the application's proposal to extend Ruston Lane through to Redwood Road.

Regards,
Kevin Sherburne

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Kevin Sherburne <[REDACTED]>
To: mallen@cityofnapa.org <mallen@cityofnapa.org>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 at 10:28:52 AM PST
Subject: File No. PL22-128

Mr. Allen,

I have received notification of a project proposed at 2550 Redwood Road, Napa, California (File No. PL22-0128).

ATTACHMENT 8

We are opposed to any project that would extend Ruston Lane to Redwood Road. We have lived on Ruston Lane for nearly 20 years. We bought the house on Ruston Lane because the street was not a through street. Any project that extends Ruston Lane to Redwood Road would destroy the character of the neighborhood and have a negative impact on home values on the lane.

The City of Napa is estopped from extending Ruston Lane to Redwood Road. There is no evidence that, since the development of Redwood Village, the City of Napa has never taken the position that Ruston Lane should extend to Redwood Road. The residents of Ruston Lane have relied on the City's position. For the City now to take a different position is unjustifiable, especially in light of a reasonable alternative -- placing the entrance to the proposed development on Redwood Road.

Further, the residents of Ruston Lane have relied on the negative easement that has historically existed with respect to the 1.5 acre parcel. Having failed over the past half-century to take any development action to extend Ruston Lane to Redwood Road has resulted in the vested right of residents of Ruston Lane to enjoy the peace and quiet of a dead-end lane.

Please deny the application's proposal to extend Ruston Lane through to Redwood Road.

Regards,
Kevin Sherburne

Michael Allen

From: deborah zimmer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 8:37 AM
To: Michael Allen
Subject: File no.PL22-0128

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Unverified Contact

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[EXTERNAL]

Good Morning,
I received a courtesy notice regarding an application to build a 6 house development which included an extension of Ruston Lane to Redwood Road. We would like to talk to you and review all documents of the development plan as the Ruston Lane home owners were given an assurance 3 years ago by the developer at that time that Ruston lane would not be extended through to Redwood Road. We are once again opposed to any development that includes an extension of Ruston Lane to Redwood Road.

Regards,
Debbie Zimmer
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Michael Allen

From: patrick marrinan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 11:26 AM
To: Michael Allen
Subject: 2550 Redwood Road Subdivision

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

Hello,

We recently received a notice from the City regarding a new subdivision at 2550 Redwood Road. We are long time residents of Argyle St and have been hoping for the extension of Ruston Lane for years. This would greatly help alleviate the speeding traffic on Argyle.

Is the tentative map of the proposed subdivision available for public viewing?

Thank you,

Patrick and Susan Marrinan

[REDACTED]



PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES EXCERPT

APRIL 20, 2023

MEETING CAN BE VIEWED BY CLICKING [HERE](#)

1. CALL TO ORDER: 5:30 P.M.

A. ROLL CALL: Commissioners – MASSARO, SHOTWELL, HUETHER, HURTADO, KELLEY
ABSENT: Commissioners – None
STAFF: Community Development – Ricky Caperton, Michael Allen, Michael Walker, Patty Baring
 City Attorney's Office – Sabrina Wolfson
 Fire Department – Greg Fortune, Brandon Veyna
 Public Works – Tim Wood

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS/APEALS

A. REDWOOD ROAD SUBDIVISION – 2550, 2554 & 2552 REDWOOD ROAD (File PL22-0128) The project requests Design Review Permit and Tentative Subdivision Map approvals to subdivide a 1.56 acre parcel into 6 single family residential lots and construction of single family homes on each lot. The project includes the demolition of three existing homes and the extension of Ruston Lane to Redwood Road. The project site is located south of the terminus of Ruston Lane and north of Redwood Road, approximately 500 feet east of Dry Creek Road within the Low Density Residential General Plan Designation and the Single-Family Residential (RS-7) Zoning District. (APN 007-261-003) (Allen)

CEQA ACTION: The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines, which exempts in-fill development projects consistent with the applicable general plan designation and on a site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend the City Council adopt a resolution determining the project is exempt from CEQA and approving a Design Review Permit and Tentative Subdivision Map.

Commissioners provided disclosures.

Senior Planner Michael Allen presented the Staff Report, provided background information related to the application and provided a recommendation.

The Commission requested clarification regarding dedications, potential easements or factors that would facilitate the complete construction of the street on the adjacent property not proposed for development.

Mr. Allen responded explaining that the City cannot require a developer to construct the portion of the street that is on another's property. He explained that the project would construct two full drive aisles, parking, sidewalk, on the development side, and curb and gutters on both sides of the street, but the on street parking and sidewalk on the east side would not be completed until the properties to the east eventually develop.

Chair Massaro invited the Applicant to speak.

Thomas Baldacci, on behalf of the Applicant, Castle Properties, provided brief background information related to the application and offered to answer Commissioner questions.

The Commission had the following questions and comments for the Applicant:

- What contributed to the density and lot count configuration?
- Clarification was requested regarding:
 - ADU consideration
 - The roof materials
 - Solar panel inclusion on the roof
 - Bioswale drainage and maintenance easement
- Commission would like ADU information to be provided to buyers

Mr. Baldacci responded to Commissioner questions and comments, clarifying the following:

- The zoning and existing lot size contributed to the lot count, size and configuration
- ADU Footprints were submitted to Staff
- Placement of the ADU should be a choice of the homeowner
- The Applicant is sensitive to parking impact when adding ADUs
- Clarification was provided regarding bioswale maintenance

Mr. Allen provided additional clarification regarding the Applicant's maintenance requirements for the bioswale and Commission purview.

Chair Massaro opened the meeting for a public hearing.

Michael Zimmer, 3641 Ruston Lane, spoke of his concern of traffic impacts and bioswale maintenance. He spoke in opposition to through traffic.

Paul Hicks, Neighbor, spoke of his concern of construction impact and through traffic.

Steve Miro, 3620 Ruston Lane, spoke of his concern of opening up the street to through traffic.

Kevin Sherburne, Neighbor, suggested a dead-end cul-de-sac.

Jonathan Tyer, Neighbor, supports the project, but is in opposition to the through traffic.

The Commission had the following questions for Fire Department Staff:

- Clarification was requested regarding:
 - Benefits to the Fire Department from street through access
 - Possibility for use of Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA)
 - Pedestrian Safety

Fire Marshal Greg Fortune responded to Commissioner questions and comments:

- Response times and the number of responding units require through access.
- Exceptions in street standards for when the City can allow a hammerhead or alternative turnaround and are reviewed case by case, but must meet required findings.

After receiving no further requests to speak, public comment was closed.

Commissioners Huether and Kelley moved and seconded to close public hearing.

Motion carried:

AYES: MASSARO, SHOTWELL, HUETHER, HURTADO, KELLEY
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:
RECUSED:

The Commission had the following questions and comments for Staff and the Applicant:

- Did the Applicant reach out to the neighborhood residents?
- Is the Applicant amenable to a condition to include stub outs for future ADUs?
- Does the General Plan show the connection of this road?
- Clarification was requested regarding:
 - Safety concerns crossing the road
 - Exceptions
 - Future Road Extension signs
 - Cul-de-sac request requirements

Mr. Baldacci responded to Commissioner questions, explaining there was neighborhood outreach, and that the Applicant would be open to include ADU stub outs, should the Commission condition it.

Mr. Allen responded to Commissioner questions, providing clarification regarding:

- Road safety as reviewed by the Public Works Department
- Intended right of way of the through street
- Necessary justifications to grant Exceptions
- The General Plan does not show the connection of this road.

Senior Civil Engineer Tim Wood responded to Commissioner questions and comments:

- The City does not post signs indicating "Future Road Extensions" at dead end streets.
- Through streets that aren't constructed are identified in the General Plan but typically for collectors and arterials (larger roads). Ruston Lane is a local street.
- The developer would need land rights from the neighbors to the east to complete the street.
- In addition to fire and medical vehicle access, a cul-de-sac would also need room for garbage trucks and street sweepers.

Commission discussion and deliberation ensued. They made the following final questions and comments:

- The Applicant met the Design Guidelines
- The Commission expressed a desire to review the Design Guidelines
- All but one Commissioner was in support of the road connectivity
The Commission expressed a desire to include stub outs for future ADU utilities.

Commissioners Huether and Hurtado moved and seconded to recommend the City Council adopt a resolution determining the project is exempt from CEQA and approving a Design Review Permit and Tentative Subdivision Map with the modification that the Applicant add stub outs for future water and electricity connections for future ADUs.

Motion carried:

AYES: MASSARO, SHOTWELL, HUETHER, HURTADO
NOES: KELLEY
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:
RECUSED:

DRAFT