

PUD-88, Sherman and Cheryl Balch

Application for Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan approval to subdivide an approximately ten-acre lot into two single-family residential lots: (1) an approximately 3.5-acre parcel containing the existing residence, detached garage, and sport court; and (2) an approximately 6.5-acre lot which would include the construction of an approximately 4,000-square-foot single-story home and attached garage, a 1,200-square-foot detached second living unit, and two detached garages. The property is located at 6010 Alisal Street in unincorporated Alameda County.

Rosalind Rondash presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key components of the proposal.

Commissioner Olson stated that on page 1 of the staff report, reference is made to an approximately 4,000-square-foot single-story home, and on page 3 of the same report, reference is made to a new 4,000-square-foot two-story, single-family residence. He inquired if the proposed home is a single-story or two-story structure.

Ms. Rondash replied that it is a single-story house. She apologized that she noticed the error earlier in the afternoon while she was preparing for tonight's presentation.

Commissioner Blank complimented staff for the fourth staff recommendation on page 21 of the staff report and commented that this is the longest English sentence he has seen all year. He then noted that there are two "Fire" sections in the Conditions of Approval: Conditions 75 through 78 and Conditions 89 through 91. He stated that it seems odd that they would be separated like that and inquired why those are not consolidated into one global area and whether that was done intentionally or was a cut-and-paste work gone wild.

Ms. Rondash replied that a few years ago staff reformatted the Conditions of Approval such that the first part would include special conditions specific to the project, the middle section would be standard conditions, and the final part would be Code conditions. She continued that the standard Fire conditions would be in the middle section, and the Code Fire conditions would be in the final section.

Commissioner Blank stated that he would like to revisit that under Matters Initiated by Commission Members.

Chair Pentin agreed.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Sherman Balch, Applicant, stated that Ms. Rondash did a very thorough job and that the project arrived at a good conclusion. He noted that he started the project a couple of years ago with a Preliminary Review, which helped in the design to meet the requirements, and he then got sidetracked by some of his other projects.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Blank stated that he likes the project and thinks it is a great project.

Commissioner Blank moved to find that there are no new or changed circumstances or information which require additional CEQA review of the project and that the proposed PUD development plan is consistent with the General Plan and Happy Valley Specific Plan; to make the PUD findings for the proposed development plan as listed in the staff report; and to recommend approval to the City Council of Case PUD -88, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in Exhibit A of the staff report. Commissioner Narum seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

**AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, Olson, Pearce, and Pentin
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: None
ABSENT: None**

Resolution No. PC-2012-45 recommending approval to the City Council of Case PUD-88 was entered and approved as motioned.