

**SITE PLAN AND APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE (SPAARC)
MEETING NOTES
February 10, 2010**

Attendees:

Committee Members: D. Argumedo, P. D'Agostino, R. Dahal, I. Eckersberg, W. Hallen, J. Metzger, M. Rons, Lloyd Spells,

Citizen Member: Stelios Valavanis

Other Staff: B. Barnes, P. Enerio, B. Newman; C. Ruiz

Presiding Member: W. Hallen

A quorum being present, acting Chair Hallen called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

Projects Reviewed:

SPAARC	1889 Maple Avenue	Preliminary & Final
Proposal for the installation of a wind turbine		

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: David Mann Condo owner

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Mann proposes to install a wind turbine on the roof above his condo unit. The following was discussed:

- Wind turbine dimensions (now compliant with zoning ordinance):
 - 17'+ tall (total height of building and structure may not exceed 55')
 - 10' diameter
 - Spins on a small vertical axis so sails are lying horizontally rather than standing vertically
 - 4 sail cloth sails in 2 pairs, opposite each other
- Mr. Hallen said that noise can be an issue with wind turbines because of the sound the gears make; Mr. Mann said this does not have gears; he said the manufacturer has said it is very quiet; he will know because it will be directly above his unit; mechanism works in a way that air flow is not interrupted, which is a source of noise
- Mr. Mann has permission by his condo association to install the wind turbines on a trial basis for 90 days
- The Committee discussed the City ordinance as it relates to wind turbine structures and the zoning criteria for "accessory" structures

Action:

The Committee voted by majority to approve with 3 opposed.

Request for variation to allow existing driveway to remain and build a 2 car garage

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Don Friedman Property owner

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Friedman requested that a portion of his existing driveway be allowed to remain. The following was discussed:

- There is a 1 car garage on the property which Mr. Friedman would like to replace with a 2 car garage
- Neighbor's garage is on property line and he does not have enough room to build a compliant garage; if it is 3' from property line it will be less than 10' from his house
- A utility pole in the alley does not allow 2-car access to a garage with alley access
- Wants to leave part of the existing driveway for access to a new garage
- Mr. Friedman said:
 - He will not make money from the proposed plan
 - It will not adversely affect neighbors' property; he has letters of approval from several neighbors
 - Hardship: he has had 2 operations and his wife has a back condition so off street parking space to be on side of house which is already there, will help
 - Won't affect property value
 - Will increase pervious surface
- The Committee was concerned with the temporary parking that might occur on the front yard, the potential safety issue for pedestrians while walking on the sidewalk between the curb cut and the driveway, and the applicant would have access to a new garage from the alley.

Action:

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the request.

Proposal for the installation of 2 new AT&T pedestals

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Sal Martinez Engineer

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Martinez presented drawings of the plans for the locations of the proposed pedestals. The following was discussed:

- Mr. Martinez explained that he is proposing the above-ground pedestals to prevent excavation when splicing is necessary
- Pedestals are plastic, 12" in diameter and 2-3' tall, inserted 18" into the ground, and lift up and off for access to splicing
- Areas around pedestals are not to be landscaped; access is needed
- Pedestals to be located in parkway on City property
- Cost is approximately \$300 to install, as opposed to \$3,000 to install a 3'X5' vault underground
- Homeowners have been notified; one called & was okay with pedestal
- It was determined by the City and AT&T that these were the best possible locations
- Mr. Valavanis stated that many communities have them underground

- The Committee discussed the advantage to having a manhole, with frequency of excavation having been stated at a couple of times a year

ACTION:

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend manholes as opposed to pedestals.

Other Business:

The Committee voted by majority with one abstaining to approve the January 20, 2010 meeting notes.

The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m. The next SPAARC meeting will take place on Wednesday, February 17, 2010 unless otherwise noted.

Respectfully submitted,
Bobbie Newman