

MEMORANDUM

Date: 9/7/2021

To: Planning Department

From: James L. Jensen, Consulting Civil Engineer

Subject: **3935 Hansford Court Hillside Development Permit Findings (Swimming Pool)**

To Whom It May Concern,

The following findings are made in accordance with Section 20-32.060.F of Title 20 of the Santa Rosa City Code.

1. Site planning minimizes the visual prominence of the hillside development by taking advantage of existing site features for screening, including tree clusters, depressions in topography, setback hillside plateau areas, and other natural features.
Response: the proposed swimming pool and retaining walls are located behind the existing house and fence and will not be visible from the street or neighboring properties.
2. Site development minimizes alteration of topography, drainage patterns, and vegetation on land with slopes of 10 percent or more.
Response: the installation of the retaining walls around the pool will confine grading to the shape of the pool and eliminate/minimize the need for slope grading up the hill from the pool.
3. Site development does not alter slopes of greater than 25 percent, except in compliance with Section 20-32.020.B.
Response: as shown on the slope map included with this submittal, existing slopes in excess of 25 percent are from previous construction in areas that are not visible to the public due to screening by existing fencing and the primary residence.
4. Project grading respects natural features and visually blends with adjacent properties.
Response: the swimming pool and retaining wall design is close to the existing residence and does not extend unnecessarily into the natural terrain behind the residence. The design approach to this project appears consistent with the typical approach to hillside development in this region of Santa Rosa by minimizing construction footprint and retaining existing trees outside of the construction footprint.

5. Building pad location, design, and construction avoids large areas of flat pads, and building forms are “stepped” to conform to site topography.
Response: the pool design incorporates retaining walls as a means of stepping into the hillside. No building pads are associated with the swimming pool itself; however, the location of the swimming pool, being very close to the existing residence, does minimize the expansion of flat area needed for the pool.
6. The proposed project complies with the City’s Design Guidelines.
Response: the project complies with Section 3.1 by taking advantage of the existing residence and fence to screen the new pool, retains existing trees for shade as much as possible, blends in with surrounding single-family homes, and adds to its own unique character. By sitting at the same level as the residence, the swimming pool design preserves vistas, does not cause silhouettes, does not recontour the hillside, and minimizes grading. The swimming creates zero view impacts and utilizes retaining walls to eliminate long cut slopes.
7. The proposed project complies with the requirements of Chapter 20-32.060 and all other applicable provisions of the Zoning Code.
Response: the application for this HDP includes all materials requested by the Planning Department, complies with the HDP element of the zoning code, and meets setback and land use standards of the zoning code, thereby allowing these findings to be made.
8. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and any applicable Specific Plan.
Response: no specific plan governs this area of Santa Rosa. This swimming pool is allowed as accessory to the residential use of the property, which is allowed in the General Plan by the Very Low Residential land use designation.
9. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare.
Response: swimming pools associated with single family homes are not considered detrimental to public health, safety, or general welfare. As designed, this swimming pool will have zero impact on the public, and will not require a magnitude of water that would be considered detrimental to the general welfare of the public.

Should you have any questions regarding these findings, please do not hesitate to contact me at 707-541-2300, or jjensen@adobeinc.com . Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,


James L. Jensen, P.E.
Consulting Civil Engineer