

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING  
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS, CALIFORNIA  
Civic Arts Plaza  
2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard  
Board Room - Third Floor  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362-2903  
(805) 449-2343  
3:00 p.m.

Thursday, April 26, 2001

MINUTES

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.
2. Staff Present: Barry Branagan, Hearing Officer  
Shelly Austin, Planning Technician  
Gayle Marston, Recording Secretary
3. Public Hearing:
  - A. Case: PPD 2001-25, Applicants: Kenneth & Ruth Ann Bachrach.  
Request to allow the conversion of an existing three-car garage to a storage room, exercise room, hobby room, office and bathroom and construct a new 3-car garage to the front of an existing single-family detached dwelling.

Speakers:

Dan Witting, architect for the project and representing the applicant, 2787 Sagra Street, Thousand Oaks. He mentioned that the applicant's primary reason for converting the garage was because of the needed care of elderly parents that were going to be moving into the house. There was a guest bedroom that was being used as an office, which now would be converted to their parent's bedroom. To accommodate that, they wanted to have a storage area to place some of the parents' possessions in storage in the garage, create a new home office for the applicant, and then decided to add a bathroom with an outside door to accommodate possible swimming pool construction in the future. Mr. Witting stated that because of a large oak tree, the house was set back farther from the property line than other houses in the development mainly to avoid any encroachment into the oak tree. By doing this, it allowed floor space for a new 3-car garage. Most of the houses in the area are large two-story houses, and he felt that by having a one-story garage, that it would soften

Administrative Hearing  
4-26-01

the effect of a two-story house. He stated that an adjacent house sets closer to the street than the applicant's house.

Mr. Witting further stated that the homeowners association did review the project and requested several changes which were complied with. The homeowners association approved the project. Mr. Witting mentioned that the opposing neighbor objected to the applicant's running a business out of his home. The applicant moved the business out of the house and is renting a space elsewhere to conduct business.

Ken Bachrach, applicant, 1566 Heather Oaks Lane, pro. He mentioned that the main reason for the expansion is to accommodate his elderly parents, who will be moving in and living with his family because they had health problems and needed care.

Dennis Rehm, 155 Millen Verde Ridge Lane, Thousand Oaks, con. He mentioned he lived across the street from the Bachrachs. He felt that the use of the property had been misrepresented to the City. He did not want to stop the project completely, but rather, to seek a compromise. He mentioned that the Bachrachs had been conducting business out of the residence for a long time, and had deceived the homeowners association. He asked for a deed restriction on the property that would prohibit commercial operation of a business on the property and asked that the existing deed restriction for residential use remain. He also asked for a deed restriction so that the future homeowner will not conduct business out of the home. He asked for a compromise on the size of the addition that would not compromise the intent of taking care of Mr. Bachrach's relatives. Mr. Rehm further stated that the homeowners association's architect is not licensed by the State of California to practice architecture. He also proposed rather than have the notch between the garage that is being added and the existing garage, that the new garage be built directly upon the old garage without the break in the roof line and without violating City codes. He pointed out that the indented roof line is not consistent with the rest of the subdivision. He complained about the blatant garage doors facing the street.

Dan Witting addressed Mr. Rehm's comments and stated that adding wording to include a deed restriction on commercial use is agreeable. The consultant used to review the plans was a civil engineer and had been used by many homeowner associations. The consultant had written guidelines and enforced CC & R's. He is a licensed, qualified architect. Mr. Witting clarified that the addition will be constructed on top of the existing driveway, so the existing landscaping will not be touched;

Administrative Hearing  
4-26-01

therefore, landscape plans were not necessary. The front walkway will be modified. The notch in the door was mainly to meet Code requirements to allow natural light, ventilation and a window to the office area. If the applicant were to enclose the notch, it might be possible to re-work the windows so that they are in the sidewall instead of in the notch, but this would cause other problems. Mr. Witting stated that the garage doors facing Mr. Rehm's property in the proposed plans are the same garage doors facing him now. Mr. Witting further mentioned that the applicant is just moving the garage doors forward about 25 feet. There are one-story attached garages with the garage doors facing the street in the neighborhood.

Hearing Officer Branagan approved PPD 2001-25 based on the testimony heard with the addition that the Bachrach's have been advised about the commercial uses on the property and restrictions regarding residential use.

4. Adjournment - The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:20 p.m.