Planning Commission

Staff report

May 22, 2018

Item 2: PLN 17-0013, RELIEZ TERRACES MAJOR SUBDIVISION/PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND CONCEPT PLAN (REZONING)

Project Planner: Troy Fujimoto, (925) 671-5224, tfujimoto@pleasanthillca.org

Applicant & Property Owner: Mt. Diablo View Associates LLC., 12885 Alcosta Blvd. Suite A, San Ramon, CA 94583

I. BACKGROUND

The project was initially reviewed by the Planning Commission at its April 24, 2018 meeting. At the meeting, the project was discussed and feedback was provided to the applicant and further consideration of the project was continued to the May 22, 2018 meeting. The Planning Commission’s comments are provided in the next section along with responses from the applicant.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a public hearing to consider recommendations concerning PLN 17-0013, consisting of a Planned Unit Development District (Rezoning) & Concept Plan and Major Subdivision (Vesting Tentative Map), submitted by Mt. Diablo View Associates LLC. The Planning Commission (PC) recommendations will be provided to the City Council which will be the final decision-maker on the project.

The site is proposed to be rezoned from the existing R-10 Single Family – 10,000 square foot lots zoning district to a PUD (Planned Unit District).

The proposed PUD “Concept Plan” addresses the following:

1. Site plan for the PUD.
2. Standards and criteria for development relative to natural resources and open space.
3. Development regulations.
4. Design guidelines/criteria including architecture and landscaping.
5. General Plan consistency.

The proposed PUD is based on the R-10 Single Family Residential – 10,000 square foot lots Zoning District with modifications to development standards related to minimum lot area, minimum lot width & depth, and maximum lot coverage.
In addition to the PUD rezoning and related Concept Plan, the Planning Commission will be considering the accompanying environmental document (Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration) and all related concurrently submitted entitlement applications.

III. ANALYSIS

A. Planning Commission Summary Letter from April 24, 2018 Meeting Date

The following is a summary of the comments made by the Planning Commission and responses from applicant (in italics):

1. Reconfigure the Site Plan and Vesting Tentative Map to reflect the following direction:
   a. Lot 1 to have internal access onto the private road. As part of this reconfiguration, adjacent parcels may have to be modified, or at a minimum the setback areas may need to be modified from the vehicular access easement on Lot 3.

   The applicant has not agreed to make these changes and noted concerns regarding elevation changes, additional paving, and impacts to adjacent lots that would have negative impacts to the overall project design. In addition, the applicant has noted that no safety issues exist in its current configuration and other drive-way cuts already exist across the street on Boyd Road.

   Staff has provided a condition of approval (see condition no. 3e) to address this issue.

   b. Include a 1,000 to 2,000 square foot portion of Lot 1 to be common open space, with an amenity within this area (potentially a trail head features, artwork or other remembrance of the site).

   The applicant has agreed to provide a 1,000 square foot portion at the corner of Boyd and Pleasant Hill Roads, where a historical plaque of some type would be created. However, the applicant proposes to dedicate this open space to the City for HOA insurance reasons.

   Staff recommends requiring the open space to be common area owned and maintained by the homeowner association (see condition no. 3f). The applicant has not provided a plan showing the configuration of the open space and any related improvements. Staff recommends requiring the applicant to provide a conceptual plan and revised tentative map prior to City Council consideration of the PUD and tentative tract map.

   c. Include the sidewalk “gap” closure improvement on the western side of Pleasant Hill Road

   The applicant has noted that making this gap closure a condition of approval is not appropriate, and cannot legally be a requirement of the project. The applicant states that this was initially presented as an improvement in-lieu of undergrounding utilities.

   Staff recommends requiring this improvement pursuant to condition no. 3e and as specified in the original Engineering Division conditions of approval for the
project as a public benefit related to PUD approval and based on recommendations from Engineering staff.

2. Modify the proposed Concept Plan to note the following:
   a. Incorporate/identify the specific development standard deviations proposed, including Minimum Lot Depth, Minimum Lot Width and Minimum Lot Area. Trees should be preserved on the property to the greatest extent feasible with final determination through the Architectural Review Permit and Development Plan Permit.

   Minimum Lot Depth, Width and Area have been included in the revised concept plan (Attachment C-2). Tree preservation language has been added to the Concept Plan, but does not note the requirement of an arborist and peer review prior to any removal. Staff recommends requiring the Concept Plan to be modified prior to City Council review to include this information (see condition no. 3d).

   b. A final design for all retaining walls shall be subject to review and approval through the Architectural Review and Development Plan Permit. The retaining wall on the eastern edge of the property shall be designed to minimize the finished height, through additional landscaping, tiering of the wall or other exterior wall designs.

   Incorporated into Concept Plan, but staff recommends additional language to require PC review through the Development Plan permit in addition to ARC review (see condition no. 3c).

   c. Homes along the southern edge of the property (Lots 9, 10, 11 & 12) shall be limited to one story.

   Incorporated into Concept Plan.

   d. Homes along Boyd and Pleasant Hill Roads (Lots 1, 2, 12, 13 & 17) shall be articulated and not have a “boxy or blocky” appearance, thus, deviations and variety of heights, 2nd floor setbacks (from the 1st story) are required to be incorporated into the home design.

   Concept Plan notes that lots 2, 13, and 17 will be designed to avoid a boxy appearance.

   Staff recommends that language be incorporated into the Concept Plan that states “Future residences on Lots 1, 2, 12, 13, & 17 shall be designed to be articulated and not have a boxy or blocky appearance, and shall have a variety of heights and 2nd floor setbacks from the ground floor subject to final review and approval by the Architectural Review Commission.” See condition no. 3a.

   e. Note that trees shall be preserved to the greatest extent feasible, with particular preservation efforts noted for tree # 9, 15, 25, 26, 29, 38, 41, 86, 191, 193, 199.

   Incorporated into Concept Plan.

   f. The residence on Lot 1 is required to front (with appropriate design) Boyd Road.

   Incorporated into Concept Plan.
Additional Comments

The applicant has proposed a new modification to development standards that had not been requested until this resubmittal. The applicant requests up to a 20% reduction in setbacks (front, rear, side and corner side) subject to ARC and PC review and approval during final review of the Architectural Review and Development Plan Permit (respectively). Staff recommends that this provision only apply to Lots 3 and 4 to allow greater flexibility as Lot 1 access would be installed between these two lots.

IV. CONCLUSION

The project is before the Planning Commission for recommendations concerning the proposed Rezoning (and associated PUD Concept Plan) and for the concurrently submitted Major Subdivision (Vesting Tentative Tract Map), for the project. The Planning Commission recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council, which will be the final decision-maker on all permits associated with the project (including the Major Subdivision).

The project is generally in conformance with the type of development envisioned by the City for this site in the General Plan. The applicant has agreed to provide a 1,000 square foot open space area at the corner of Pleasant Hill Road and Boyd Road, that would incorporate a historical plaque, however, the applicant is not supportive of the HOA maintaining this property. In addition, the applicant still opposes reconfiguration of Lot 1 as discussed in the staff report and does not support providing a sidewalk gap closure along Pleasant Hill Road. Staff has proposed conditions of approval to implement the Planning Commission’s direction as noted above.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission receive public testimony, review the proposed project, provide further direction regarding the issues identified in the staff report and conditionally recommend approval of the project to the City Council through adoption of the proposed Planning Commission Resolution (Attachment A-2).

VI. ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A-2</td>
<td>Proposed Planning Commission Resolution and Conditions of Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B-2</td>
<td>Proposed Draft Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment C-2</td>
<td>Proposed Revised PUD Concept Plan and Map – Rezoning Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment D-2</td>
<td>Proposed Vesting Tentative Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment E-2</td>
<td>Additional Applicant Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment F-2</td>
<td>Planning Commission Staff Report April 24, 2018 (<a href="#">weblink</a>) – Public Hearing Item #1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>