I. INTRODUCTION

A. Project Description

The proposal includes a four-lot subdivision and associated four new two-story homes with identical floor plans as noted below:

- First floor living – 2,074sf
- Second floor living – 1,264sf (28sf less than proposed at previous study sessions)
- Garage – 515sf
- Covered porches – 346sf

The resulting lot coverages would range from 23.9% to 27.8% on lots ranging in size from 10,549 to 12,262 net square feet. Associated floor area ratios would be 27.3% to 31.7%. Other improvements include landscaping, fences, and retaining walls.

The final tree preservation/removal plans will also be reviewed by the Architectural Review Commission and Planning Commission at this phase in the process.

B. Background

In 2005 the Zoning Administrator reviewed Minor Subdivision MS 04-003 for a four-lot subdivision at this location. The proposed lots ranged from 11,005 to 11,479 square feet with proposed two-story home sizes between 3,200 and 3,500 square feet. The item was continued to allow the applicant
time to further study drainage, home designs, and tree removal. In 2009, the application was withdrawn.

In 2017, the applicant applied for a lot line adjustment, resulting in two lots and proposed homes for each. In 2018, the application (PLN 17-0207) was withdrawn to address various issues associated with the design of the project. A new submittal was received in September 2018 (PLN 18-0367) for a four lot subdivision and associated homes.

In November 2018, the ARC held a study session for PLN 18-0367 and in February 2019, the Planning Commission held a study session (see Staff Report, Attachment D).

As part of the process, environmental review occurred as the City prepared a Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the project. The initial Draft IS/MND was circulated in April 2019. Due to comments received from the public and Native American Heritage Commission that resulted in modifications to the Draft IS/MND, the Draft IS/MND was updated and was subsequently recirculated in August 2019 for review; the review period expired on September 16, 2019 (Attachment F).

C. Project Location

The project site consists of two undeveloped parcels that currently do not have street addresses. The parcels are directly south of 60 and 98 McKissick Street.

II. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. General Plan

The General Plan designates the site as Single Family Residential Medium Density.

B. Zoning

The zoning designation is R-10, Single Family.

C. Site Description and Existing Land Use

The 1.19 acre site consist of two undeveloped parcels of .6 and .57 acres. The rectangular-shaped site slopes gently down toward the southeast corner of the site with an elevation difference of approximately 16 feet. The site is accessed off McKissick Street between two existing home sites. The site is
bordered on all sides by existing residences. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers are 149-061-026 and 149-061-033.

D. **Surrounding Zoning and Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-10 Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R-10 Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-10 Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>R-10 Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. **CEQA Status**

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Pleasant Hill intends to issue a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. The Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) prepared for this project was first available for public review in April 2019 and subsequently recirculated from **August 16, 2019, through September 16, 2019** and was available at the Planning Division and on the City of Pleasant Hill webpage at [www.pleasanthillca.org](http://www.pleasanthillca.org). The IS/MND has identified potential project issues requiring mitigation in the following areas: Biological Resources, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils and Hazards/Hazardous Materials, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities/Service Systems. After mitigation, the project would not have any significant unavoidable impacts, nor impacts which would be cumulatively considerable. The Draft Recirculated IS/MND is included as Attachment F. Public comments/responses were received during circulation of the Draft IS/MND (Attachment I).

F. **Public Notice**

A notice of public hearings, and Draft Recirculated IS/MND was mailed to each residence and/or property owner of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Notices were also sent to all applicable/required public and private agencies. In addition, notice for the public hearings was provided via signage posted at the site, on the City website, and via publication in the Contra Costa Times Newspaper on August 16, 2019.
G. Related Applications

The project also includes a vesting tentative parcel map to allow a minor subdivision on the site into four residential lots. This Architectural Review Permit and associated map will be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

III. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF REVIEW

A. Purpose

The purpose of architectural review is to evaluate the interdependence of property values and aesthetics, and to provide a method to promote sound land use development. More specifically, architectural review is intended to:

i. Ensure excellence of architectural design;

ii. Ensure that siting and architectural design of structures, including their materials and colors, are visually harmonious with surrounding development and with the natural landforms and vegetation of the areas in which they are proposed to be located;

iii. Ensure that plans for the landscaping of open spaces conform with the requirements of Section 18.115.010.B and that they provide visually pleasing settings for structures on the site and on adjoining and nearby sites, and blend harmoniously with the natural landscape; and

iv. Prevent excessive and unsightly grading of hillsides, and preserve natural landforms and existing vegetation.

v. Ensure substantial compliance with City-wide design guidelines.

Based on current code provisions, the Architectural Review Permit will be reviewed for a decision by the Planning Commission. Thus, the Architectural Review Commission will make its recommendations to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

IV. ANALYSIS

A. Architecture

The proposed plans reflect Craftsman and Bungalow styles. The applicant has provided six color and material schemes for the four sites, providing two extra schemes for prospective buyers. The applicant has noted that in order to provide flexibility, a particular style/color scheme will not be limited to a particular lot, however, there shall be no duplications among the four lots. Material and colors choices are noted below:
Craftsman - Scheme 1
  o Material and Color
    ▪ Body color - SW Link Gray (green/gray)
      • Lap siding –
    ▪ Trim – SW Alabaster (off white)
      • Columns, gable ends, windows
    ▪ Accent – SW Kaffee (brown)
      • Front door, garage door
  o Roofing Material
    ▪ Eagle Roofing – Ponderosa Composition shingle - Charcoal
  o Windows
    ▪ Vinyl - white
  o Masonry
    ▪ Wainscot - El Dorado Stacked Stone – Dry Creek
    ▪ Wainscot sill – El Dorado, split edge – Coastal Sand
  o Exterior Lighting
    ▪ Westinghouse – Black Lantern

Craftsman – Scheme 2
  o Material and Color
    ▪ Body color - SW Renwick Beige (beige)
      • Lap siding/stucco
    ▪ Trim – SW Nice White (off white)
      • Columns, gable ends, windows
    ▪ Accent – SW Rookwood Terra Cotta (rust)
      • Front door, garage door
  o Roofing Material
    ▪ Eagle Roofing – Ponderosa Composition shingle - Charcoal
  o Windows
    ▪ White vinyl
  o Masonry
    ▪ Wainscot - El Dorado Cliffstone - Cambria
    ▪ Wainscot sill – El Dorado, split edge – Coastal Sand
  o Exterior Lighting
    ▪ Westinghouse – Black Lantern

Craftsman – Scheme 3
  o Material and Color
    ▪ Body color - SW Pewter Cast (medium gray)
      • Lap siding/stucco
    ▪ Trim – SW Cultured Pearl (light beige)
• Columns, gable ends, windows
  ▪ Accent – SW Jute Brown (brown)
  ▪ Front door, garage door

  o Roofing Material
    ▪ Eagle Roofing – Ponderosa Composition shingle - Charcoal

  o Windows
    ▪ White vinyl

  o Masonry
    ▪ Wainscot - El Dorado Meseta Fieldstone
    ▪ Wainscot sill – El Dorado, split edge – Coastal Sand

  o Exterior Lighting
    ▪ Westinghouse – Black Lantern

**Bungalow – Scheme 1**

  o Material and Color
    ▪ Body color – SW pediment (light beige)
      ▪ Stucco
    ▪ Trim – SW Marshmallow (off white)
      ▪ Columns, gable ends, windows
    ▪ Accent – SW Rock Bottom (dark green)
      ▪ Front door, garage door

  o Roofing Material
    ▪ Eagle Roofing – Ponderosa Composition shingle - Charcoal

  o Windows
    ▪ Vinyl - white

  o Masonry
    ▪ Wainscot - El Dorado Rough cut – Moonlight
    ▪ Wainscot sill – El Dorado, split edge – Grey Sky

  o Exterior Lighting
    ▪ Westinghouse – Black Lantern

**Bungalow – Scheme 2**

  o Material and Color
    ▪ Body color - SW Versatile Gray (medium gray)
      ▪ Stucco
    ▪ Trim – SW Ibis White (off white)
      ▪ Columns, gable ends, windows
    ▪ Accent – SW Status Bronze (dark brown)
      ▪ Front door, garage door

  o Roofing Material
    ▪ Eagle Roofing – Ponderosa Composition shingle - Charcoal
Windows
- White vinyl

Masonry
- Wainscot - El Dorado Padova Fieldstone
- Wainscot sill – El Dorado, split edge – Grey Sky

Exterior Lighting
- Westinghouse – Black Lantern

Bungalow – Scheme 3

Material and Color
- Body color - SW Analytical Gray (taupe)
  - Stucco
- Trim – SW Westhighland White (off white)
  - Columns, gable ends, windows
- Accent – SW Raisin (dark brown)
  - Front door, garage door

Roofing Material
- Eagle Roofing – Ponderosa Composition shingle - Charcoal

Windows
- White vinyl

Masonry
- Wainscot - El Dorado Adante Fieldledge
- Wainscot sill – El Dorado, split edge – Grey Sky

Exterior Lighting
- Westinghouse – Black Lantern

Note: Previously the ARC suggested that there be some sort of logical material break between the stucco and the horizontal siding (Craftsman model). The exterior of this model style has been augmented by eliminating all stucco and carrying the horizontal siding to all elevations of the building.

*Color boards and rendering available at meeting.

B. Development Regulations

The following table provides R-10 Development Regulations:
C. Compatibility

The surrounding neighborhood is zoned R-10. The existing homes in the vicinity range in living space from 1,120 to 2,887 square feet with FAR’s of 5% to 23% and lot coverage from 8% to 28%. Additionally, lot sizes range from 8,778 to 20,473 square feet. While the proposed homes are generally larger than the surrounding existing residences, the project does comply with the development standards for the R-10 zoning district as noted in the table above.

The existing homes within the vicinity of the project (along McKissick, Hubbard, and Oakvue) were built at various times (1935 to 2012) and reflect a variety of architectural styles, thus, there is no overall design theme for the neighborhood.
D. Landscape

The proposed landscaped areas will be required to comply with the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance recently adopted by the State of California. The submittal includes a Water Efficiency Landscape Worksheet for each lot which indicates compliance. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant will be required to submit a Water Efficient Landscape application (18.52.050), Condition 5.4. The project would also comply with Section 18.20.040.G.1 which provides that 50% of a required front yard shall be maintained as landscape area. The proposed landscape areas would be 782 square feet (65%), 821 square feet (64%), 1,360 square feet (78%), and 1,639 square feet (77%).

All proposed plants, with the exception of the Dwarf Tall Fescue, are noted as low water use. Eight 24” box trees (two Crape Myrtles, two flowering plums, and four California Live Oaks) are proposed for the front yards. Additionally, 20 Arbutus Marina trees and seven California Live Oaks are proposed for perimeter screen trees, all are 15 gallon size.

E. Tree Removal

Due to grade constraints within the property lines, all 40 onsite trees will be required to be removed. Hortsience, Inc. provided an Arborist report, which was subsequently peer reviewed by Traverso Tree Service. Both reports additionally addressed seven off-site trees that are required to be protected during construction, however full evaluation of these trees could not be done as they are on private property. The arborist report notes that 17 native and 13 non-native protected trees are proposed to be removed. Per Section 18.50.110 of the Zoning Ordinance, 49, 15-gallon, replacement trees are required. Previously, the ARC commented that the site could not adequately support all 49 trees, thus the applicant has agreed to off-site planting per the City’s direction, to include adjacent properties. The preliminary landscape plan provides that eight of the 35 replacement trees will be 24 inch box size; the remaining 27 trees will be 15-gallon size, in compliance with Section 18.50.110 of the zoning ordinance.

Note: an adjacent neighbor has obtained an additional arborist report which focused on two off-site trees and the possible impacts that grading for the proposed project could have on them. (Attachment I).

F. Site Circulation

The site is accessed off of McKissick Street via a 25’ wide access and utility easement. The access easement narrows to 20’ approximately 127’
from the entrance. It is at this point where a hammerhead turn out is located per Contra Costa Fire Protection District requirements. Additional guest parking is provided for three vehicles and each parcel contains a driveway for additional parking.

G.  **City Wide Design Guidelines**

The proposed plans address the following Residential Guidelines (RG):

**RG.II.A.1.f – (Single-Family Site Planning)** – Encourage variable setbacks for front facing elevations of homes and garages to create a visually interesting streetscape. Variable setbacks are proposed for the front elevation at the recessed porch area. Additionally, at least one, possibly two of the proposed homes could include a low wall in the front yard that will create a courtyard which will further enhance streetscape.

**RG.II.A.3.f (Building Architecture and Appearance)** – Buildings should include architectural details that may include, but not limited to: porches, bay windows, balconies, railings, fascia boards, and trim to enhance the character of the building. Covered front porches, dormers, courtyard walls, and various trim components are proposed which would provide aesthetic architectural elements.

**RG.II.A.3.g – (Building Architecture and Appearance)** - Building materials and colors should enhance the neighborhood and be compatible to the neighborhood. Building materials (stucco, lap siding, and stone) would be similar to other residences in the neighborhood. In addition, the proposed colors would be similar to other color palettes in the neighborhood.

**RG.II.A.3.n (ii) – (Building Architecture and Appearance)** - Roof materials should have texture and relief. The proposed composition roofing would provide a textured appearance.

**RG.II.A.4.e (iii) - (Landscaping)** – Any loss of heritage or protected trees require an arborist report as part of the project request and shall be peer reviewed for accuracy by the City. There are no heritage trees on the project site. An arborist report was submitted for the site and was peer reviewed.

**RG.II.A.4.p. (i) – (Landscaping)** - Hardscape should be minimized in the front yard. At least 50% of the front yard shall have live landscaping. The proposed landscape plan indicates that all four lots will address this guideline (64% - 78%).

**RG.II.A.7.b (iv) – (Infill – Single Family Residential)** – Use first floor roof elements to break up two story walls. The proposed design includes first
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floor roof elements to break up two story wall predominantly on the front and rear elevations, however there are portions of the side elevations have include this feature.

RG.II.A.7.b (v) – (Infill – Single Family Residential) – Limiting second floor area volume. The second level has less living space area than the first floor and at the direction of the ARC, the second floor volume was further reduced by 28 square feet.

RG.II.A.7.b. (vi) – (Infill – Single Family Residential) – Setting back second floor walls from first floor walls below. The second floor walls on the front elevation have been set back from the first floor walls below.

RG.II.A.7.b (vii) – Infill - Single Family Residential) – Design windows that are harmonious and respect the character of the neighborhood. The majority of the proposed windows either face front, toward the shared access driveway, or are oriented to face the other proposed homes in the new development. There are minimal second story windows on one elevation and no second story windows on the rear elevation.

RG.II.A.7.b (x) – (Infill - Single Family Residential) - Second floor windows should be designed to preserve the privacy of adjacent properties where possible. There are minimal second story windows on one elevation and no second story windows on the rear elevation.

RG.II.A8.g. (Subdivisions) – Varied front yard setbacks (as allowed by Zoning Code) should be used throughout the subdivision. All four of the proposed homes have varied front yard setbacks.

RG.II.A8.p (Subdivisions) – Provide adequate visitor parking. The proposed project includes three guest parking spaces in addition to the eight spaces provided by all four driveways.

RG.II.A.10.a. (ii) –(Environmental Sensitivity) – Using recycled materials, low energy bulbs and low flow fixtures, energy efficient appliances, windows, tankless water heaters, etc. The project includes water conservation irrigation, low flow plumbing fixtures and energy efficient fixtures, complying with Cal Certs and Title-24 requirements. Additionally. Light pollution will be reduced via the use of minimal wall mounted down lighting. Lastly, high efficiency furnaces will be installed as well as the insulating of all exterior walls and ceilings.

Residential Guidelines Not Addressed:
RG.II.A.1.e – Set back garages or de-emphasize garages from the front of the dwelling. The garages are not set back or de-emphasized; however all proposed homes in the subdivision face inward to a private driveway access and not the public street.

RG.II.A.4.n (i) – (Landscaping) – When replacing existing mature trees, new trees should be 36-48 inch box size to quickly replace the lost tree canopy or smaller trees should be planted in numbers that replace the lost tree canopy. The preliminary landscape plan provides that eight of the 35 replacement trees will be 24 inch box size; the remaining 27 trees will be 15-gallon size, in compliance with Section 18.50.110 of the zoning ordinance.

H. Engineering Comments

The Engineering division has reviewed the application for compliance with drainage, water quality, and C.3 requirements as well as other engineering design standards. The applicant has revised drainage plans and hydraulic study to include diversion of water to the nearby creek via Hubbard Avenue as opposed to the original plan which drained through private property. The applicant has satisfied the requirements of the Engineering Division.

I. Discussion Items

Staff recommends that the ARC provide comment/direction to the applicant regarding the:

- Tree replacement
  - Eight address Design Guidelines size, all comply with zoning ordinance
- Garages not de-emphasized
  - Design Guideline
- Massing, however as directed previously by the ARC, the second floor has been reduced by 28 square feet and the second floor was stepped back above the garage by 11’9”
- Sufficiency of items addressed

V. NEXT STEPS

The Planning Commission will review the project (including the vesting tentative parcel map and architectural review permit) and provide a decision. The Architectural Review Commission recommendations will be considered by the Planning Commission as part of their review.
VI. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission conduct the public hearing, receive comments from all interested parties, provide feedback and direction on the project, including input on the issues identified in the staff report and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission for the requested Architectural Review Permit.

VII. ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td>Proposed Conditions of Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B</td>
<td>Proposed Project Plans &amp; Material Specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment C</td>
<td>Applicant’s Written Statement &amp; Reply to Public Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment D</td>
<td>April 9, 2019 PC Study Session Staff Report (includes November 15, 2018 ARC Study Session Staff Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment E</td>
<td>Public Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment F</td>
<td>Draft Recirculated IS/MND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 1 – Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 2 – Hydrology Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 3 – Biological Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 4 – Cultural Resource Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 5 – Geotechnical Investigation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 6 – Supplement to Geotechnical Investigation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment G</td>
<td>Proposed Revision to Draft Recirculated IS/MND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment H</td>
<td>Memo in Response to Draft Recirculated IS/MND Public Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment I</td>
<td>Public Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>