

- SUBJECT:** PUD-74
- APPLICANT:** Pamela Hardy, Ponderosa Homes II, Inc.
- PROPERTY OWNER:** Ponderosa Homes II, Inc.
- PURPOSE:** Application for Planned Unit Development (PUD) development plan to construct 110 detached single-family homes for residents aged 55 years and older at the public school option/Medium Density Residential-senior housing site located at 1 Reimers Drive in the Ironwood Development.
- GENERAL PLAN:** The General Plan Land Use designation for the parcel is Public and Institutional/Medium Density Residential.
- ZONING:** Zoning for the property is PUD-LDR/MDR/HDR/P&I & Mixed P&I/MDR (Planned Unit Development – Low Density Residential/Medium Density Residential/ High Density Residential/Public & Institutional and Mixed Public & Institution/Medium Density Residential) District.
- LOCATION:** 1 Reimers Drive (within the Ironwood Development)
- ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Exhibit A, Proposed Plans, Green Point Checklist, Traffic Study, Noise Study, Biotic Evaluation, and Geotechnical Investigation
 2. Exhibit B, Recommended Conditions of Approval
 3. Exhibit C, Location Map
 4. Exhibit D, Letter from Pamela Hardy, Ponderosa Homes, dated May 20, 2008, Including San Francisco Chronicle Article Regarding Rossmoor Development in Walnut Creek
 5. Exhibit E, Excerpt of California Civil Code Section 51.3
 6. Exhibit F, Draft Minutes of the March 19, 2008, Planning Commission Work Session Meeting
 7. Exhibit G, Affordable Housing Agreement for the Ironwood Development

8. Exhibit H, Community Trails Master Plan
 9. Exhibit I, Draft Negative Declaration
 10. Exhibit J, Email from Laura Purcell, dated March 9, 2008
 11. Exhibit K, Letter from Toni Purcell, dated March 11, 2008
-

I. BACKGROUND

Ponderosa Homes' "Ironwood" development was approved by the City Council in 2002, consisting of 175 new single-family homes, 16 duets, a 172-unit senior apartment project, a church/day care facility, and a public school option/Medium Density Residential (MDR)-senior housing site. Two existing farmhouses along Mohr Avenue were also retained. The senior apartments and most of the single-family homes have been built. The Pleasanton Presbyterian Church recently finished the first phase of its church facility.

The Pleasanton Unified School District had a five-year option agreement with Ponderosa Homes to buy the approximately 23-acre public school option/MDR site in the development as a potential school facility. The School District chose not to exercise its option to purchase the property and Ponderosa Homes would like to develop the site as medium-density senior housing as allowed by the Ironwood Planned Unit Development (PUD).

March 19, 2008, Planning Commission Workshop

In order to receive early feedback from the Planning Commission and any interested individuals regarding the proposed project, a Planning Commission work session was held on March 19, 2008. The Planning Commission provided the following comments on the work session discussion points (additional comments made by the Commission are located in the attached minutes):

1. *Is the size and location of the recreation area acceptable? Are the private recreation area amenities acceptable?*

Commissioners O'Connor and Olsen felt that the size, location, and amenities of the recreation area were acceptable. Commissioner Blank felt that the size and location were acceptable, but would like to see a jogging or bike path added. He would also like to see some "green area" added along the eastern boundary.

2. *Does the Commission support a gated community?*

Commissioner Olson noted that for a development such as this, he believed that a gated community made sense for the residents, who preferred additional home and personal security. Commissioner O'Connor stated that he did not favor a gated community unless it was at a senior

community. Chairperson Blank indicated that he did not support any gated developments, which he felt detracted from the open community feel of Pleasanton.

3. *Does the Commission wish to make any suggestions regarding the architectural materials used?*

Commissioner Olsen indicated that he liked the house designs. Commissioner O’Conner stated he would like to see more detailing and “quaintness” added to the homes. He noted that Plan 4 was not as attractive as the other models. Commissioner Blank felt that the Plan 4 design needed to be improved. He noted that the other three models could use more detailing. He also indicated that the placement of the two-story model was important and he would like to know where they would be located in the development.

Commissioner Blank indicated that the homes needed to be sprinklered and would like to see more than 50 Green Building points. He requested viewscapes be provided from the neighboring homes.

Workshop Public Comment

John Knight, 3372 Sagewood Court, indicated that he was happy with the development and that Ponderosa disclosed the project to him when he purchased his property. He requested public trail access through the proposed EVA connecting to Sandstone Court.

Staff had also received an email and letter from two residents in the Ironwood development which were forwarded to the Commission for the workshop. Linda Purcell, 3363 Sagewood Court, expressed concerns regarding view impacts, setbacks from the existing homes, the proposed gated community, and public parks and trails in the east Pleasanton area. Toni Purcell, 3461 Cornerstone Court, expressed concerns regarding circulation/traffic and dust impacts from construction activity.

II. SITE DESCRIPTION

Subject Property and Surrounding Area

The subject property, measuring approximately 23-acres in area, is located at the eastern side of the Ironwood Development and abuts the eastern terminus of Reimers Drive (please see the aerial photograph of the site and surrounding area on the following page, which was taken in 2005). The undeveloped site is relatively flat and contains non-native annual grasses. The southern portion of the site is currently being used as a temporary construction yard for the adjacent Ironwood development. A temporary gravel construction access road is located along the western edge of the site.



The property is bordered on the west by single-family homes in the Ironwood neighborhood. The City's Operation Service Center (OSC) is located to the south of the subject site. Old Mohr Avenue right of way and a Zone 7 lake (formerly Hanson Aggregates quarry pit) are located to the north. This lake will become one of the "Chain of Lakes" which is to be used for water storage, groundwater recharge, and recreation uses. A portion of the former Hanson Aggregates quarry property (now owned by Legacy Partners) is located to the east.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Proposed Plan

The applicant proposes to construct 110 detached single-family homes for residents aged 55 years and older. The project features are summarized below:

- Lot sizes would range from a minimum of 5,100 square feet to approximately 13,500 square feet in area.
- Four house models would range in size from approximately 1,916 square feet to 2,920 square feet. Three of the models are one-story tall and one model is two-stories tall. The

one-story models would measure between 17 to 24 feet in height, depending on the model and elevation type. The two-story model would measure between 25½ and 26½ feet in height, depending on the elevation type. There would be three different elevation styles for each house model type which provides up to twelve varying streetscape elevations.

- The proposed homes and future additions to the homes would need meet the following proposed site development standards:

SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARD:	PROPOSED:
Floor Area Ratio: <u>Lot Sizes up to 9,999 sq. ft.</u> One-story homes Two-story homes <u>Lot Sizes 10,000 sq. ft. and larger</u> One-story homes Two-story homes	 48% max. 58% max. 23% max. 29% max.
Height ¹ One-story Two-story Note: Height measured from foundation elevation to the mid-point of the highest ridge to the eave line.	 24 ft. max. 30. ft. max.
Principal Structure Setbacks: Front (garage/house/porch) - Sides - Street Side - Rear -	 20/12/12 ft. min. 5 ft. min. ² 13 ft. min. 10 ft. min.

¹Two-story homes are prohibited on Lots 18-21 and 29-32.

²A 10-foot minimum western side yard setback is required for Lots 19, 20, 30, and 31.

- Two garage parking spaces would be provided per unit. In addition, residential driveways would be at least 20-feet long to accommodate parked vehicles with the garage door in a closed position. On-street parking would also be allowed in front of the residences. Eleven perpendicular and eight parallel parking spaces would be provided for the clubhouse in case residents choose to drive to the facility.

- Reimers Drive (off of the Ironwood Drive traffic circle) would provide access to the development. The applicant is proposing a gated development with private streets. Street sections would measure 36-feet wide (curb-to-curb) with parking on both sides of the street except near the entry gates. Sidewalks would be located on both sides of Street “A” from the gated entry to Court “G.” Other portions of Street “A” and the secondary streets would have sidewalks on one side of the street. No sidewalks would be provided in the cul-de-sacs.
- An emergency vehicle access (EVA) road would connect Court “G” to Sandstone Court in the existing Ironwood development. Ponderosa Homes had previously recorded EVA easements on the two lots at the end of Sandstone Court to accommodate a future EVA, but not general public access/trail. EVAs would also be provided between Court “F” and Street “A,” between Court “D” and Street “A,” and between Reimers Drive and the City’s OSC.
- A private recreation area with an approximately 4,544-square-foot clubhouse would be located near the center of the development. The clubhouse would contain a club room with kitchen, wine locker, meeting room, office, exercise room, restrooms, and storage areas. Outdoor amenities include a pool, spa, bocce ball court, and covered and uncovered seating areas.
- Front yard landscaping would be installed for each lot and would be maintained by a homeowners association.

IV. ANALYSIS

Land Use

Conformance with the General Plan

The subject public school option/MDR site was approved for either public school or medium density residential senior housing land uses. The site’s General Plan Land Use Designation of “Public and Institutional/Medium Density Residential” reflects this dual land use. The Medium Density Residential General Plan Land Use Designation allows for 2 to 8 dwelling units per acre (DUA) and a midpoint density of 5 DUA. The General Plan indicates that residential projects which propose densities greater than the midpoint should be zoned PUD and contain sufficient public amenities. The proposed medium density residential senior housing development is consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the site. In addition, the proposed density of 4.8 DUA is below the midpoint density and public amenities are not required for this project. The proposed project would also further the following General Plan Programs and Policies:

Land Use Element

Policy 2: Develop new housing in infill and peripheral areas which is adjacent to existing residential development.

Housing Element

Goal 1: Attain a variety of housing sizes, types, densities, designs, and prices which meet the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

Goal 14: Provide adequate locations for housing of all types and in sufficient quantities to meet Pleasanton's housing needs.

Policy 48: Provide for the special-housing needs of large families, the elderly, the disabled, the homeless, and families with single-parent heads of households.

Policy 49: Highlight senior citizen housing issues so that the senior population of Pleasanton has access to housing which meets their needs as the population ages.

The land use of this site has been discussed as part of the City's General Plan Update. The City Council included 113 residential units at this site in its preferred land use plan that is being used for completing the Draft General Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Update. In addition, since a public school would not be built on the site, the General Plan Land Use designation of the site would change from "Public and Institutional/Medium Density Residential" to "Medium Density Residential" as part of the General Plan update.

Zoning and Uses

Zoning for the entire Ironwood development is PUD-LDR/MDR/HDR/P&I & Mixed P&I/MDR (Planned Unit Development – Low Density Residential/Medium Density Residential/High Density Residential/Public & Institutional and Mixed Public & Institutional/Medium Density Residential) District. The subject school option/MDR-senior housing site was zoned as Mixed Public & Institution/Medium Density Residential, allowing either a Pleasanton Unified School District educational facility or single-family attached or detached MDR senior housing. The proposed single-family detached MDR senior housing is consistent with the zoning of the property.

Disclosures

The draft conditions of approval require that the following disclosures be included with the deed of sale for all lots in the development: proximity to the Livermore Airport and overflights; adjacency of the City's Operations Service Center, including the police firing range and fire training facility; industrial uses in the vicinity, including the Pleasanton Garbage Service

transfer station and the Kiewit Construction and Utility Vault facilities; gravel harvesting and processing in the vicinity; gravel and garbage truck traffic on Busch Road; and future uses of the quarry pits. The draft conditions also require that these disclosures be prominently displayed in the tract sales office for this development.

Age Restrictions

The applicant has indicated that the development would follow State law (California Civil Code Section 51.3) with respect to age restrictions. (See Attachment # 5.) In general, at least one resident in the dwelling must be a “qualifying resident” 55 years or older. Any other resident in the same dwelling must be a “qualified permanent resident” (e.g., a person who is 45 years of age or older or a spouse or domestic partner). A “qualified permanent resident” is also a disabled person or person with a disabling illness or injury who is a child or grandchild of the qualifying resident or qualified permanent resident, or a permitted health care resident who is hired to provide live-in, long-term, or terminal care to a qualifying resident, or a family member of the health care resident providing that care. Exceptions are included in case of divorce or if the qualifying resident dies. A condition of approval requires that the occupancy restrictions be included in the project CC&Rs, which shall be subject to the final review and approval by the City Attorney.

Traffic and Circulation

Vehicular access to the development would be provided from Reimers Drive (off of the Ironwood Drive traffic circle). The development would have a gated entrance and private streets. Street sections would measure 36-foot wide (curb-to-curb) with parking on both sides of the street except near the entry gates. Sidewalks would be located on both sides of Street “A” from the gated entry to Court “G.” Other portions of Street “A” and the secondary streets would have sidewalks on one side of the street. No sidewalks would be provided in the cul-de-sacs. An emergency vehicle access (EVA) road would connect Court “G” to Sandstone Court in the existing Ironwood development. EVAs would also be provided between Court “F” and Street “A,” between Court “D” and Street “A,” and between Reimers Drive and the City’s OSC. The EVA between Reimers Drive and the OSC is a requirement of the original Ironwood development, as the applicant was allowed to relocate the existing EVA at the western perimeter of the OSC to the northern perimeter location shown on the plan.

The Pleasanton General Plan requires site-specific traffic studies for all major developments which have the potential to exceed Level of Service (LOS) “D,” and requires developers to implement the mitigation measures identified in these studies. A traffic study prepared by TJKM Transportation Consultants, acting as the City’s traffic consultant, was prepared to analyze the traffic and circulation for this project.

The traffic study analyzed the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour LOS traffic for the following three scenarios:

- Existing – This scenario evaluates the existing traffic conditions.
- Existing Plus Approved Projects – This scenario includes the existing traffic plus traffic from approved but not yet built/completed projects.
- Existing Plus Approved Projects Plus the Proposed Project – This scenario includes the existing traffic, plus traffic from approved but not yet built/completed projects, plus traffic from the proposed project.

The proposed 110-unit detached single-family homes for residents aged 55 years and older would generate approximately 587 daily trips on an average weekday, including a total of 30 AM peak hour trips (11 trips inbound and 19 trips outbound) and 53 PM peak hour trips (32 inbound and 21 trips outbound).

Seven intersections were analyzed in the traffic study based on the number of trips that the project adds to the intersections and the existing level of service (LOS) at the intersections. All seven of the study intersections currently operate at LOS “D” or better. Adding traffic from the approved but not built/completed projects will result in one intersection not meeting the LOS “D” or better standard:

- Valley Avenue at Santa Rita Road – LOS “E” in the PM peak hour

Adding the traffic from the proposed project to the approved projects will not result in any additional intersections exceeding the LOS “D” or better standard. The project would add a very small overall average delay of 1.6 seconds to the Valley Avenue/Santa Rita Road intersection, resulting in no change to the LOS at this intersection in both the AM and PM peak hours. The construction of a third southbound left-turn lane at this intersection will allow it to operate at LOS D in the PM peak hour. The City is also exploring other mitigations for this intersection. The mitigation at this intersection is considered to be a Citywide responsibility. Therefore, the project’s payment of the City and Tri-Valley Traffic Impact Fees is considered to be its mitigation of this improvement.

Staff notes that the proposed project would generate considerably less traffic than the 1,000-student high school that was previously assumed for this site. The high school would have generated approximately 1,160 AM peak hour trips and approximately 100 PM peak hour trips (as noted above, the proposed project would generate approximately 30 AM peak hour trips and 53 PM peak hour trips).

Gated Development

The applicant is proposing a gated entrance to the development. The General Plan Circulation Element indicates: “Discourage the development of further gated communities which inhibit the sense of greater community and make City utility and emergency services more difficult to provide.” Similar language has been included in the Draft Circulation Element as part of the General Plan Update: “Discourage new gated communities.”

The applicant has stated that the needs for residents of a senior community are different than other residential neighborhoods. Residents in senior communities frequently prefer the limited access and additional security that a gated community provides. The applicant also notes that many residents are retired or semi-retired and travel frequently for extended periods of time. In addition, many residents would be senior-aged women who prefer the additional home and personal security provided by a gated community. The development would have substantial common use amenities, such as a large community clubhouse, pool/spa and a bocce courtyard, and the applicant feels the gate would serve to control access by non-residents. The applicant also noted that many similar senior retirement communities have similar gated access control. The applicant submitted an article on the Rossmoor Development in Walnut Creek (see Attachment #4), which is a gated development. The article indicates that the single women in the development like the sense of security provided by the gates.

Although staff normally does not support gated developments, staff is not opposing a gated development in this case because it would be located in a senior community. Furthermore, the gate would be equipped with an override system so that emergency vehicles/response would not be impeded.

Trails

The City’s Community Trails Master Plan shows a future trail adjacent to the northern boundary of the subject site. This future trail would start near the Mohr Avenue/Martin Avenue intersection and head east to provide access to the future recreation uses that will be established around the old quarry pits. Staff has had discussions with the applicant about providing a trail connection from this development to the future trail (e.g., create a narrow homeowner’s association-owned parcel with trail between Lots 36 and 37). The applicant does not wish to provide a trail connection due to security concerns. Although staff believes it would be beneficial for the residents to have this trail connection, staff understands the applicant’s security concerns and finds it acceptable not to provide the trail connection.

At the workshop, a resident on Sagewood Court had requested public trail access through the proposed EVA connecting to Sandstone Court. An EVA easement was created on the two lots at the end of Sandstone Court, but a public access easement was not provided. Therefore, public access is not provided along the Sandstone Court EVA and the EVA would include a seven-foot tall solid gate that would prohibit public access.

Allowable Vehicles on Private Streets

Golf carts are sometimes used by residents in senior communities, even when there is no golf course. For example, a resident may wish to drive a golf cart to the clubhouse. Therefore, staff has included a condition which would allow residents to utilize alternative types of vehicles on the private streets (e.g., golf carts), should they be desired by residents.

Parking

Staff believes that there would be adequate parking provided in the development for both residents and guests. Two garage parking spaces would be provided per unit. In addition, residential driveways would be at least 20-feet long to accommodate parked vehicles with the garage door in a closed position. On-street parking would also be allowed in front of the residences. Eleven perpendicular and eight parallel parking spaces would be provided for the clubhouse in case residents choose to drive to the facility.

The applicant intends to establish special parking restrictions in the CC&Rs for the private streets (e.g., no RVs, no boats, limited parking hours, etc.). A condition of approval requires that the parking restrictions be submitted for review and approval by the City Attorney and Director of Planning and Community Development.

Noise

External noise sources that could affect the site include noise from the City's Operation Service Center (OSC) to the south, sand and gravel operations to the east, Livermore Municipal Airport, traffic on adjacent City streets, Pleasanton Garbage Service transfer station, Kiewit Construction and Utility Vault facilities, and other adjacent land uses. Seven-foot tall masonry walls are currently located along the site's southern and western boundaries. The existing seven-foot tall wall along the southern boundary would be removed and replaced with a new seven-foot tall masonry wall. For Lots 93 and 94, the seven-foot wall along the southern boundary would be located on top of a five-foot tall retaining wall (making the effective height of the wall 12-foot tall from the City's OSC side of the wall), further mitigating noise from the City's OSC. Seven-foot tall masonry walls would also be constructed along the project's northern and eastern boundaries.

For single-family housing projects, the City's General Plan generally requires that backyard areas not exceed 60 dB L_{dn} and that indoor noise levels not exceed 45 dB L_{dn} . In addition, if the noise source is aircraft, the General Plan states that residential developments should be strongly discouraged where exterior noise levels exceed 55 dB L_{dn} due to aircraft and should not be allowed in areas where exterior noise levels exceed 65 dB L_{dn} due to aircraft. A noise study was prepared to ensure that the project will meet General Plan noise standards. The noise study indicates that the aircraft noise exposure at the site is less than 55 dB L_{dn} and that traffic noise exposure at the site is less than 60 dB L_{dn} . Therefore, noise levels from traffic and airport noise would meet the General Plan noise standards and noise mitigation is not required for these noise

sources. Nevertheless, the project has been conditioned to provide disclosure to buyers of the proximity to the airport and overflights.

The project site is exposed to intermittent noise from the City's Operations Service Center. The noise study indicated that the police firing range, which is located approximately 630 feet from the project's southern boundary, would be the most significant noise source from the OSC. The noise study indicates that gunshot noise is significantly more annoying than traffic noise at the same level. The noise study recommends that noise levels from gunshots be reduced to not exceed 40 dBA L_{max} inside the residences with the windows and exterior doors closed. In order to meet this interior noise standard, the windows and exterior doors on the east, west, and south sides of the homes on Lots 3, 4, and 91-96 would need to provide at least 25 dBA of noise reduction on the first floor and provide at least 35 dBA of noise reduction on the second floor. These homes would also need to be provided with forced air mechanical ventilation (i.e., air conditioning) so that windows and doors may be closed at the discretion of the occupants to control noise. The exact Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings of the windows and doors to meet these requirements would be determined at the building permit stage. A condition of approval requires that the applicant comply with the recommendations of the noise study.

Noise Impacts on Adjacent Properties

The development of residential uses on the property will generate added urban noise, such as traffic, landscape maintenance activities, etc. However, noise levels will not change substantially from that currently experienced in the area.

Short-term construction noise would be generated during any new construction of this site. The City normally allows construction hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, with Saturday construction allowed if there are no nearby residents that could be impacted by construction noise or activities. Since there are existing residences directly adjacent to the proposed project site, staff is not recommending that Saturday construction be allowed. Staff is recommending a condition that would allow the Director of Planning and Community Development to approve earlier construction "start times" or later "stop times" only for specific construction activities (e.g., concrete foundation/slab pours) if it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Community Development that that the construction and construction traffic noise will not impact nearby residents. Construction equipment would be required to meet DMV noise standards and be equipped with muffling devices.

Grading Plan

The subject property generally has flat terrain. Site grades generally range from an elevation of 352 feet at the south end of the site to an elevation of 361 feet at the northeast corner. Grading for the proposed project would be limited to that required for preparation of the building pads and foundations, streets, and utilities. Retaining walls from 1.2 to five feet in height would be installed along portions of the site perimeter to provide proper slope for utilities or to provide

adequately sized flat area in the rear yards. Staff finds the proposed grading to be minor and generally acceptable. Staff is recommending a few relatively modest changes which it believes would enhance the overall project. First, staff recommends that short (up to approximately 2.7-foot tall) retaining walls be installed along the rear property lines of Lots 10-13 and 16-17 in order to eliminate the 2:1 slope bank in the rear yards and to maximize the flat, usable space. Second, Lots 32-40, 44-51, and 78 would have up to a 3.5-foot tall retaining wall along the rear property lines. A seven-foot tall precast wall would be located on top of this retaining wall, resulting in up to a 10.5-foot tall wall as viewed from the residences where there could be a 10-foot rear yard setback to the home. Staff feels that a 10.5-foot tall wall would be overbearing on these properties. Since the seven-foot wall height is not required for noise mitigation at this location, staff is recommending that the soundwall either be lowered in height or be designed with openings in the upper portions of the wall. Conditions of approval address these items.

Drainage Plan

In order to reduce stormwater runoff and pollutants from the site, drainage from the roofs and lot surface drainage would be conveyed to and treated by grassy swales between the homes and sidewalk/street. Bioretention and landscape-treatment areas would be located in the common open space areas. The project would also include an underground storage basin in order to match pre-project runoff from the site. These are types of stormwater runoff measures that are strongly supported by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and local agencies like Pleasanton implementing the urban clean water runoff program.

Drainage from most of the private roads would be conveyed to media filtration vaults (i.e., oil/water separators) below the roadway. Staff notes that media filtration units are no longer a preferred stormwater treatment measure by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and local agencies implementing the urban clean water runoff program as they require regular maintenance and do not provide an effective means to treat both the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff from a site. Therefore, staff recommends that the applicant utilize an alternative storm water treatment for the roads and that its design be shown on the tentative map plans.

Geotechnical Study

A Zone 7 lake (formerly Hanson Aggregates quarry) is located to the north and northeast. The top of the bank of the lake is approximately 85 feet from the northern perimeter of the project site. The lake's southern slope bank is steeply sloped (roughly 1.5:1 to 2:1). Portions of the slope bank are unstable and Zone 7 is working with the former owner to repair it.

A geotechnical investigation was prepared by Cornerstone Earth Group to evaluate the physical and engineering properties of the subsurface soils and prepare recommendations for site work and grading, building foundations, flatwork, retaining walls, and pavements. The project's proximity to the Zone 7 lake was also analyzed for potential geologic hazards.

From a geotechnical engineering standpoint, Cornerstone Earth Group states that the proposed development can be constructed as planned, provided that the recommendations contained in the report are incorporated into the project design and grading. Examples of recommendations include: remove the existing soil stockpiles and only reuse them for backfill if they meet certain criteria; compact soils in accordance with the latest American Society for Testing and Materials standards; and post-tensioned concrete mat foundations need to be based on procedures developed by the Post-Tensioning Institute (latest edition) and as referenced in the 2007 California Building Code. Cornerstone Earth Group also determined that the proposed development was set back an adequate distance from the top of the Zone 7 lake's slope bank to avoid any potential geologic hazards. A condition of approval has been included that requires the applicant to comply with the recommendations listed in the geotechnical report.

The geotechnical study was reviewed and conditionally accepted by the City Engineer. The City Engineer has requested that a condition of approval be included which requires the unstable portions of the adjacent Zone 7 lake's slope bank be repaired prior to the construction of Lots 31 through 42 unless pier and grade beam foundations are used for these homes.

Architecture and Design

The project proposes four different plans: Residence One, Two, and Three are single-story homes with three elevation styles each; and Residence Four is two-story home with three elevation styles. The elevation styles include "Mediterranean," "Cottage," "Tuscan," and "Napa Craftsman." Nine different color schemes generally comprised of earth tones and natural colors are proposed for exterior paint, stone, brick, and roof colors. In order to ensure that the colors compliment the architectural style of the proposed homes, some of the color schemes are limited to a specific elevation style.

Staff generally feels that the building designs are attractive and that the architectural styles, finish colors, and materials will complement the surrounding development. Staff is recommending a few minor changes which it believes would enhance the overall design of the project: 1) staff believes the building architecture should be "four-sided," with front elevation trim/window elements carried through on all sides of the buildings; 2) staff recommends that additional cornice detailing be added to the turret on the "Mediterranean" elevation and that the turret roof pitch be slightly steepened, if feasible, on this elevation type; and 3) since the "Tuscan" and "Mediterranean" elevations on Residences Three and Four have basically the same first floor elevations, staff is recommending that the same elevation types not be placed next to each other. Conditions of approval address these recommendations. In addition, since actual samples of the roof, stone, and brick have not been provided, staff has included a condition which requires that actual color/material samples of the roof, stone, and brick be submitted for final review and approval by the Director of Planning and Community Development. The condition would also allow the proposed house and roof colors to be used on

different color schemes, provided the Director of Planning and Community Development found that the colors/materials complimented the architectural style of the proposed home.

Site Development Standards

The site development standards established by this proposal are generally satisfactory. Staff has proposed that the height definition be measured vertically from the lowest finished grade adjacent to an exterior wall of the house to the highest elevation of the building. In addition, staff believes the floor area ratio (FAR) calculation should be consistent with the Municipal Code, which is the total square footage of the house, excluding garage, divided by the lot area. Staff has also added typical setback and height limits for accessory structures.

The site development standards would allow FARs from 23%-58%, depending on the lot size and number of stories. Staff is supportive of the house FARs as proposed, recognizing they allow higher FARs than the 40% limit used for R-1-6,500 zoning. However, the proposed FARs are not exceptionally large when compared to FARs on similarly-sized lots in recent PUD projects.

Neighbor Concerns

At the March 19, 2008, workshop, Linda Purcell, 3363 Sagewood Court, had submitted an email expressing concerns regarding view impacts created by the proposed homes and the proposed setbacks of the proposed homes from the existing Ironwood homes. The applicant has responded to these concerns by limiting the homes on Lots 18-21 and 29-32 (the first two homes adjacent to Sagewood and Sandstone Courts) to one-story and by increasing the side yard setbacks on Lots 19, 20, 30, and 31 from a five-foot minimum to ten-foot minimum. These restrictions would also apply to future additions to these homes. Staff believes that the proposed story and setback restrictions on these homes adequately address view and privacy impacts to the adjacent neighbors on Sagewood and Sandstone Courts. Staff also notes that there would be a seven-foot soundwall between the existing and proposed homes. The applicant has also noted that the homes at the end of Sandstone and Sagewood Courts were plotted with larger eastern side yard setbacks of 15 and 20 feet, respectively, to provide a larger buffer to the future development on the school option/MDR site. The proposed plans include cross-sections showing the two existing Ironwood Estates homes at the end of Sagewood Court and the closest proposed homes.

Affordable Housing

The City's Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance (IZO) requires new single-family residential projects of fifteen units or more to provide at least twenty percent (20%) of the dwelling units as affordable units to very low, low, and/or moderate income households. For multi-family projects of fifteen units or more, the IZO requires at least fifteen percent (15%) affordable units.

The Affordable Housing Agreement for the Ironwood development (please see Attachment # 7) established a 24% affordable unit requirement for the entire 363-unit project. The applicant built 138 affordable units in its 172-unit senior apartment project in the Ironwood development. Because this exceeded the 87 affordable units that were required by 51 units, the City granted the applicant (as allowed by the IZO) 51 Inclusionary Unit Credits that could be used to satisfy the requirements of the IZO on the school option/MDR site. The 51 Inclusionary Unit Credits will more than meet the affordable housing requirements for this project. Therefore, none of the units in the project need to be affordable and none are proposed.

Green Building

As required by the City's Green Building Ordinance, the proposed project is required to qualify for at least 50 points on Alameda County Waste Management Authority's "Single-Family Green Building Rating System." The applicant has proposed to incorporate a considerable number of "Green Building" measures into the project, providing approximately 100 points. Some of the proposed green building measures include: installing high-efficiency irrigation systems; using engineered lumber in the beams and headers and oriented strand board (OSB) for wall and roof sheathing; installing low-emitting recycled-content insulation; exceeding Title 24 state energy conservation requirements by 15%; installing photovoltaic panels to meet 60% of the development's electric needs or 2.4kw; installing Energy Star[®] dishwashers; and utilizing zero or low volatile organic compound (VOC) emitting paints. Please see the attached Green Building checklist for the complete list of the proposed Green Building measures.

Common and Private Open Space

The project includes active and passive private recreation areas for the residents, including a clubhouse, pool and spa, bocce ball court, and covered and uncovered seating areas. Private, individual open space would also be provided in the yard areas of the lots. Staff is satisfied that the combination of common and private open space, clubhouse, bocce ball court, and pool will meet the community's needs. The clubhouse would also provide a gathering/socializing location for the residents.

Landscaping and Fencing

Front yard landscaping would be installed for each lot and would be maintained by a homeowners association. At least one street tree would be provided per lot. Enhanced streetscape landscaping would be provided from the existing terminus of Reimers Drive to Court "D." A substantial amount of landscaping would be provided for the clubhouse and other common open space areas. The plant species and irrigation systems would comply with several of the "Green Building" measures listed on the "Single-Family Green Building Rating System." Staff finds the proposed landscape design, densities, and species to be acceptable.

A fence elevation and typical fencing locations have been shown on the front yard landscape plan, Sheet L5. Staff finds the fence design and locations to be acceptable. A condition of approval requires that a fencing plan be provided for all of the lots in the development.

V. PUD CONSIDERATIONS

The Zoning Ordinance of the Municipal Code sets forth purposes of the Planned Unit Development District and "considerations" to be addressed in reviewing a PUD development plan.

1. Whether the plan is in the best interests of the public health, safety, and general welfare:

The proposed project, as conditioned, meets all applicable City standards concerning public health, safety, and welfare. The subject development would include the installation of all required on-site utilities with connections to municipal systems in order to serve the new lots. The project will not generate volumes of traffic that cannot be accommodated by existing City streets and intersections in the area. The structures would be designed to meet the requirements of the Uniform Building Code, Fire Code, and other applicable City codes. The proposed development is compatible with the adjacent uses and would be consistent with the existing scale and character of the area. Adequate setbacks would be provided between the new dwellings and the existing structures on the adjacent properties.

Therefore, staff believes that the proposed PUD development plan is in the best interests of the public health, safety, and general welfare, and that this finding can be made.

2. Whether the plan is consistent with the City's General Plan and any applicable specific plan:

The site's "Public and Institutional/Medium Density Residential" General Plan Land Use Designation allows either public school or medium density residential senior housing land uses. The Medium Density Residential General Plan Land Use Designation allows for 2 to 8 dwelling units per acre (DUA) and a midpoint density of 5 DUA. This project, as proposed, calculates to 4.8 DUA. The proposed medium density residential senior housing development is consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the site. The proposed project would further several General Plan Programs and Policies encouraging new housing to be developed in infill and peripheral areas that are adjacent to existing residential development and for the City to attain a variety of housing sizes, types, densities, designs, and prices which meet the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. The project would also meet a General Plan Housing Element policy to provide for the special-housing needs of large families, the

elderly, the disabled, the homeless, and families with single-parent heads of households.

Thus, staff concludes that the proposed development plan is consistent with the City's General Plan, and staff believes that this finding can be made.

3. Whether the plan is compatible with previously developed properties in the vicinity and the natural, topographic features of the site:

Surrounding properties include single-family homes, the City's Operation Service Center, a Zone 7 lake, and undeveloped former quarry property. As conditioned, staff believes that the proposed residential lots and homes would be compatible with the surrounding uses. The proposed house locations, house designs, and site development standards have been designed/created to minimize impacts on neighboring properties, including mass and visual impacts as viewed from the adjacent properties and streets. The subject property generally has flat terrain. Grading of the lots has been limited to the creation of the pads for the future homes and to achieve the proper functioning of utilities.

Therefore, staff feels that the PUD development plan is compatible with the previously developed properties and the natural, topographic features of the site, and staff believes that this finding can be made.

4. Whether grading takes into account environmental characteristics and is designed in keeping with the best engineering practices to avoid erosion, slides, or flooding to have as minimal an effect upon the environment as possible.

As described above, the site is flat with minimum changes in grades proposed. The steeply sloped old quarry pit located to the north of the site has been analyzed and does not pose a threat to the project in the event of bank failures. However, to further ensure safety, a condition requires that the northernmost homes not be built until the slope bank is repaired or unless the northernmost homes are built with pier and grade beam foundations. Erosion control and dust suppression measures will be documented in the improvement plans and will be administered by the City's Building and Public Works Departments. The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The flood hazard maps of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) indicate that the subject property is not located in a flood hazard zone.

Therefore, staff believes that this finding can be made.

5. Whether streets and buildings have been designed and located to complement the natural terrain and landscape:

The flat site has no constraints to either roads or buildings. The residences are one- and two-story. The massing of homes is appropriate given the adjoining, similar residences.

The project site is at the terminus of recently developed residential areas of the City. The curving streets and short culs-de-sac minimize monotony and the appearance of mass. New street and open space landscaping is also proposed.

Therefore, staff feels that this PUD finding can be made.

6. Whether adequate public safety measures have been incorporated into the design of the plan:

The streets, gated entry, and EVA connections of the proposed development are satisfactory and can be negotiated by fire and other emergency vehicles. The new homes would be equipped with automatic residential fire sprinklers. The homes would be required to meet the requirements of the Uniform Building Code, Fire Code, other applicable City codes, and State of California energy and accessibility requirements.

Therefore, staff believes that this finding can be made.

7. Whether the plan conforms to the purposes of the PUD District:

The proposed PUD development plan conforms to the purposes of the PUD district. One of these purposes is to insure that the desires of the developer and the community are understood and approved prior to commencement of construction. Staff believes that the proposed project implements the purposes of the PUD ordinance in this case by providing a medium-density senior housing project that is well-designed and sited on the subject property, that fulfills the desires of the applicant, and that meets the City's General Plan goals and policies, including those promoting special-housing needs of the elderly. Moreover, input from the adjacent property owners and tenants has been sought and obtained through a Planning Commission workshop; further opportunity for public comment will occur at the Planning Commission and City Council hearings.

Staff feels that through the PUD process the proposed project has provided the developer and the City with a development plan that optimizes the use of this site in a sensitive manner. Therefore, staff believes that this finding can be made.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public notices were sent to all property owners and tenants within a 1,000-foot radius of the entire Ironwood development, including the project site. The applicant indicated that she also had met with the Ironwood residents to discuss the proposed project. As noted above, staff had received an email and letter from two residents in the Ironwood development during the workshop review. At the time this report was written, staff has not received any additional comments or concerns from any of the adjacent owners or tenants.

VII. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

A draft Negative Declaration has been prepared for the proposed project. Based on an initial study, staff believes that approval of Case PUD-74 would not have any significant adverse effects on the environment. Staff, therefore, believes that the Negative Declaration can be issued in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If the Planning Commission concurs with this environmental assessment, it must make the finding that the Negative Declaration is appropriate prior to taking action on the project.

VIII. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Find that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment and adopt a resolution recommending approval the attached draft Negative Declaration;
2. Make the PUD findings for the proposed development plan as listed in the staff report; and
3. Adopt a resolution recommending approval of Case PUD-74, PUD development plan approval to construct 110 detached single-family homes for residents aged 55 years and older, subject to the conditions of approval listed in Exhibit B, and forward the application to the City Council for public hearing and review.

For questions or comments about this proposal, please contact: Steve Otto, Associate Planner at 925-931-5608 or sotto@ci.pleasanton.ca.us.