



Planning Commission Staff Report

August 22, 2007
Item 6.b.

- SUBJECT:** PUD-63
- APPLICANT:** Mike Carey
- PROPERTY OWNERS:** Frank Auf Der Maur, Steve Maestas, and Mike Carey
- PURPOSE:** Work Session to review and receive comments on an application for Planned Unit Development rezoning and development plan approval to: (1) rezone an the existing 11,265-square-foot parcel from the RM-15 (Multiple-Family Residential) District to PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential) District; and (2) construct four single-family residential units with two detached garages.
- GENERAL PLAN:** High Density Residential-Greater than 8 dwelling units per gross acre.
- SPECIFIC PLAN:** Downtown Specific Plan: High Density Residential
- ZONING:** Rezone from the existing RM-1,500 (Multiple-Family Residential) and Core Area Overlay District to PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development-High Density Residential) District
- LOCATION:** 418 Rose Avenue
- ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Location Map
 2. Exhibit A, Option One Site, Elevation, and Floor Plans and Option Two Site plan dated “Received February 21, 2007”
 3. Exhibit C, Questions

BACKGROUND

In February of 2007 the applicant, Mike Carey, submitted a Planned Unit Development application for the vacant lot located at 418 Rose Avenue. Since submitting the application, staff has been working closely with Mr. Carey and other City Departments to provide direction

regarding regulations for the lot by developing single-family homes with detached garages. The applicant has recently presented two similar projects to the Planning Commission, one on West Angela and another on First Street; however he is considering a different approach to this development and would like to receive comments from the Commissioner's prior to finalizing the plans.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject site is an approximately 11,265 square-foot (.26 acre) flat vacant lot bounded by Rose Avenue and Augustine Street located in the Downtown Specific Plan and Core Area Overlay District. There is currently one tree on the site, located on the far northeast corner, with additional vegetation and trees located on bordering property lines on neighboring sites. There are two-story multiple-family developments and detached multi-family residential units throughout the neighborhood.

View from Rose Avenue & Augustine Street



View from Rose Avenue



Located across the street on Rose Avenue



Located behind the subject site on Augustine



PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to rezone the subject site from RM-15 (Multiple-Family Residential-minimum 1,500 sq. ft. lot area per unit) District to PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development-High Density Residential) District to provide more design flexibility. The applicant is proposing two site design options for consideration. Option one consists of four detached two-story single-family homes with two detached garages. The detached garage for lots one and two would consist of two separate 1-car stalls with bonus rooms above while the detached garage for lots three and four would consist two separate 1-car and 2-car stalls with the 2-car having a second dwelling unit above it verses a bonus room. The second-dwelling unit would require one parking space continuously available to the occupants; in this case it would be one of the two parking stalls on lot 4. The units would be approximately 1,384 square-feet in size with a floor area ratio (FAR) of 73% and 79%+/- . The maximum height will be approximately 24-feet with the garage heights proposed at 22-feet; both measured from finished grade to the top of the roof ridge.

In option two the applicant is proposing five attached townhomes. This option puts the driveway and tuck under garages behind the units so that they are less visible. With the exception of the tuck under garages, which would likely increase the height of the units, the style and FAR will be similar to that proposed in option one.

DISCUSSION

After submitting the formal application, the applicant approached staff with the following options:

1. Move forward with the option one as a production proposal and develop the units with two alternative, but complementary, designs similar to the previously approved West Angela Street project.
2. Move forward with the option one site plan layout and do a custom lot development by establishing design guidelines for the individual lots to allow homeowners more variation in design and diversity.

OR

3. Move forward with an attached townhome development as a production proposal and develop the units with alternative designs.

Staff is presenting the Commission with the site layout concepts, which would apply to the options listed above, for consideration and comments.

General Plan, Downtown Specific Plan, and PUD Land Use Designation

The applicant proposes to change the zoning of the property from RM-1,500 to PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development-High Density Residential). Either option would be consistent with the General Plan and Downtown Specific Plan land use designation for the site. The General Plan land use designation for the subject site is High Density Residential (greater than eight dwelling units per gross acre). For example, with four units on approximately .26 acres, would result in 15.4 units per acre, which is greater than the requirement of 8 units per acre (2.08 units on this site), and therefore consistent with the General Plan designation. Both options would also be consistent with the following General Plan policy in the Housing Element,

“at a minimum, maintain the amount of high-density residential acreage currently designated on the General Plan Map.”

The Downtown Specific Plan designation for the property is High Density Residential. The proposed residential project, with 4 or 5 units, would conform to this designation. The project would also be consistent with the following Downtown Specific Plan policy,

“Encourage development at densities which generally exceed the General Plan range midpoints in order to enhance the opportunities for affordable housing, unique housing types, and economic growth in the Downtown.”

Site Layout

Option one consists of 4 individual lots with two shared detached garages and 3 bonus rooms with a potential second dwelling unit above one garage. Staff notes that because second dwelling units are mandated by the State, it would not count towards the General Plan Housing cap. Option two consists of 5 attached townhomes with tuck under garages and driveway access in the back.

Since the initial submittal in February, there have been several discussions regarding the potential for custom lots with design guidelines that would include various architectural styles, colors, and materials, verses production lots which would entail developing the site with one color and material pallet. The applicant is proposing that the site layout for option one remain the same, for either custom or production lots; with the front of the houses facing Augustine Street and the detached garages in the back. Each lot is similar in size and building footprints and will consist of individual driveways leading to the detached garages. If attached units are desired, then the applicant would move forward with production homes since design guidelines would not be feasible.

Direction Needed:

- *Which would be more appropriate for this area, attached or detached units?*
- *Are the units appropriate in size and height?*

- *If option one is desired, would it be appropriate to have larger three-story homes with tuck under garages instead of detached garages to increase the yard area?*

Architectural Design

As listed above, production lots would consist of the applicants developing the site with a design scheme consisting of two varied wall articulations and material selections, as shown in Exhibit A. The material pallet for each of the units would contain horizontal hardi-board siding and painted stucco with alternative color schemes. In option one, the proposed units would be approximately 24-feet tall with the detached garages being approximately 22-feet, when measured from finished grade to the roof ridge. The two detached garages would be divided into two individual single-car spaces, except for the two-car garage on lot 4, to allow for individual homeowner use. A bonus room is proposed above each car space, except for the two-car garage, which will have a second dwelling unit. Each unit is two-stories with a covered front porch and private backyards.

The design guidelines approach would maintain the same lot size and building footprint and floor plans, for option one, however it will have a custom lot approach by providing the homeowner with design guidelines consisting of varying architectural styles, colors, and materials for individual diversity. With option two, the units would be attached with a production lot approach since it would not be feasible to do design guidelines for townhomes.

Direction Needed:

- *Are custom lots with design guidelines appropriate for this site, with option one?*
- *Are the architectural styles and materials proposed with the production lot appropriate?*
- *Would it be appropriate for production or custom, which ever is desired, to have differing architectural features and massing?*
- *Would 3-story homes with tuck under garages match the architectural style and massing of the neighborhood; whether attached or detached?*

Parking

If the detached units were supported, whether custom or production, tandem parking would be designed on the site plan as shown. The attached units would provide each unit with a two-car tuck under garage with no tandem parking being provided. For projects in the RM-15 and Core Area Overlay Districts, a total of 12 parking spaces would normally be required per the Pleasanton Municipal Code; however, there are off-street spaces surrounding the property.

Direction Needed:

- *Is the proposed parking appropriate even though guest parking is not provided?*
- *Would it be appropriate to have tuck under garages to allow for more parking?*
- *Should the yard area, in option one, be reduced to provide for more parking stalls?*

PUBLIC NOTICE

Notice of this workshop was sent to all property owners and occupants within 1,000-feet of the subject property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the items identified by staff (Exhibit C) for discussion and provide direction concerning desired changes to the proposal.

Staff Planner: Natalie Amos, Assistant Planner, 925.931.5613, namos@ci.pleasanton.ca.us