

Mayor
Willard Rodarmel
Mayor Pro Tem
John Plourde
Council Members
John Gordon
John Murray
William Siegel



**Planning
Department**

711 Cinnamon Drive
Lemoore CA 93245 Phone
(559) 924-6740
FAX (559) 924-6708

STAFF REPORT

Item # 5

To: Lemoore Planning Commission
From: Holly Smyth, Planning Director, Gloria A. Hobbs, Assistant Planner
Review Date: August 27, 2012
Subject: Planned Unit Development Application #2012-01 from Wathen-Castanos Hybrid Homes, Inc., to utilize new floor plans and elevations in Tract 872 – known as Heritage Park (or previously known as Sugar Plum Village Subdivision)

Background:

A planned unit development (PUD) for Tract 872 was originally approved by City Council Resolution #2006-15 with conditions on May 2, 2006 to Robert Badasci to subdivide and develop 30.51 acres into 97 single family lots (up from the originally proposed 89 lots) through Subdivision Map #2006-20/Planned Unit Development #2006-02/Conditional Use Permit #2006-02 so long as the average lot size is not less than 10,300 square feet. This original resolution mostly pertained to Subdivision Map items but did state in condition #11 that "The PUD overall footprint plan, elevations, and floor plans shall be submitted for separate review and approved by the Planning Commission and City Council prior to the Final Map being recorded. Review and approval process will be held through a public hearing before the Planning Commission and a City Council meeting and appropriate processing fees paid....and floorplans will not exceed a 35% floor area ratio". According to the staff report, the FAR limit was put in place because half of the subdivision was zoned RA-20 which only allowed a 25% FAR, and the other half was zoned R-1-7 which could not exceed 40% FAR.

On May 14, 2007, City Council approved the overall plot plan, floor plans and elevations through Resolution #2007-10 for the subdivision in conformity with the PUD Design Guidelines in place at that time and carried over the 35% maximum FAR requirement. On May, 2008, final map for Phase I of Tract 872 consisting of 33 lots was recorded. Phases II and III of the subdivision are still active maps but have not yet been recorded. No building permits have been pulled for any phase at this time (however civil/infrastructure work has begun) and no other phases have yet been recorded but are in process.

With the adoption of the new 2012 Zoning Code Table 9-9B-4-1, some of the previously approved setbacks tied to the original approval of the subdivision were codified. The PUD overlay setbacks include an 18-25' front yard, 5' and 5' single-story side yard, and a 10' rear yard for single stories. This codified table did not specify a height for two-story buildings as part of the PUD overlay zone. However, Table 9-5B-2 shows that the underlying zone district of Residential Low Density (RLD) requires 5' additional side yard and back yard setbacks for two-story buildings and a 15' street side setback for corner lots. These are the setbacks that apply to the subdivision. Additionally, the 2012 Zoning Code changed the underlying zone district of the property from R-1-7 and RA-20 to Residential Low Density (RLN) which has a 40% FAR and a 75% lot coverage requirement, of which 60% maximum lot coverage in the front yard. Lot coverage includes all covered surfaces (house and garage 1st floor footprint, driveway, walkway, patio, stoops, etc.) divided by land area. So the 75% overall coverage would take all covered surface areas and divided by the size of the lot (excluded the restricted access area). The 60% front yard coverage would typically add the driveway and walkway surfaces forward of the house and divide by the lot area in front of the house and front fence lines. See Figure 9-5D1-2-E2 in the Zoning Code for visual explanation of lot coverage.

In 2012, Shepard Lane, LP, purchased the entire Tract 872 from FB Holdings LLC, for Wathen Castanos, which removed the subdivision from foreclosure. Wathen-Castanos submitted an application to 1) revise the floor plans, elevations and overall plot plan for the entire subdivision and 2) allow a variance on floor area ratio (FAR) from 35% to 40% in Tract 872, Heritage Acres (also known as Sugarplum Village). The subdivision is located north of Daphne Lane, south of Boxwood Drive, east of Cinnamon Drive, and west of the Lemoore Canal.

Floor Area Ratio variance: The floor area ratio (FAR) is defined by Lemoore's Code to be "the ratio between gross floor area of the primary structure(s) on a site and gross site area. It includes all occupy-able floors of a building, making it a three-dimensional unit of measure. For example, a multi-story building with a total floor area of one hundred thousand (100,000) square feet on a fifty thousand (50,000) square foot lot will have a FAR of 2.0." The applicant is asking that the FAR be increased from the originally approved 35% up to 40%. The original intent of the 35% lot coverage ratio requirement was to account for the two different zoning types that were originally on the project site. The westerly half of the subdivision was R-1-7, which would normally allow for 7,000 square foot lots and a FAR of 40% while the easterly half was RA-20, which would normally allow lots with a minimum 20,000 square foot lot sizes and a FAR of 25%. Part of the reasoning for keeping the low FAR was to average the two zone together and was therefore contained as part of the conditions of approval. The secondary intent was to help address the lots that back onto the Lemoore Canal, as these lots will be extra large but have restricted access to the back 47-67' of each newly created parcel. This is because the way the canal functions is that they do not own the land where the canal is located but have easement rights that go from roughly the centerline of the canal up the embankments, across a compacted gravel surface vehicular access area and back down the toe of the slope that the owner of the property is restricted from using.

The 2012 Zoning Code changed the entire underlying zoning of the entire area to Low Density Residential (RLD). This district allows for a maximum FAR of 40% and then separately identifies that lot coverage shall not generally exceed 75%, and that the front yard coverage not exceed 60% of the front yard. Staff believes that these coverage ratios should apply as well as the 40% FAR being sought so long as these ratios for lots that back onto the canal with restricted access easements are based on "useable land" property and does not include the restricted access area in the calculation. This would maintain one of the main purposes of the lower FAR and would meet some of the original intent of the PUD approval. No action is needed on the variance as the new 2010 Zoning Code accommodates and will be applied as discussed above.

Revised floor plans and elevations have been submitted for the subdivision to be individually plotted as permits are pulled using the individual plot plan process to insure that the PUD six-pack rule, setbacks, FAR, coverage and any applicable conditions are being met rather than pre-plotting the entire subdivision. The developer believes this will allow greater flexibility in the sales of the homes. According to Section 9-9B-2-C of the Zoning Code, if a project proponent is requesting a significant change in the project design to a previously approved PUD (see attached Exhibit A), then they would need to conform to the required PUD component outlined in Section 9-9B-2-B. Because the Subdivision map had separate conditions from the design component, only the design components should apply which involve the following:

- 1) Performance and development requirements related to yards, lot area, intensity of development on each lot, parking, landscaping, and signs (which relates to the FAR, percentage coverage, setbacks, and the like) ; and
- 2) Master home plan design and pre-plot (which Section 9-5C-3-B goes into specific design details, which incorporates the old PUD Design Guidelines and supersedes them as they are now codified).

The currently approved floor plans include 3 one-story and 3 two-story models with three very distinctive elevations each (as shown in Exhibit A). The proposed new plans include 6 one-story and 2 two-story floor plans, with 3 elevations each with optional wainscoting stone veneers, optional 3rd car garage and optional courtyards (see attached Exhibits B and C). Staff worked with the developer to try to incorporate more varying features so that the elevations did not look identical in the same two-dimensional elevation styles (i.e. French Cottage, versus English Cottage, versus American Cottage), as the Zoning Code Section 9-5C-3-2B requires that "no two (2) identical looking floor plans and elevations shall be placed on lots within a group of five (5) adjacent lots. For purposes of this section, adjacent lots shall mean those lots on either side of the subject lot and those three (3) lots directly across the street from the subject lot (referred to as a "six pack")".

The general differences between the currently approved plans and the proposed plans are as follows:

Design Characteristic	Last Approved Subdivision by Sugarplum	Proposed by Wathen Castanos
General Floor Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,197 sq. ft. 1-story, 3 bedroom/2 bath with detached 2-3 car garage, front porch • 1,519 sq. ft. 1-story, 3 bedroom /2 bath with side entry 2 car garage and front porch • 1,844 sq. ft. 1-story, 2-4 bedroom/2 bath with 2 car garage • 2,035 sq. ft. 2-story, 4 bedroom/3 bath with detached 2-3 car garage, and front porch • 2,335 sq. ft. 2-story, 4 bedroom/ 2 1/2 bath with 2 car garage and front porch • 2,876 sq. ft. 2-story, 4 bedroom/3-3½ bath with side entry 2 car garage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,470 sq. ft. 1-story, 3 bedroom/2 bath/2-3 car garage, and optional courtyard. • 1,695 sq. ft., 1-story, 4 bedroom/2 bath/2-3 car garage, and front courtyard. • 1,848 sq. ft. 2-story, 4 bedroom/3 bath/2 car garage, and front courtyard. • 1,918 sq. ft., 1-story, 5 bedroom/2 bath/2-3 car garage. • 2,160 sq. ft., 1-story, 5 bedroom/2 ½ bath/3 car garage. • 2,202 sq. ft. 2-story, 4-5 bedroom/3 bath / 3 car split side-entry garage. • 2,360 sq. ft. 1-story, 3 bedroom/2½ bath/ 3 car garage, and optional courtyard. • 2,560 sq. ft. 1-story, 4-5 bedroom/2 ½ baths/3 car garage and tucked courtyard.
Roof material	-30 year composition roofs	-30 year composition roofs
Porches	-Four of the plans incorporated useable front porches on the forward most wall	-Three plans contain useable porches while two other plans have optional useable porches.
Elevations	<p>-Used 6 plans with 3 elevations for each plan which substantially vary from one another (i.e. all elevations have different roof structures, garage door features, window types, column types, vertical roof vent details, porch enclosure materials, and other small details) providing 18 totally different looks.</p> <p>-Garage type include, front entry, side entry, and detached styles with different window design features and colors incorporated</p> <p>-Solar panel advertising was to be in model homes with an option to purchase such available.</p>	<p>-Propose 8 plans with 3 elevations which have more minor differences between the same type elevations and all have stone veneer options.</p> <p>-Front entry and side entry garage types with complimentary color incorporated and all have 3rd car option if not standard in the plan.</p>
Stories	- Up to 55% of the subdivision can have 2-story house plans, this excluded possible 2-story detached setback garages.	<p>-Unsure of the mix of how many one-story and two-story home will be incorporated as these are not pre-plotted.</p> <p>-New Zoning Code policy does not limit the percentage of 2-story homes, and therefore should not be applied any longer.</p>
Wrap architecture	-All dwellings have a wrap around architecture down a portion of the building sides.	-Side elevations show optional stone wainscoting wrap onto the side by 1' and need to wrap within 6" of the fence line on corner lots. For plans that don't have the stone option, shrubbery should be installed to reduce the blank wall with the exception of plans 185L, 1918, 220L which have articulated house features to avoid blank house plane.
Façade material	Stucco and wood siding	-Stucco and optional stone/brick veneers

The below chart summarizes the residential design standards in the 2012 Zoning Code that are applicable to the proposed drawings and how they can meet the standards. The attached Exhibit D shows some typical plot plan layouts with typical setbacks and various plans. Staff added the color elevations below the applicant's plot plan to get a visual idea of how the elevations might look along a street.

Applicable Design Standards for Residential Projects under Section 9-5C-3, with subsections as listed		How Proposed Plans Meet Code
A2a	The front yard setback of adjacent homes shall have a minimum two foot (2') stagger between adjacent lots	Draft Street Scenes only show 1' stagger between most front home fronts. When submitting plot plans, adjacent homes will need to have minimum of 2' stagger and should fully utilize the 18-25' front yard setback range originally approved for the PUD.
A2e	Buildings shall be designed with structural and spatial variety along the front facades to avoid monotonous appearance	Most plans do include change top roof lines but have varied wall elements and details like carriage lights to help avoid monotony.
A4a	Garage shall not extend more than five feet (5') beyond the front of the home. The only exception to this standard permitted shall be swing garages.	All front load garages are either flush with house or setback behind house frontage with the exception of one plan that has a side entry/swing garage.
A4b	All garages are required to minimize the negative visual impact of the garage door. Options to achieving this requirement include, but are not limited to, the following: -place at the rear of lot such as alley load -recess behind the living area -utilize side-on garages (i.e. swing garage) -cantilever the second story over garage -utilize a tandem garage -articulate garage doors with windows, paneling, recesses, and other details	Proposed garages are visually minimized by: -recessing most behind the living area -utilizing a side-on garage (i.e. swing garage) plan -cantilever the second story over garage in one plan -Incorporating three different types of paneling and painted in complimentary colors
A4c	Garage doors facing the street shall not exceed 50% of the width of the home.	All plans, including those with a 3 rd car garage option, meet this requirement based on garage door width.
A4d	No more than 1 in 7 master home plans may utilize a swing garage design.	Project is not pre-plotted, therefore there should be a condition that no more than 14 homes of the 97 shall be swing garage plan 2202 (aka 220L)
B1c	Master home plans shall include "anti-monotony" provisions, including -(i) design rooflines with changes in ridgeline direction and configuration; -(ii) a minimum of one home plan within each master plan series shall be one story (this only applies to single family developments); -(iii) All homes shall be oriented to the street with garages de-emphasized and living areas placed toward the front of homes; -(iv) a minimum of 25% of all homes designs shall include an outdoor living area such as a porch or courtyard that is at least 5'0 in depth to allow for seating.	(i) Incorporating the 2-story plans helps to give an appearance of a change in ridgeline, even though the 1-story plans all have a continuous ridgeline across the top of the homes. (ii) one story plans are included. (iii) All plans orient towards the street and de-emphasize garages with living areas placed toward the front of homes as discussed in A4b. (iv) Three of the eight plans have standard courtyards, while two plans have optional courtyards, and the remaining three plans have no courtyards. Therefore, 38% of the home designs include a standard courtyard and meet this requirement.
B2a	No two (2) identical looking floor plans and elevations shall be placed on lots within a group of <u>five (5) adjacent lots</u> . For purposes of this section, "adjacent lots" shall mean those lots on either side of a <u>subject lot</u> and those three (3) lots directly across the street from the subject lot (referred to as a "six pack")	-1470 & 1695 elevation/style combinations are almost identical with the exception of a courtyard and need to avoid same looking style/elevation being placed within the six-pack from each other when plotted on lots unless four additional "substantially varying features" (as defined below) are included. -2160 & 2560 elevation/style combinations are almost identical with the exception of a window next to the door and need to avoid same looking style/elevation being placed within the six pack from each other unless four additional "substantially varying features" (as defined below) are included.
Applicable Design Standards for Residential Projects		How Proposed Plans Meet Code

under Section 9-5C-3, with subsections as listed		
B2a cont.	<p>-(i) Building facades shall include distinctive architectural features like windows, chimneys, and other such elements. Use articulation of building massing to reveal internal organization of building elements such as stairs, atriums, internal gathering spaces, and major interior spaces.</p> <p>-(ii) Designs of homes in residential subdivisions should be substantially different from one another so that no plan/elevation should look similar to another.</p>	<p>-(i)The three elevation styles each incorporate a different front window grid pattern.</p> <p>-(ii) See above comment under B2a on Plans 1470 & 1695 and Plans 2160 & 2560.</p> <p>As an example, if Plan 1695 French Cottage were to be located in a six-pack with Plan 1470 French Cottage, four additional features (such as house color, roof color, contrasting garage door color, change in window grid patterns, addition of a third car garage, etc.) would need to be different.</p>
B2c	<p>Elevations facing public streets or public open spaces areas, shall (i) wrap façade materials along the side yard elevations to the fence line; (ii) provide architectural features to articulate facades such as trim around doors and window with substantial depth and detail, window boxes, brackets, overhangs, trellises, and/or lattice.</p>	<p>-On corner lots facing the street, side elevations need to either wrap the optional stone wainscoting within 6” of the fence line or incorporate softscape shrubbery to help breakdown the visible blank wall (excluding plans 185L, 1918, 220L which have articulated house features to avoid blank house plane).</p>
B2d	<p>Entry features from a public or common sidewalk shall be provided. (i) when provided, porches shall provide functional seating areas with a minimum depth of five feet 5’; (ii) front doors shall be clearly visible from the street; (iii) Architectural elements and material shall be used to denote a primary entrance, including use of a higher-quality door and hardware.</p>	<p>-(i) All plans that incorporate courtyards have at least 5’ depth of useable area (meaning they are not part of required path of travel)</p> <p>-(ii) Most front doors set back approximately 15-26’ behind the forward most portion of the house, with one plan setting the door only 8’ front the front building façade. The deep entry insets beyond 20’ may be difficult to be clearly visible from the street.</p> <p>-(iii) All plans use higher quality doors, uncertain of the hardware, while only plan 1918 incorporates a raise architectural element to denote the entry area.</p>
B2e	<p>Windows and doors shall:</p> <p>-i. Use window molding, shaped frames, and sills to provide architectural relief</p> <p>-ii. Frame all windows with a minimum of 4” trim and/or inset into façade to provide depth and shadow lines.</p>	<p>-All front window designs incorporate trim work and/or insets and incorporate differing grid designs to provide architectural relief.</p>
B2f	<p>Upper-story balconies shall have a minimum depth of 6’</p>	<p>None of the 2-story plans incorporate balconies.</p>
B2g	<p>Side facades facing public areas (public or internal streets and sidewalks, open space areas, etc.) shall match the level of design detail on front facades when visible.</p>	<p>See comments above under B2c.</p>
B3	<p>Entries. Primary residential entries shall create an inviting transition between the public and private realm, as follows:</p> <p>-a. Separate private entries from the public sidewalk with a semi-private transition area, such as a porch, terrace, stoop, or similar element</p> <p>-b. Provide weather protection over each primary entry extending a minimum of 4’ from the building façade.</p> <p>-c. Primary residential entries shall have at least two of the following characteristics: i. Awning or portico, ii. Multi-panel door, iii. Transom windows and/or sidelights, iv. Durable, high-quality door hardware, v. Solid core door with wood or wood-like finish.</p>	<p>-a. All plans incorporate a transition area</p> <p>-b. All entries have at least 4’ covered area directly in front of the doors.</p> <p>-c. All entries have multi-panel doors. Plan 1918 incorporates a portico while Plan 2160 incorporates a side-light type feature. With the information provided, it is difficult to determine if the remaining plans incorporate at least 2 of these residential entry elements, and therefore a condition should be added to include at least 2 of these elements in every plan.</p>

Over the last eight years of Planning Commission and City Council design review, “sufficiently vary” has meant that the elevations have at least 5 substantial features varying on the plans which can include:

- Front door entry details vary substantially
- Main roof spans are totally different from one another

- Minor roof spans types differ
- Garage details vary (add windows or change framing type that surround opening)
- Architecture types/features vary
- Window types varying in grid design and/or framing details around window
- Courtyards are added instead of options
- Roof material varies
- Veneer of façade face varies

In the last two Planned Unit Development (PUD) approvals, Planning Commission has also allowed roof color and house color to be considered a varying feature.

As discussed above, most of the house plans look substantially different from one another except Plan 1470 is almost identical to Plan 1695 and Plan 2160 is almost identical to Plan 2560 when the same elevation style is used. If 1470 and 1695 are to be located within the six-pack with the same elevation type or if 1695 and 2160 are to be located within the six-pack with the same elevation type, there should be at least four substantially varying features to meet the “substantially varying” requirement of the PUD as a condition of approval. Staff has cut and pasted a street scenario, shown as Exhibit E, if these same elevation types were to be located adjacent from one another to give the Commission an idea of what they might look like if other features were not modified to create more variation.

Staff believes that the proposed plans are not of the same variety of the previous approval, however with the above listed modification/conditions, they will meet the minimum design requirements of the City.

The developer has submitted an overall subdivision map with setback lines shown on each property showing 5' and 10' interior side yards (depending on # of stories), 15' side yard setback on street side of corner lots, 18' front yard, and 10 & 15' rear yards (depending on # of stories). Only the front yard setback should be modified to evenly distribute the varying setbacks of 18-25' as originally approved for the PUD. Because the plans/elevations are not pre-plotted and the developer wants to assign as they go, the developer will need to file an individual plot plan submittal with appropriate fee for each lot and staff will have to make sure the plans/elevation within a 6-pack are substantially different from one another as discussed above. All air conditioning units must be at least 3' away from fencing for adequate fire access. Applicable fencing standards are located in Table 9-5A-7-E1 of the 2012 Zoning Code and do require fencing over 42" in height on corner lots to be setback even or behind the building structure and setback at least 3' behind the sidewalk with landscape planted on the street side of the fence.

Environmental Impact:

The proposed application does not trigger the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as the subdivision was approved separately from the house designs and therefore modifying the house designs does not meet the definition of a “project” under CEQA.

Public Outreach:

The developer has invited neighbors/occupants within 300' of the subdivision inviting them to a community meeting at the Lemoore Chamber on Thursday, August 23rd from 4-7 pm. It is anticipated that the developer will report on the meeting input at the Planning Commission’s public hearing.

The City staff sent public hearing notices to property owners within 300' of the subdivision with copies of the black and white elevations and reference to other color drawings and floor plans on the City’s website and published a public hearing notice in the Hanford Sentinel on August 8th regarding the project.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review staff information, listen to staff report, conduct the noticed public hearing, and incorporate any needed modifications to the draft resolution if needed and adopt Resolution #2012-12 approving the above discussed house plans with conditions discussed above.