

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 # 6

To: Lemoore Planning Commission
From: Gloria A. Hobbs, Assistant Planner, Holly Smyth, Planning Director
Review Date: November 26, 2012
Subject: Planned Unit Development Application #2012-02 for Woodside 05N, LP. to utilize new floor plans and elevations on the remaining 37 vacant lots in Tract 821 Phase II – known as “Davante Liberty” Subdivision

Subdivision/PUD Background:

A planned unit development (PUD) for Tract 821 was conditionally approved by City Council Resolution #2005-08 on February 15, 2005 to subdivide and develop 68.16 acres into 238 single family lots and a pocket park in two (2) phases through Subdivision Map #2004-05/PUD #2004-03/Conditional Use Permit #2004-08 for the Tract 821. Phase II was approved with 96 lots. This resolution approved an overall plot plan, floor plans, and elevations of the subdivision in conformity with the PUD Design Guidelines and set the impact fees to City Council Resolution #2000-21 (which were the most current at that time).

In January 2006, Davante Villas for Nova Development submitted floor plans, elevations and overall plot plans for Phase II of Tract 821 located north of Cinnamon Drive, south of Fallenleaf Drive, east of 19th Avenue and west of Liberty Drive. Planning Commission and City Council approved the revised plans based on some modifications to the overall plot plan. Fifty nine (59) of these originally approved plans were built by Nova Development.

In June 27, 2011, Planning Commission reviewed submitted floor plans, elevations and overall plot plans for Phase II of Tract 821 submitted by Lennar Fresno, Inc. who was interested in purchasing the remaining 37 lots in Phase II at that time. After holding a public hearing on the application, the Planning Commission denied the revised plans based on public comments and found the proposed revisions did not meet Items #6 and #28 of the PUD Guidelines and blend in with the existing neighborhood. The City Council affirmed the Planning Commission's decision to deny the revised plot plans, floor plans and elevations. On November 28, 2011, Planning Commission held a new public hearing for Lennar Homes, Inc., on their modified plans based on the City's requested to have the architectural character more suited to the existing neighborhood. Planning Commission denied this submittal and thereafter, it was appealed to the City Council who overturned the denial and approved the modified submitted plans for the 37 lots in Phase II of Tract 821. Lennar homes ultimately did not purchase the remaining lots.

“In God We Trust”

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS
Chairperson – Ronald E. Meade, *Vice-Chair* Jeffrey Garcia
Bob Clement, Dave Brown, Jim Marvin, Calvin Monreal, Bill Wynne

New Development Submittal by Woodside Homes:

On October 19, 2012, Woodside 05N, LP (who purchased the 37 single family lots in Tract 821 Phase II) submitted a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application with their floor plans and elevations for the 37 lots which includes lots 168 through 174, Lots 177 through 180, lots 184 through 186, lots 188, 189, 192, 193, 194 and 242, and lots 195 through 210 and lot 221 of Phase II of the Subdivision (as shown on the attached drawing). The applicant has different floor plans and elevations that they want to use that are more similar to the existing development than the last approval made on house plans. The applicant has not submitted a pre-plotted plan layout for the entire subdivision as they would prefer to submit individual plot plans as the buyers make their selections, which will require an additional fee for each submittal.

Procedurally, Section 9-9B-2-C of the Zoning Code states that if a project proponent is requesting a significant change in the project design to a previously approved PUD, 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 of Section 9-9B-2-B 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).

According to Table 9-2A-6-1 of the Zoning Code, all PUD's are procedurally required to go through two public hearings, one at the Planning Commission and one at the City Council. A public hearing notice was published in the newspaper and letters were sent to property owners within 300' from the exterior perimeter of the project area regarding the public hearing.

The Zoning Code Table 9-9B-4-1, identifies setbacks that were originally approved with the initial PUD approval and will be required to be continued. The PUD overlay setbacks include an 18-25' front yard (with at least 2' staggered between adjacent lots), 10' minimum garage side sideyard and a 5' minimum setback on the remaining sideyard for a single-story home (or 10' and 10' sideyard setbacks for 2-story homes), and a 10' rear yard. Additionally, Table 9-5B-2 shows that the underlying zone district of Residential Low Density (RLD) requires a 15' street side setback for corner lots and all air conditioning units must be at least 3' away from fencing for adequate fire access. Applicable fencing height and setback 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 and need to be followed.

The new developer has shown an interest in wanting to use the standard RLD setback to porch standard of 12' which is not currently included in the above discussion and should be allowed to encourage the incorporation of front porches.

RLD (Residential Low Density) zone district requires a 40% floor area ratio and a 75% overall lot coverage requirement, of which 60% maximum lot coverage allowed 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. These lot coverage items/issues will need to be met for the subdivision either by plotting the worse case scenario (ie. the largest foot print plan on the smallest lot), or individual lots if the worse case does not meet the standards.

The developer has submitted a typical plot plan of three lots to generally show how typical plans may sit on the lots and the reflected setbacks which will be applied to the individual plot plans when they are submitted. Because the plans/elevations are not being 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 below and meet all setback and coverage requirements.

Revised floor plans and elevations have been submitted for the 37 lots in this 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 37 single family lots of Tract 821 Phase II subdivision.

The initial Phase II with DaVante included six floor plans with three elevations each (for a total of 18 different elevations) with an earth tone color palette and Mediterranean in design. The four single story plans contain 1,684, 1,875, 2,030, and 2,416-2,655 square feet of house area. The 2-story plans contain 2,049–2,872 and 3,084-3,324 square feet of house area. Plans ranged from 3-6 bedrooms with 2-3 bathrooms.

The currently approved floor plans for the 37 remaining lots for Lennar Fresno (that were approved by City Council December 20, 2011) includes five (5) floor plans with a total of two (2) different looking elevations each ranging from 1,694, 1,905, 2,000, 2,223, and 2,257 square foot single story homes with 3-4 bedrooms, 2-3 bathrooms with distinct architecture styles and would utilize a color palette to be compatible with the existing homes.

The proposed new plans submitted by Woodside Homes include five (5) floor plans (2 one story and 3 two story plans) with a total of three (3) different looking elevations for each plan (for a total of 15 different elevations) ranging from 1,916, 2,127, 2,451, 2,714 and 3,147 square feet with 3-7 bedrooms and, 2-3 bathrooms with distinct architecture styles and would utilize a color palette to be compatible with the existing homes. They also include optional wainscoting stone veneers, 3rd car garage and courtyards, as shown on the attached Exhibits. 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 37 lots in this subdivision are proposed to be individually plotted as permits are pulled using the individual plot plan process which will insure that the PUD six-pack rule, setbacks, FAR, coverage and any applicable conditions are being met rather than pre-plotting the 37 single family lots of Tract 821 Phase II subdivision. The following four pages of tables summarize past approvals compared to the proposal as well as how the proposed plans can meet City standards.

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.

Staff believes that the proposed plans are generally of the same quality and architecture style as the developed portion of the subdivision and will blend well with the neighborhood so long as the below noted adjustments discussed below, that are also reflected in the resolution, are made.

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

Design Characteristic	Originally Approved PUD Plans from Davante Villas (6 plans with 3 elevations each)	Last Approved PUD Plans by Lennar Fresno (5 plans with 2 elevations each)	Proposed PUD Plans by Woodside 05N, LP (5 plans with 3 elevations each)
General Floor Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Plan 1 – 1,674 sq. ft. 1-story, 3 bedroom/2 bath with 2-car garage -Plan 2 – 1,875 sq. ft. 1-story, 3-4 bedroom/2 bath with 2-car garage -Plan 3 – 2,030 sq. ft. 1-story, 4 bedroom/ 2 bath with 2-car garage -Plan 4 –2,049-2,872 sq. ft. 2-story, 4-5 bedroom/ 3 bath with 2-3-car garage -Plan 4xl –3,084-3,324 sq. ft. 2-story, 5-6 bedroom/ 3 bath with 3-car garage -Plan 6 – 2,415-2,655 sq. ft. 1-story, 3-6 bedroom/ 2-3 bath with 2-3 car garage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Plan 129 – 1,694 sq. ft, 1 story, 3 bedroom/ 2 bath with 2 car garage - Plan 130 – 1,905 sq. ft., 1 story, 4 bedroom/ 3 bath with 2 car garage - Plan 155 - 2,223 sq. ft., 1 story, 4 bedroom/ 3bath with 2 car garage - Plan 206 – 2,000 sq. ft., 1 story, 4 bedroom/ 2 bath with 2 car garage - Plan 204M-2,257 sq. ft. 1 story, 4 bedroom/ 3 bath with 2 car garage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Plan 1- 1,916 sq. ft. 1-story, 3 bedroom/2½ bath/ 2 car garage, and opt. courtyard - Plan 2- 2,127 sq. ft. 1-story, 4 bedroom/ 2 bath/ 3 car garage, and optional courtyard - Plan 3 - 2,451 sq. ft. 2-story, 4 bedroom / 2 ½ baths / 3 car garage/part tandem parking space and porch - Plan 4- 2,714 sq. ft.,2 story, 4 bedroom/ 3 baths/3 car garage. - Plan 4 Bonus - 3,147 sq. ft., 2 story, optional 4-7 bedroom or bunk room/ 3 baths/3 car garage
Roof	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Tile roofs throughout in various colors on a steeper 5/12 and 6/12 pitch roof which makes house height taller with storage space -Only two of the six plans have predominate ridge line parallel with street, most roofs incorporate hips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will vary between flat tiles and barrel tiles similar to the existing neighborhood. - All plans have predominate ridge line parallel with street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will vary between low profile S tile or flat tile -None of the five plans have predominate ridge line parallel with street, most roofs incorporate hips
Porches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Large front porches/courtyards on three of the six plans (2 are on single-story plans and 1 is on a two-story plan) ranging in size from 140 square feet to about 300 square feet in size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Only Plan 129 proposes a useable porch. -Condition added so that at least one additional floor plan would incorporate ½ wall porch feature to mimic large outdoor space as many plans have in the Devante Villas Tract 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -One plan contain a useable/optional courtyard and one plan has a useable porch incorporated and one plan has an optional front porch shown on elevation. -Section 9-5C-3-B-1-c-iv requires at least 25% of the homes to include front courtyards/patios. Given the size and % incorporated into the existing homes, courtyards/patios should be enlarged as greenlined and incorporated into 50% of the lots.
Elevations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Used 6 plans with 18 elevations which substantially varied 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 on 96 single family lots (of which 59 are constructed). -Garage doors have a different design feature and color -Four of the six plans incorporate pronounced architectural detailing at the entry areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed 5 plans with 2 elevations that vary slightly from one another. All plans show the same front doors and window shutters. The applicant proposes front doors and window shutter accents to be Mediterranean style, and decorative transom windows with iron bar accents have been added to some models. -Letter dated 9/21/2011states that garage doors will be “carriage house” style and will have windows in the top of the panels to match existing subdivision. -Carriage lights will be installed on each side of the garage opening. -None of the plans incorporate separate architectural styling at door entry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Propose 5 plans with 3 elevations which vary from one another and all have stone veneer options. -Front entry and side entry garage types with complimentary color incorporated. Front entries on Plans 1 and 2 are deeply recessed while Plans 3, 4, and 4bonus are pulled forward. Plans 2-4bonus have architectural detailing at front entry door. -All Garage door openings have different design features, but window in the top portion is optional -Plans 2 and 4 have a 3rd car garage. -Carriage lights are not shown on plans and should be incorporated on both sides of the garage to blend with the existing.

Design Characteristic	Originally Approved PUD Plans from Davante Villas (6 plans with 3 elevations each)	Last Approved PUD Plans by Lennar Fresno (5 plans with 2 elevations each)	Proposed PUD Plans by Woodside 05N, LP (5 plans with 3 elevations each)
Stories	<p>-20 homes of the 59 existing built homes in this phase are two story and 39 are single story. An additional eleven (11) 2-story homes would have been built within remaining 37 lots.</p> <p>-Single-story and two-story homes have a mixture to form an interesting skyline and architectural interest.</p>	<p>All plans are single story. Plan 206 is a single story with a two story look because of the two dormer windows on top of the main roof. Eight of these plans are shown in the overall pre-plot plan.</p>	<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, but does require that at least one home plan be a single-story, which is being met.</p> <p>-If wanting to stay with the full intent of the original PUD approximately 8-15 of the 37 lots should be 2-story homes</p>
Wrap architecture	<p>Front façade wraps minimum 3' to the fence line down corner lots.</p>	<p>- Letter dated 9/21/2011 proposes wrap features only on corner lots for a distance of 3'.</p>	<p>-Plans 1 and 2 have long blank walls along the non-garage side of the house which would usually face the street side of a corner lot. It appears that optional wrapping architectural detailing can continue to the fence line, and will need to be incorporated on the corner lots and not be optional. For plans that don't have the stone option, shrubbery should be installed to reduce the blank wall which articulates house features to avoid blank house plane. Plans 3, 4, and 4 bonus have enough articulation that wrapping stone work back to the fence is not needed.</p>
Façade material	<p>Stucco, stucco with brick, or stucco with stone</p>	<p>- Homes will be stucco with stone veneer accents</p>	<p>-Stucco and optional stone/brick veneers</p>

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.

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	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, however details like carriage lights need to be added flanking the garages to help avoid monotony. Optional window elements in the garages of Plans 1 and 2 would further help avoid monotonous appearance.
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 do not extend more than five (5) feet beyond the front of the home or are setback behind house frontage. No entry/swing garage doors are proposed.
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 behind the living area or do not extend more than five feet beyond the front of the home. -Incorporating different garage paneling options, with optional windows painted in complimentary colors. -One house plan does incorporate a tandem 3-car garage. -Plan 4 bonus room does incorporate cantilevered second story over the garage.
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, meet this requirement based on garage door width as shown on the site plan.
A4d	No more than 1 in 7 master home plans may utilize a swing garage design.	Not applicable, as no swing garages are proposed in submitted plans
B1a	The structural mass of larger residential buildings shall be broken down into smaller component parts representative of individual dwelling units .	-Two-story plans have lots of roof line articulations and changes in plane to break down the mass of the buildings.
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) All rooflines have changes in ridgeline direction and do not follow single ranch style ridgeline which is more in line with the portion of the subdivision already constructed. (ii) Two 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) Two 1-story plans have optional courtyard, and one two story plan has a front porch that are "useable". Given the constructed portion of the subdivision incorporates front courtyards in approximately 50% of the plans with sizes ranging from 140-300 square feet in sizes, half of the proposed plans should incorporate similarly sized courtyards/patios on 19 front lots.

Applicable Design Standards for Residential Projects under Section 9-5C-3, with subsections as listed	How Proposed Plans Meet Code
<p>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”)</p> <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>-To avoid having identical looking floor plans within a six-pack, plans 1 and 2 elevation/style combinations look very similar to one another with the exception of a 3-car garage and entry tower feature and shall avoid placing the same elevation number within the six-pack from each other, unless three additional “substantially varying features” are added. As an example, if Plan 1a were to be located in a six-pack with Plan 2a, three additional features (such as garage door windows, front courtyard, and different color palette.) would need to be different so that that are substantially different from one another.</p>
<p>B2c 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>-Plans 1 and 2 have long blank walls along the non-garage side of the house which would usually face the street side of a corner lot. It appears that optional wrapping architectural detailing can continue to the fence line, and will need to be incorporated on the corner lots and not be optional. For plans 1 and 2 that don’t have the stone option, shrubbery should be installed to reduce the blank wall which articulates house features to avoid blank house plane. Plans 3, 4, and 4 bonus have enough articulation that wrapping stone work back to the fence is not needed.</p>
<p>B2d 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) Plans 1 and 2 incorporate optional courtyards. Not all plans have at least 5’ depth of useable area (meaning they are not part of required path of travel). See above discussion on patios for modifications that should be incorporated.</p> <p>-(ii) Most front doors set back approximately 8’-18’ behind the forward most portion of the house. This allows visibility from the street.</p> <p>-(iii) Unsure if higher quality doors and hardware being used.</p>
<p>B2e 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>
<p>B2f Upper-story balconies shall have a minimum depth of 6’</p>	<p>None of the 2-story plans incorporate balconies.</p>
<p>B2g 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>
<p>B3 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’..</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. Not all entries have at least 4’ covered area directly in front of the doors and need to be modified</p> <p>-c. All entries have multi-panel doors. 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>

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 did some outreach to the surrounding neighborhood/occupants by mailing letters to the current occupants of the entire surrounding subdivision inviting them to a neighborhood meeting/ open house on October 30, 2012, to get input on the new revised plans. At the meeting they made available full packets of the color drawings, elevations, and floor plans for neighbors to take with them. City staff attended the meeting and saw that a number of the residents attending the neighborhood meeting. Some of those present were vocally opposed to the prior development proposal but were very happy with the options proposed by Woodside Homes. It is anticipated that the developer will provide a further 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 street elevations of the 5 home types and reference was made to go on the City’s website for further drawings. A public hearing notice was also published in the Hanford Sentinel on December 1, 2012 regarding the project.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review staff information, listen to staff report, conduct the noticed public hearing to take any public testimony, and incorporate any needed modifications and adopt Draft Resolution #2012-17 approving the above discussed house plans with conditions discussed above. Because of the PUD involved, the Planning Commission’s resolution will be forwarded to City Council and another public hearing will be held to ratify, modify, or reverse Planning Commission’s recommended decision.