

1 meet the guidelines in place. Commission Chair Lee did not want to create a situation where the
2 development violates the guidelines because there is no other choice.

3
4 Planning Commission liaison Chastain suggested that, without looking at specific plans for each lot that
5 the site strategy and organization needed to be examined by the EIR.

6
7 Commission Chair Lee questioned the 6,000--sq.ft. house sizes proposed. He noted a rendering showing
8 a gate and fence, and commented that is a direction the Commission has tried to discourage. He
9 questioned the manipulation required between Lots 1 and 2 for the garage. Commission Chair Lee
10 pointed out a lack of turnaround area for fire trucks on Lot 5. Drainage information needs to be provided.
11 He could not endorse the project as shown today and asked that if the Design Review Commission were
12 going to bend the rules to build these six houses, how will future development on these lots be
13 addressed.

14
15 Ms. Sinnette advised that one of the purposes of an environmental review is to analyze the defined
16 project. A secondary purpose of the review is identifying whether there is an environmentally superior
17 project, and whether the project can be modified to make it better. She anticipated that a series of home
18 sites might be identified and then lot lines would be built around them. She stated that the project could
19 be conditioned with design guidelines. Commissioner Blodgett liked the concept of specific design
20 guidelines. Ms. Sinnette suggested that a condition of approval could be recommended that a set of
21 master plan and design guidelines be developed prior to filing of the subdivision map. Commissioner
22 Blodgett suggested a study session format to discuss general design development guidelines with the
23 developer.

24
25 Ms. Sinnette stated that design guidelines are not typically a part of an EIR. However, she suggested
26 that the developer could provide a better prototype so the EIR could provide a better analysis.
27 Planning Commission liaison Chastain commented that the developer could provide an organizational
28 strategy for each lot, from which design guidelines could be developed.

29
30 Commissioner Ward commented that the better subdivisions have set design guidelines that provide rules
31 of the road for future development.

32
33 Commission Chair Lee felt some decisions would need to be made regarding concessions given by the
34 City in terms of the development ordinances in order to produce a project that is acceptable.

35
36 The Commission agreed that:

- 37 ▪ Design guidelines need to be developed.
- 38 ▪ The Commission is comfortable with development where previous development has occurred, but
39 is interested in exploring other potential building sites on the property.
- 40 ▪ The driplines of the trees need to be identified, as well as an evaluation of the health and viability
41 of the oak trees, in determining the building sites.

42
43 The Commission returned to agenda item 7B.

44
45 **B. TR6569 AND HDP86-04 GREG WOEHRLE (APPLICANT), SOLDIER FIELD**
46 **PARTNERS, LLC (OWNER); LR ZONING AND H-O-D:** Request for 1) a subdivision of 87.9 acres into
47 eight residential lots and one remainder open space lot pursuant to Part 6, Lafayette Municipal Code
48 (LMC), 2) a hillside development permit pursuant to Chapter 6-20, LMC, and 3) an exception to
49 development within a class 1 ridgeline pursuant to Section 6-2026, LMC, located at 3148 Lucas Drive,
50 APN 238-080-019.

51 **Recommendation:** Conduct scoping meeting and provide input to staff regarding issues related to
52 aesthetics, site planning, and building design.

53 **Project Planner:** Christine Sinnette. **CONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL**
54 **IMPACT REPORT**

55
56 Commissioner Ward recused himself from this agenda item. Ms. Sinnette advised that the proposed
57 project is the subdivision of an 87.9-acre property into eight residential lots. The project was referred to
58 the Design Review Commission to solicit input on the potential environmental impacts of the proposal as

1 they relate to aesthetics, site planning, and building design. The current LR zoning designation allows a
2 maximum density of eight lots. The lots range in size from 1.5 to 5 acres, with the average lot at 3 acres.
3 The proposed project includes eight residential lots and a remainder parcel (Parcel A). Parcel A consists
4 of 59.62 acres of open space and a .8-acre site containing an existing telecommunications facility. Lots
5 1 through 7 would be located at the southern end of the project site and accessed via Lucas Drive. Lot 8
6 would be accessed from the eastern extension of Lucas Circle. Lucas Drive is currently a stub street
7 that terminates at the property line of the subject parcel, and Lucas Ranch Road, a private road.
8 Transitions between Lucas Drive and Lucas Ranch Road have been planned to provide continuity with
9 the existing neighborhood while maintaining the natural environment of the project site.

10
11 At the February 3, 2005 Planning Commission meeting a public hearing was held and the environmental
12 checklist prepared by Planning staff reviewed. The Planning Commission agreed with the conclusions
13 presented in the environmental checklist and directed staff to move forward with the preparation of the
14 EIR.

15
16 Similar to the previous subdivision project discussed tonight, Ms. Sinnette advised that staff sought input
17 from the Design Review Commission on the project's environmental impacts relating to aesthetics, site
18 planning and building design. In that light, the potential impacts identified are:

19 20 Aesthetics

- 21 ▪ The project site is located on Burton Ridge, a locally designated Class I and Class II ridge; some
22 homesites, particularly those on lots 3, 4 and 5 may be visible from sites listed in the City's
23 Viewing Evaluation Map. The EIR shall contain a detailed visibility analysis of proposed lots and
24 homesites through the use of cross-sections, photomontages, or other equivalent graphic
25 methodology. Project evaluation shall include erection of story poles to identify building height
26 and mass.
- 27 ▪ Development would introduce a new source of light that could adversely affect nighttime views.
- 28 ▪ Visual impacts from grading and landslide repair.

29 30 Land Use

- 31 ▪ Development within the setback of a Class I and Class II ridge.
- 32 ▪ Development of building sites with slopes of 30 percent or greater.

33
34 The applicant has prepared a set of design guidelines intended to reduce the visual impacts of the
35 development by controlling building form and orientation, the location and extent of yard landscaping, the
36 design of retaining walls, and the maintenance of large areas of natural terrain and landscaping. The
37 Master Plan contains proposed building typologies depending on where the lot is located within the
38 subdivision. Lots 1, 2, 3 and 8 are considered to be in the neighborhood transition zone. Traditional
39 residential forms embodied in the Ranch, Bungalow, and Prairie styles would be promoted for this area.
40 Lots 4, 5, 6 and 7 are in more visually sensitive areas and consideration should be given to their
41 development and house design by fitting into the contours of the topography and the natural
42 environment. Hip and gable roof forms would be discouraged in these areas while shed and parapet
43 roof shapes would be encouraged. Earth toned building colors have been proposed, all roofs would be
44 gray in color, and only clear glass would be allowed.

45
46 Ms. Sinnette said that Ward-Young Architects is the new architect hired for this project and has prepared
47 some new exhibits for this meeting.

48
49 Greg Woehrle, applicant, gave an overview of the project's development. A study session was held with
50 the Design Review Commission about 5 years ago. At that time, the project proposed a 28-home
51 subdivision. Since then, the project has been reduced from 28 homes to 25, from 25 to 17, and
52 ultimately with the adoption of current ordinances allowing 1 home per 10 acres, to 8 homes. Mr.
53 Woehrle has worked to transition the project into conformance with the new regulations. He has retained
54 Ward-Young Architects to develop a theme and concept for the whole development. That concept and
55 theme reflects the horse-type properties that surround the project.

56
57 Mr. Woehrle requested the Design Review Commission's comments and input on how to develop that
58 theme. He referred to the tentative map and stated that the development has been clustered in the

1 southern area of the property, with one house out on its own. Primary visibility of the development is
2 from the upper soccer fields at Burton Valley Elementary and, in the winter months, from Sweet Drive. In
3 proposing the home sites, the applicant worked from a previously prepared EIR. The intent is to leave a
4 lot of open space, and part of the idea in clustering the homes, is to keep the trails intact. Mr. Woehrle
5 stated that potentially 95% of the site would be left untouched.

6
7 Mr. Woehrle stated that home sizes of 6,000-sq.ft. are targeted, and commented that the reduced
8 number of homes creates a need to build a larger, estate size home to recoup economically the returns
9 expected. He noted that an independent appraisal reported the breakeven level would be at 13 lots.
10 With 8 homes, the ratio of land to dollars spent requires a larger home to prevent further losses.

11
12 Mr. Woehrle has received a lot of questions from the neighbors about the relationship of the project to
13 individual lots. He has tried to work with the neighbors and be sensitive to their concerns. In that regard,
14 Mr. Woehrle has developed an alternative plan, and noted that the EIR will also provide alternative ideas
15 for home sites. Mr. Woehrle has tried to take a broader approach in viewing how the project fits within
16 the economics of the City of Lafayette. He welcomed the Commission's comments.

17
18 Commission Chair Lee opened the meeting to public comment.

19
20 Brad Kisner, 3159 Lucas Dr., representing BurtonValley.com, stated that, at the request of the
21 developer, a group met at the property to review the proposal. The group expressed concern about the
22 visibility of the homes that are situated higher on the ridge. Mr. Kisner pointed out that many of the
23 existing homes on the upper portion of Lucas Drive back up to open space, and those homeowners are
24 not in favor of homes being located behind theirs. The alternative proposal that has been prepared by
25 the developer allows for a more transitional development. Mr. Kisner pointed out a couple of new
26 locations that are actually quite hidden and he felt they were worth exploring. Overall, his concern is the
27 visibility of the new development and in minimizing the mass.

28
29 Bryan Goldwyn, 2750 Rohrer Drive, owns the former Henson horse property. His list of concerns
30 included drainage and visibility. He was also concerned about future owners complaining about his
31 horses. Mr. Goldwyn thought his property value would decrease with the loss of open space.
32 Commissioner Blodgett asked if Mr. Goldwyn's realtor had advised him about the proposed
33 development. Mr. Goldwyn acknowledged that he was aware of the possibility of a development and
34 stated that he had, at one time, offered to purchase the property up to the ridge from Mr. Woehrle.

35
36 Brad DeLong, 1 Lucas Court, was primarily concerned with drainage and landslides. He stated that a
37 third concern regarded the four lots to be developed with a scenic easement. Mr. DeLong questioned
38 what the future obligation of the existing homeowners would be in maintaining that open space.

39
40 Commissioner Hertel asked Mr. Woehrle to respond to Mr. Kisner's comment about transitioning out of
41 the formal development. Mr. Woehrle stated that the transition concept would be analyzed in the EIR.
42 Commissioner Hertel also asked about the viability of the upper lots. Mr. Woehrle explained the
43 reasoning for those lots.

44
45 Commission Chair Lee asked if there were a transition zone that allowed the fabric of the existing
46 neighborhood to fade into the development, would Mr. Woehrle entertain the idea that those houses not
47 be 6,000-sq.ft. but perhaps a couple of 4,000-sq.ft. homes working up to 6,000, or even 7,000-sq.ft.
48 where they are tucked away. Mr. Woehrle pointed out that there are grading constraints to be considered
49 in reviewing that possibility but they would be considered in the EIR.

50
51 Commission Chair Lee closed the public hearing and called for Commission comment.

52
53 Planning Commission liaison Chastain stated that the Planning Commission's discussion included
54 drainage, issues of landslides, quality of soils, privacy concerns, view points, vegetation, and all of that
55 will be part of the EIR. He suggested that the question of what happens when the cows go away, and
56 the transition of the landscape could be made part of the EIR. He also recalled that the Planning
57 Commission had been concerned about coming off the spur of Lucas Circle

1 Commissioner Cleaver commented that the developer seemed to be approaching the hillside as an
2 opportunity and not as series of restrictions. He referred to the comments provided for the earlier
3 subdivision application.

4
5 Commissioner Hertel thought the most important comment from the previous subdivision application was
6 the idea of trying to do a site analysis. He would like to see that analysis before the project moves
7 forward. He commented that the analysis should carry with it the fact that every site may not be suitable
8 for a fixed size home. Commissioner Hertel felt the developer was moving in the right direction in his
9 communications with the neighbors, in moving some of the more visible sites back into the recesses of
10 the property. Philosophically, he liked the idea of connecting to the existing neighborhood. Looking at
11 the isolated lot, he assumed the developer understands the privacy issues and landscaping needs. He
12 referred to the Zimmerman documents and style and would like to see the applicant maintain that quality
13 of direction.

14
15 Commissioner Blodgett was pleasantly surprised at the lack of opposition, and felt that was a sign of
16 positive communication by the developer with the public. He agreed with Commissioner Hertel's
17 comment that it would be nice to see the transition up Lucas Drive, and liked the idea of a trade-off of a
18 couple of smaller homes for one much larger one. Commissioner Blodgett emphasized the need to
19 minimize grading and making the homes fit with the contours. The applicant will need to show how the
20 prototype homes can be implemented into these particular sites.

21
22 Commission Chair Lee reviewed some of the discussion from the previous subdivision application. One
23 of the important things is to understand the full extent of the development, especially if the homes are to
24 be marketed as ranches. He noted that the Design Review Commission's charge was not to critique the
25 design but to help the EIR process by covering all the bases. The site analysis needs to be thorough,
26 and include: the slope, drainage, view sheds, tree canopies, and a full description of all the constraints.
27 He noted that in exchange for the clustered development there would be give and take with regard to
28 ridge and slope declination, as well as height issues. The size of the houses will be dependent on the
29 ability to fit the house to the lot. Commission Chair Lee felt the applicant had a good beginning in the
30 development of a design guideline.

31
32 Commissioner Hertel didn't feel the extension of Lucas Drive would generate higher speeds on the road
33 and didn't feel the curve proposed would be all that valuable. He complimented the road construction
34 sections in the applicant's proposal. He would like to see the concepts depicted in the report conveyed
35 into the actual construction documents.

36
37 Planning Commission liaison Tom Chastain felt it would be helpful to see house designs for both of the
38 subdivision projects when they come back to the Planning Commission.

39
40 Commission Chair Lee commented that there was an advantage in this project that there is no vested
41 map and the Commission and public have the ability to add their concerns and this will allow the
42 developer to receive that input before putting in the buildable lines.

43
44 Ms. Sinnette advised that house designs are not typically a part of an EIR. She commented that if there
45 were a Master Plan or design guidelines that those could be analyzed. She noted that the findings of
46 the EIR can help define design criteria, e.g., a lot that exceeds the 15-degree declination could be
47 targeted for a one-story home.

48
49 Ms. Sinnette commented that in connection with the aesthetics and visibility portion of the EIR, story
50 poles would be installed. However, she warned that the story poles would depict only general bulk and
51 mass, and not final design. Commissioner Blodgett suggested that in noticing the public, some
52 explanation of the story poles is provided to avoid needlessly upsetting the public. Commission Chair
53 Lee suggested that the explanation state that the story poles depict the maximum envelope.

54
55 **C. DR07-05 LAFAYETTE HIDDEN OAKS, L.P. (APPLICANT & OWNER), R-20 ZONING:**

56 Request for design review approval per Section 6-1903 of the Lafayette Municipal Code and Planning
57 Commission Resolution 2003-27 (condition of approval D1) for a new, two-story single-family residence
58 located at 25 Samantha Drive (Hidden Oaks subdivision Lot 8). APN 185-430-010