

**CITY OF ANTIOCH
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting
6:30 p.m.**

**January 20, 2010
City Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Langford called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, January 20, 2010, in the City Council Chambers. He stated that all items that can be appealed under 9-5.2509 of the Antioch Municipal Code must be appealed within five (5) working days of the decision. The final appeal date of decisions made at this meeting is 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 28, 2010.

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Langford, Westerman, Johnson, Azevedo, Travers,
Baatrup and Manuel
Absent: None
Staff: Community Development Director Wehrmeister
City Engineer Brandt
Senior Planner Morris
Associate Planner Gentry
City Attorney Nerland
Minutes Clerk Hammers

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes November 18, 2009

On motion by Commissioner Azevedo, and seconded by Commissioner Travers, the Planning Commission approved the Minutes of November 18, 2009.

AYES: Langford, Westerman, Johnson, Azevedo, Travers
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Manuel, Baatrup
ABSENT: None

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. **Z-09-02, PW 674, PD-05-01, UP-08-04 – Park Ridge Subdivision 8846 – Davidon Homes requests a recommendation of approval to the City Council for a rezone from Specific Plan to Planned Development, a vesting tentative map, a final development plan, and a use permit to create 525 single family lots intended for single family homes construction. The project is generally located west of the State Route 4 Bypass, east of Canada Valley Road and south of Laurel Road (APNs: 053-072-016, 053-060-022 and -023). An addendum to the Future Urban Area #2 Specific Plan EIR and reaffirmation of the Statement of Overriding Considerations will also be considered.**

Mindy Gentry, Associate Planner, provided a summary of the staff report dated January 14, 2010.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Applicant, Jeff Thayer, Vice President of Davidon Homes stated that the original RDA approval was for 562 units, that they have been working closely with staff and have been taking cues from the prior Planning Commission to finalize their plans.

Jeff Thayer and Norm Dyer with Loving & Campos provided a Power Point presentation to the Planning Commission providing information on the square footage of the lots, traffic circulation through the project, the Laurel Road changes, the open space, the Community Park, information regarding their RDA approval and their current proposal.

The applicant noted that although the City would normally bear the cost of the park, that they are not seeking reimbursement and that they are also taking responsibility for building Laurel Road paying their share of approximately one million of a four million dollar cost. They went on to discuss the project amenities such as biocells, storm water treatment, project entry signs and masonry walls within the development. The applicant pointed out that their project would add much needed jobs in the area.

Vice Chair Johnson questioned applicant regarding the entrances to the open space and asked if there were parking stalls at those locations to which applicant stated that although this is not a final design, there is no off street parking planned but that there is a lot of street parking and that he did not feel this would create any type of neighborhood nuisance.

Commissioner Azevedo questioned applicant about the average lot size and the square footage per house to which applicant stated that although they did not do an analysis after RDA, that they are very consistent with their numbers but that the information was not readily available. Commissioner Azevedo went on to state that given the letter on the dais this evening that the tradeoffs for the project would be the park, streets and lot sizes larger than the old plan.

The applicant stated that while the product is fully developed and well liked, they may update the design in the near future.

Commissioner Travers questioned the applicant about the timeline for the project to which the applicant stated that once the project is approved, their best case scenario would be one year in design and that by 2012 they would be moving along. Commissioner Travers then stated that Laurel Road is very important to the project and that it is going to sell houses to which applicant stated that their estimate for the road work would be approximately 25/75 of the four million dollar cost with their portion being one million.

Commissioner Westerman questioned the applicant about the open space and if there was any connection between the open space and other trails in the area to which the applicant responded that although there will be a trail along P G & E to which there will be access, the open space is contained and backs onto streets of the project and that since it is surrounded by development, there is no direct access. Vice Chair Johnson asked the applicant what indicators would move the project along to which applicant stated that the key to the housing recovery is taking care of the foreclosure crisis.

Commissioner Baatrup questioned applicant about the 75/25 split for Laurel Road to which applicant referred to their drawings indicating that most of Laurel Road is in property to the north and that their only contact with Laurel Road is in the Northwest corner.

Community Development Director Tina Wehrmeister interjected that the 25/75 split is Davidon's current estimate and that there would be a formal determination of the development's fair share after an engineer's report is prepared.

Commissioner Baatrup then questioned the applicant about the alignment of the three roads on the eastern edge of the project and if a different alignment was considered and whether there would be sound walls to which applicant stated that yes in addition to sound walls, pursuant to noise studies, acoustical treatments would be provided for houses facing the bypass and that once the area is landscaped, they feel these plans will be far superior to what they had before.

Chairman Langford questioned the applicant about the rear garages and if there were plans to integrate them into the project to which applicant stated that although rear garages may look better, attached garages were more popular to buyers for convenience reasons and they would like the right to discuss this issue further.

Chairman Langford then asked the applicant if they had read through the conditions and given the lot sizes if the frontage of the homes would be an issue to which applicant stated that they will not be doing any setback variances.

Commissioner Travers and Chairman Langford briefly discussed Condition 89 with applicant clarifying the language being inconsistent with the staff report dealing with the 124th building permit being before or upon recordation.

Chairman Langford stated that it was his hope that the lots would be larger to aid individuals who wanted RVs to which the applicant stated that they do have an RV

component in the project and stated that adding any more RV space would cause a loss in the total units.

Commissioner Johnson questioned applicant about the tree wells and how that would aid in traffic calming to which applicant stated that the curb goes out a bit in these areas and that trees would be planted 150 to 200 feet apart to help slow down traffic.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Travers stated that although the project has a lot of variation and lots of options for buyers, he would like to see varied fronts and the addition of RV parking or rear garages on twenty or so of the larger lots.

Commissioner Westerman stated this looks like a nice development with the park and open space and appears to be a friendly place to live but that it was his feeling that the individual house plans would be discussed at a separate meeting.

Associate Planner Gentry interjected with the recommendation that the timing on the park be completed by the 271st building permit.

Chairman Langford commented on Condition 107 dealing with the cul-de-sac parking island and stated that although this is standard, these islands make it difficult for anyone with a boat or trailer and not being able to get into their driveway. City Engineer Joe Brandt stated that without island parking, street parking is difficult unless cul-de-sacs are bigger to which Chairman Langford stated that he would like to see if this could be explored.

CDD Wehrmeister suggested an addition to Condition 107 unless a parking space for each house can be accommodated at the curb+.

Chairman Langford pointed out a typo on Condition No. 76 enter+ saver furnaces should be energy+saver furnaces.

Vice Chair Johnson pointed out that Condition No. 77 is a duplication of Condition No. 75 to which Chairman Langford indicated that Condition No. 77 could then be eliminated.

Vice Chair Johnson stated that on Condition No. 111, that the intent should be a minimum+of 20 feet from the face of the garage to which City Engineer Brandt clarified that this is a minimum. Chairman Langford interjected that although 20 feet would be the minimum, it could be more than 20 feet.

Commissioner Azevedo asked applicant about the park completion and if there was a problem with the 271st building permit to which applicant stated they had no problem with that.

RESOLUTION NO. 2010-02

On motion by Commissioner Azevedo, and seconded by Commissioner Travers, the Planning Commission recommended adoption to the City Council of an addendum to the FUA #2 (East Lone Tree) Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report and recommended to the City Council approval of an ordinance to rezone approximately 169.7 acres making up the Park Ridge Project from Specific Plan (SP) to the Planned Development (PD) Designation.

AYES: *Langford, Westerman, Johnson, Azevedo, Travers, Baatrup and Manuel*

NOES: *None*

ABSTAIN: *None*

ABSENT: *None*

RESOLUTION NO. 2010-03

On motion by Commissioner Azevedo, and seconded by Commissioner Johnson, the Planning Commission recommended approval to the City Council of a Final Planned Development, Vesting Tentative Map, and a Use Permit for 525 single-family homes, approximately 25 acres of passive open space, and approximately 8.22 acres consisting of a neighborhood park for the Park Ridge Subdivision Project with the following changes:

- **On Condition No. 76, change “enter” to “energy”.**
- **Delete Condition No. 77.**
- **Change Condition 89 to state, “That the developer shall be responsible for the design and construction of Laurel Road, including infrastructure and traffic signalization, from the project’s northwestern boundary to the State Route 4 Bypass. The signed plans for Laurel Road shall be completed prior to the recordation of the final map containing the 124th lot and construction shall commence prior to or upon the recordation of the 124th lot. The City will cooperate with the developer in establishing a financing mechanism or reimbursement agreement for the improvements so when other projects adjacent to Laurel Road develop they will be responsible to pay their fair share.”**
- **Addition to Condition No. 99 “The park will be completed by the issuance of the 271st building permit”.**
- **Addition to Condition No. 111 “All driveways shall be a minimum of 20’ from the face of the garage to the property line”.**
- **Addition to Condition No. 107 to “That all cul-de-sacs shall be designed according to City standards and include a parking island, unless a parking space of 20’ can be accommodated on the curb”.**

AYES: *Langford, Westerman, Johnson, Azevedo, Travers, Baatrup and Manuel*

NOES: *None*

ABSTAIN: *None*

ABSENT: *None*

3. **UP-09-11 – Standard Pacific Homes** requests approval of modifications to the size of the single family home products for the Stonetree neighborhood at Monterra (formerly known as Nelson Ranch). The subdivision is located on the north side of Wildhorse Road, east of the intersection of Wildhorse Road and Ridgeline Drive.

Alexis Morris, Senior Planner, provided a summary of the Staff Report dated January 14, 2010. She noted that there was one comment e-mail in opposition which has been provided to the Planning Commission. She also stated that there was an omission of a condition requiring the payment of fees and the reimbursement of payments prior to approval.

Chairman Langford questioned staff whether the development was preplotted when the final map was submitted to which Senior Planner Morris stated that it was not approved as part of the tentative plan, that the developer has their own plotting plan and that although their plan was shared, it was not approved.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Applicant, Aaron Ross-Swain, Project Manager with Standard Pacific made a Power Point presentation to the Planning Commission.

Applicant stated that they have made adjustments so that they can continue to build. He pointed out the summaries of the Stonetree development as well as the adjoining developments. He stated that Plan 5 is needed as single story homes are in high demand, that this plan being 2012 square feet would be differentiated from their other product lines and that Plan 5 would be placed on 12 lots which is only 9% of the Stonetree development. He went on to show on the slides that these 12 lots will maximize the use of corner lots, the curb appeal would be adversely impacted and that they will adhere to the project setbacks and not ask for variances. Given that the home prices will be approximately \$330,000 to \$340,000, their intent is not to arrive at a fire sale and that this would be a positive impact. Applicant further stated that Plan 5 is 44 ½ feet in width but that square footage is gained by a deeper home which is not noticeable from the street. He went on to point out that Plan 5 is only 9% of Stonetree and only 3% overall and that they would maintain the same design standards to provide a desirable plan to homebuyers for faster absorption and build out.

Commissioner Azevedo asked applicant about the amenities of the single story home compared to the two story home and if the quality of the craftsmanship would be the same to which applicant stated that a single story home is a major selling point and that the interior specs would be the same throughout their project. Commissioner Azevedo then asked applicant if lot elevations next to each other have been taken into account

given that there are not too many flat areas on the streetscape to which applicant stated that the greatest height difference between two homes would be 3 ½ feet.

Vice Chair Johnson stated that his concern was that there was not a separate living room to which applicant stated that homebuyers are more focused on the bedroom count than a living room and that this floor plan has been very successful.

Senior Planner Morris interjected that although there is a great room and formal dining room in Plan 5, there is no living room.

Commissioner Travers asked applicant to elaborate on build it green. Applicant stated that this is based on a green point rating system and that they are eligible for the program which would allow points based on landscaping, solar, Title 24, Energy Star, etc. Commissioner Travers asked if the solar aspect could now be put into the mortgage of the home to which applicant clarified that it could. Commissioner Travers expressed his opinion that it is difficult to find 2000+ square foot single story homes and that he is in favor of the project as long as it doesn't diminish the quality of the home.

Commissioner Baatrup clarified with applicant that the solar feature in the future would include Plan 5. He stated that his concern was with the narrowness of Bedroom 2 and that he would like the width to be at least as wide as Plan 1. Applicant stated that they haven't thought that far ahead but this would be open to suggestion.

Commissioner Azevedo clarified with applicant that the width of Plan 1 is 50' wide, Plan 2 is 48' wide, Plan 3 is 48' wide, Plan 4 is 50' wide and Plan 5 is 44 ½' wide.

Chairman Langford expressed his concern that plans could be moved around to more than these 12 lots in question to which applicant responded that these plans may not fit on other lots, that they couldn't just swap them out and that they have reshuffled the plans. He stated that once approved, they would solidify the development plan, create plot plans and pull permits. Chairman Langford stated his concern was that the plans were being downsized and that he would like to see the elevations changed to make the streetscape look better with possibly increasing the width from 44 ½' to 48'.

Commissioner Travers stated that he would like to see the front of the house widened by four feet for aesthetics to which applicant stated that they could add a wraparound porch instead of building out the home.

Commissioner Baatrup stated that the goal would be to make the home appear wider to which Commissioner Azevedo asked applicant if the wraparound porch would accomplish this to which applicant stated that he does not think that the code dictates how deep the porch would be but would have to check.

Chairman Langford stated that the ideal would be to change the pitch of the roof for the width to be the same on the side as the front.

Commissioner Baatrup stated that if bedroom 2 and the bathroom were made a little larger that this would be architecturally pleasing and would not appear to look added on.

Chairman Langford clarified with applicant that this would involve carrying the stone or detail elements around as well.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Manuel stated that while he understands economics, there is a definite need for single story homes but feels that anything under 2500 sf in a single family home would be asking for too many people in too small a space. He further expressed concern with concentration of where these are located and the possibility of investors coming in. He stated that he would not be interested in decreasing any properties for those reasons.

Vice Chair Johnson questioned staff if the Planning Commission can influence the appearance of the home making it wider to which Senior Planner Morris stated that the home size ordinance would deal with that aspect and that there are four findings in the staff report. Vice Chair Johnson further stated that while he is still up in the air at this point with the project that he is concerned about lot sizes, setbacks not moving, and about investors coming in.

Commissioner Travers asked applicant if there was a Homeowners Association which would stipulate that units be owned occupied to which applicant stated that there is no HOA and that they cannot control investors. Commissioner Travers asked Senior Planner Morris if a condition can be added that the width of the façade on the new plan must be equal to the minimum of any previous house that has been approved to which she indicated that the width could be specified which would clarify the front elevation.

Commissioner Azevedo stated that while he understands the concerns of Commissioner Manuel, he felt that since the sales price would be low to mid \$300,000s, that there would not be much of a difference in the price and his primary concern is not the square footage but the quality of the materials being comparable to the previously approved other homes.

Chairman Langford stated that he would like to see a compromise in bringing the mass of the house out a bit which would make the front elevation bigger and possibly bumping up the square footage a little.

Vice Chair Johnson stated that based on Langford's comments, he could support the project.

Commissioner Azevedo questioned applicant about the depth of the plan to which applicant stated that Plan 5 is 63 feet deep and that their goal would be to possibly widen the width on the garage side to provide a larger garage which would create physical massing on the front.

Commissioner Baatrup stated that he felt the widening should take place on the living side and not on the garage side.

Chairman Langford stated that keeping with what the Design Review Board has done in the past, the ideal was to not make the garage equal to or bigger than the house and believed the massing would look better on the house side.

Applicant stated that with widening the plan either way, they would not want to carry that all the way back and would like to look at adding 2 feet to the living side and 2 feet to the garage side.

Commissioner Baatrup stated that he would be ok with popping out the bedroom and the bathroom on the living side four feet to 48q

Chairman Langford stated he was in agreement.

RESOLUTION NO. 2010-04

On motion by Commissioner Travers, and seconded by Commissioner Westerman, the Planning Commission recommended the City Council approve modifications to the unit size for the Stonetree at Monterra product, subject to the following added conditions:

- 10. That the front elevation of the new Stonetree Plan 5 shall be at least 48 feet in width and that the additional width shall be added to the living area side of the home at a minimum depth of bedroom number two and bathroom number two as shown on the proposed Plan 5 floor plan dated November 2, 2009.***
- 11. No permits or approvals, whether discretionary or mandatory, shall be considered if the developer is not current on fees, reimbursement payments and other fees that are due.***

AYES: Langford, Westerman, Johnson, Azevedo, Travers, Baatrup
NOES: Manuel
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Community Development Director Wehrmeister stated that the T-Mobile project continued at the last Planning Commission meeting to February 3, 2010, has requested a further continuance and therefore the first meeting in February has been cancelled, the next Planning Commission meeting now being February 17, 2010.

CDD Wehrmesiter announced that due to an organization change necessitated by the economy and Dave Sanderson's retirement, the Recreation Department will now come under Community Development but clarified that there will still be a Parks and Recreation Commission.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Nothing was reported.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Azevedo provided a summary of the most recent Transplan meeting.

City Attorney Nerland mentioned that there may be the potential of subcommittee meetings being held on the RDA Ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Langford adjourned the Planning Commission at 8:55 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting on February 17, 2010.

Respectfully Submitted,
Cheryl Hammers