

Legislation Text

## File #: 12-613, Version: 1

Staff Report for Matter of PLN2012-00039, Rezone and Planned Development for 16 Residential Units Which Includes Retaining Four Single-Family Residences and Constructing Six New Two-Family Residences (12 New Units) at 13533-13547 Aurora Drive and to Rezone the Properties from RO Residential Outer District to RO(PD) Residential Outer, Planned Development Overlay District. The Proposed Project also Includes New On-Site Improvements such as Driveway Access, Visitor Parking Spaces, and Landscaping. Assessor's Parcel Numbers 79A-584-18-1, 79A-584-18-2, 79A-584-19-1 and 79A-584-19-2; S. Fagalde, Aurora Partners, LLC (Applicant and Property Owner)

# SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

The property owner proposes to develop the property at the west side of Aurora Drive, north of Fairway Drive, with a 16 unit planned development that would retain four existing single-family homes and include six new two-story duplexes. The subject property is adjacent to the Marina Golf Course and walking distance to the City's shoreline area.

At its December 20, 2012 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council approval of the Rezone and Planned Development subject to the recommended conditions.

# Recommendation:

The Planning Commission and staff recommend that the City Council approve the following:

- 1. Find that the Rezone and Planned Development is Categorically Exempt from CEQA pursuant to Sections 15303 (b) and 15332.
- 2. An Ordinance to rezone the property from RO Residential Outer District to RO(PD) Residential Outer, Planned Development Overlay District.
- 3. The Planned Development for 16 residential units which keeps four existing single-family homes and construction of six new two-story duplexes subject to the recommended findings and revised recommended conditions of approval.

# BACKGROUND

The subject property, comprising four parcels totaling 56,000 square feet (see Vicinity Map), would be combined into one parcel containing a total of 10 residential buildings that includes four existing single-family residences and six new duplexes (16 units total). The existing single-story, single-family homes are in good condition and would remain at their existing locations (see attached Site Plan). A centrally located driveway via Aurora Drive would serve as access to the residential units that flank it, except for SF1 which is already served by another curb-cut on Aurora Drive. The central driveway

would access the attached garages to the residences, and the uncovered driveway spaces in front of the garages and the guest/visitor spaces.

The proposal has 44 off-street parking spaces that include 16 garage spaces, 16 apron/driveway spaces in tandem along the central driveway, 10 guest/visitor spaces, one carport space and one space in tandem in the Aurora Drive driveway.

The six proposed duplexes are two-story. Each unit has a living area of 1,280 square feet (see attached Floor Plans). The ground floor comprising 690 square feet would include a living room, dining room, kitchen, one-half bathroom, and a stacked washer and dryer closet. The second floor would comprise 590 square feet and include three bedrooms and two bathrooms. Not included in the living area is the attached one-car garage having a floor area of 246 square feet. The proposed plans include additional storage space as recommended by the Planning Commission. Such space will be provided overhead in the duplex's garage spaces.

The existing homes are post-war construction that has stucco exterior walls and composition shingle roofs. The proposed duplex elevations are designed similarly with stucco walls, trimmed windows and low-pitched roofs with composition shingle. In addition, the proposed elevations include covered front porches, Craftsman-style front doors, decorative lamps/light fixtures, bracketed and trimmed gables, and exposed rafter tails. The garages are appointed with decorative sectional roll-ups and a trellis element above. The front elevations of the duplexes facing the central driveway have the second floors tiered back to lessen the bulk and mass of the elevations.

In September 2012, the Planning Commission conducted a work session to review the initial proposal. The Planning Commission made recommendations related to enhancing the exterior design by adding windows to the new building's end elevations and varying the exterior paint colors of each building from one another. It also recommended providing additional storage space within the new units. These recommendations were implemented in the present design.

At the December 20, 2012 Planning Commission public hearing, the proposed plans were presented to the Planning Commission for a formal hearing. The Planning Commission found the revised site plan and elevations acceptable and made a recommendation for the project's approval. In its recommendation, the Planning Commission directed the applicant to revise the proposed exterior body colors of the buildings to show greater contrast versus the originally proposed three colors that ranged from tan to warm gray. In addition, the Planning Commission asked that the applicant explore the possibility of connecting a through-street from the subject property to the development to the north for through circulation that would not require the hammerhead turn-around on the site. The Planning Commission also asked that the logistics and perhaps other options for the refuse and recycling containers be further studied to minimize the number of them for the project. In response, the applicant has prepared a color board with paint samples having greater contrast. They will be provided at the City Council meeting for consideration. The driveway connection to the adjacent property is not feasible as the proposed site plan does not line up with the adjacent driveway. In addition, the adjacent neighbors and the applicant do not want traffic driving through their private driveways. After meeting with ACI, the waste disposal company serving the site, it is likely that the refuse and recyclable containers can be serviced along the central driveway on the subject property, similar to the development adjacent to the north. This would address the Planning Commission's concerns about having dozens of containers lined up along Aurora Drive on pick-up days. The applicant would arrange to have the driveway gates open for ACI trucks on pick-up days.

Regarding community outreach, three nearby property owners opposed the project. One objected to the two-story design. Another objected to it because it would be new development in the area. The third one opposed it due to the additional traffic and increased on-street parking demand in the neighborhood; the project would set precedent as a higher density project; and additional residents would increase Police problems.

In addition, there was outreach by the applicant and the City to American Golf Corporation (AGC), the adjacent golf course operator. AGC's concerns about fencing, disclosure to future residents about the nature of normal golf course operations (i.e., noise from equipment, maintenance, periodical spraying, etc.) were addressed and are included in the recommended Conditions of Approval.

# Applicable General Plan Policy

The General Plan Land Use Map designates the subject property for Residential Garden Density. Lots typically exceed 8,000 square feet and overall densities range from 1-4 units per gross acre (up to 5.4 units per net acre). In some cases, additional dwellings on a single lot may result in densities that are higher than this range. In this case, the proposed development of 16 units on the 56,000 square foot site equals a density of one unit per 3,500 square feet or 12 dwelling units per acre. Thus, the appropriate rezoning of the property for the project would be from RO Residential Outer to RO(PD) Residential Outer, Planned Development Overlay District. This would subject any proposal on the property to the City's discretionary review process to ensure that the new development will be compatible with the existing area. As stated in the General Plan, a single lot may result in densities that are higher than the four units per acre range.

The following General Plan policies are relevant to this residential project:

• Policy 2.05: Alterations, Additions and Infill

Ensure that alterations, additions and infill development are compatible with existing homes and maintain aesthetically pleasing neighborhoods.

• Policy 3.01: Mix of Unit Types

Encourage a mix of residential development types in the City, including single-family homes on a variety of lot sizes, as well as townhomes, row houses, live-work units, planned unit developments and multi-family housing.

• Policy 3.04: Promotion of Infill

Encourage infill development on vacant or underused sites within residential areas.

The proposed exception to density is not unprecedented. There are three properties north of the subject properties that were developed with planned developments which were greater than 4 units per gross acre.

The proposed density having a mixture of detached single-family and attached two-family development is a compatible development proposal. The detached unit design of the single-family homes and duplexes lessens any impact of the project appearing overdeveloped to the adjacent residential area and the project appears less bulky and less massive than larger attached multi-family (apartment) buildings with a greater number of units.

The proposal will provide an opportunity for new rental housing. The existing single-family homes are in good condition. Moreover, with the necessary conditions relating to landscaping, fencing, and property maintenance, the appearance of the property will be enhanced and maintained in an attractive and clean manner.

### Permits and/or Variances Granted

The RO District is unique in its myriad of various zoning requirements (i.e., lot size, lot width, density formula, setbacks,

#### File #: 12-613, Version: 1

coverage, etc.). The applicant feels the zoning requirements are too restrictive for a residential project that combines the four parcels. Thus, the Planned Development allows for flexibility and more imaginative design that results in a careful and well conceived plan that includes access, light, open space, and amenities and a plan that is compatible with the existing adjacent neighborhood. See the attached table which summarizes the reasons for the Planned Development.

- 1. The density formula in the RO District is 8,000 square feet for the first single-family dwelling, 5,000 square feet additional for each additional single-family dwelling, and 7,000 square feet additional for each additional two-family dwelling. In this case, 65,000 square feet is required for four single-family and six two-family dwellings. The project site is 56,000 square feet.
- 2. SF1 would maintain a five foot setback from the southerly side property line; SF2 would maintain approximately eight feet from the northerly side property line. Both are existing conditions and encroach into the 12 foot setback requirement. It would be impractical to move or partially remove a portion of SF2 to comply with the setback requirement. SF1 can be partially reduced since the structure that encroaches is not living area but a covered carport; however, full compliance would make the carport impractical and impassable by placing the posts in the middle of the driveway. In addition, TF6 would have an eight foot setback from the northerly side property line.
- 3. The new additional dwellings will have a minimum 10 foot separation from one another instead of 20 feet that is required in the RO District (see Site Plan, Dimensioned Plan Sheet A.2). Furthermore, additional dwelling TF6 will have an eight foot setback from the side property line where the minimum setback from the side property line is 10 feet for an additional dwelling.
- 4. Buildings TF5 and TF6 would have a 13 foot setback from the rear property line where 25 feet is the minimum requirement from the rear property line in the RO District. This exception to the setback is comparable to the setback of the 14-unit planned development adjacent to the north.
- 5. All the buildings comply with the 30 foot maximum height requirement since the existing homes are one-story and the proposed duplexes are 20 feet tall. However, there is an additional height requirement in the RO District where the maximum height of the building is 15 feet for the portions that are within 20 feet from the rear property line. Thus, an exception is necessary for TF5 and TF6, which exceeds 15 feet in height and encroaches seven feet into the 20 foot setback.
- 6. In the RO District there is a daylight plane requirement not to encroach outside a horizontal line 19 feet, 6 inches above the grade of each side setback line and slope inwards at a 45 degree angle. TF6 is proposed to have an eight foot setback, thus this one building would encroach two feet outside the building envelope.
- 7. The RO District requires the following for off-street parking spaces: a) Single-family Dwellings: two covered spaces per unit; and b) Two-family Dwellings: 2 spaces, including 1 covered space, per unit. The total required for this project is 32 spaces including 20 covered spaces and 12 uncovered spaces; however required parking is typically provided as independently accessible spaces and not in a tandem arrangement. The proposal includes 44 spaces: 17 covered spaces, 17 uncovered spaces in tandem to the covered spaces, and 10 guest/visitor spaces.

Although the proposed plan includes the seven previous listed exceptions to the RO District requirements it appears to be a comprehensive and a reasonable development proposal.

## Environmental Review

This project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guideline Article 19, Categorical Exemption, Section 15332 In-fill Development projects. Section 15332 provides that if a project is consistent with the general plan and the zoning code, is located on a site with no more than five acres, and has no value for endangered or rare or threatened species, and if approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air or water quality, and if all required utilities and public services can adequately serve the site, the residential project is categorically exempt from CEQA. Furthermore, the rezoning is exempt from CEQA, per CEQA Guideline, Section 15061(b)(3), where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the rezoning in question may have a significant effect on the environment.

#### **Board/Commission Findings**

#### File #: 12-613, Version: 1

The Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezone and the planned development to develop the site with six new duplexes and retain the existing four single-family homes, subject to the attached recommended conditions and findings.

#### Summary of Public Outreach Efforts

The Planning Commission meetings on September 20, 2012 and December 20, 2012 were noticed with a legal advertisement in the <u>Daily Review</u> newspaper, posting of the property on nearby utility poles, and notification of property owners within the 300-foot radius from the subject property.

### ATTACHMENTS

- Vicinity Map from Planning Commission Report
- Applicant's Supporting Statement, dated January 14, 2013
- Applicant's Supporting Statement, dated November 15, 2012
- Planned Development Table
- Excerpts of the Minutes of the December 20, 2012 Planning Commission Public Hearing (Unapproved)
- Planning Commission Staff Report dated December 20, 2012, without attachments
- Excerpts of the Minutes of the September 20, 2012 Planning Commission Work Session
- Recommended Findings of Fact
- Recommended Conditions of Approval
- Letter from American Golf Corporation, dated January 9, 2013
- Email from Karen Werth, dated December 11, 2012
- Aurora Cottages Cover Sheet (Sheet A.1)
- Site Plan, Dimensioned Plan, Project Data (Sheet A.2)
- Two-family First Floor Plan (Sheet A.3.1)
- Two-family Second First Floor Plan (Sheet A.3.2)
- Two-family Exterior Elevations (Sheet A.4)
- Preliminary Landscape Plan
- Topographic Survey (Sheet P.1)
- Preliminary Grading, Drainage, and Utility Plan (Sheet P.2)
- Drainage and Treatment Areas (Sheet P.3)
- Color Board (actual board will be available at the City Council meeting)
- Birdseye view of 13533-13547 Aurora Drive and Vicinity
- For Information Only-Photo-simulation Rendering of the Front Driveway and Gate
- For Information Only-Photo-simulation Rendering, Birdseye view of the Proposed Six Duplexes
- For Information Only-Photo-simulation Rendering, Perspective of Proposed Three Duplexes
- For Information Only-Photo-simulation Rendering, Perspective of the Typical Proposed Duplex
- For Information Only-Photo-simulation Rendering of the Rear Property Line Adjacent to the Golf Course

**PREPARED BY:** Elmer Penaranda, Senior Planner, Community Development Department