

Mayor  
John Murray  
Mayor Pro Tem  
John Grego  
Councilmember  
Mary Hornsby  
Ed Martin  
Willard Rodarmel



## Planning Department

210 Fox Street  
Lemoore • CA 93245  
Phone • (559) 924-6740  
FAX • (559) 924-6743

## STAFF REPORT

Item # 6

**To: Planning Commission**  
**From: Holly Smyth, Planning Director/G. Hobbs Planning Technician**  
**Review Date: May 14, 2007**  
**Subject: Public hearing for Heritage Acres Tract 872 Phases 1, 2, & 3**  
**Review and Recommendations to City Council on Floor Plans/Elevations/Plot Plan**

A planned unit development for Tract 872 was conditionally approved by City Council Resolution No. 2006-15 on May 2, 2006 to subdivide and develop approximately 30.51 acres into 97 single family homes through Subdivision Map No.2006-02, PUD 2006-02, and CUP 2006-02. The entire property is located south of Boxwood Lane, north of Geneva Drive, and east of Cinnamon Drive. The original name for this tract was Sugar Plum but the advertising name is Heritage Acres. The original conditions of approval required the developer to submit elevations, floor plans and footprint plans for approval prior to any Final Map being recorded for this development. No more than 97 units were allowed in the subdivision, so long as the average lot size is not less than 10,300 square feet. The average lot size is 10,669 square feet. A public hearing was noticed for the Planning Commission for review and recommended approval of the plans for the entire subdivision. The developer has submitted six (6) floor plans with a total of 18 different elevations with the following attributes:

- Plan 1-1,197 sq. ft. 1-story, 3 bedroom/2 bath with detached 2-3 car garage with 3 elevations
- Plan 2-1,519 sq. ft. 1-story, 3 bedroom /2 bath with side entry 2-3 car garage with 3 elevations
- Plan 3-1,844 sq. ft. 1-story, 2-4 bedroom/2 bath with 2-car garage with 3 elevations
- Plan 4-2,035 sq. ft. 2-story, 4 bedroom/3 bath with detached 2-3 car garage with 3 elevations
- Plan 5-2,335 sq. ft. 2-story, 4 bedroom/ 2 1/2 bath with 2-car garage with 3 elevations
- Plan 6-2,876 sq ft. 2-story, 4 bedroom/3-3½ bath with side entry 2-3 car garage with 3 elevations

Under the Planned Unit Development (PUD) development guidelines, R-1-7 standards and Planning Commission conditions of approval, the following items had to be analyzed for their conformance with City policy.

1. House footprints shall not cover more than 35% of each lot (Floor Area Ratio (FAR) < 35%) per condition #11 of the conditions of approval. For canal lots the FAR ratio would exclude the area that will be in the canal easement area outside fenced backyards. There are eleven (11) plans that exceed this FAR requirement, as shown on the attached spreadsheet. **Therefore the plans on lots 1, 2, 11, 23, and 29 of Phase I, and lots 8, 14, 20, 26, and 29 of Phase II, and lot 26 of Phase III must be changed to smaller house plans so that the FAR is less than 35%.**
2. Generally the PUD "garage portions of the dwelling should not extend more than 5' from the front of the main dwelling". Additionally, "garage locations are encouraged to vary in order to provide a more interesting streetscape".

### PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Chairperson –Kimberly Moss, Vice-Chair –Sharon Kendall  
Bob Clement, Lisa Elgin, Angie Leroy, Marshall Norgaard, Mel Ormonde

In order to improve variety, plans 2 and 6 include side entry garages which extend in front of the home structure between 15-22' with a 15 front yard setback (which is allowed by the R-1-7 zone district requirements). **The applicant proposes up to 3-car garage option for these side-entry units, which staff believes should not exceed 2-car garage** as the 3-car option could place the garage up to 30' in front of the house which does not follow the intent of the PUD to reduce the garage snout effect and garage predominance. All garages are also shown to have window details in the garage doors.

Plans 1 and 4 have detached 2 and 3-car garage options placed towards the back of the lot which meets the garage setback intent of the PUD. The units have a 5' side yard setback and proposes a 10' rear yard setback. These plans have the option of adding a second floor living space above the detached 2-car or 3-car garage. **The architecture should match the main house architecture which is not shown in the elevation. Additionally the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor front windows should match one another.**

Plans 3 and 5 have attached front loaded garages that do not extend more than 5' in front of the house structure thereby meeting the garage setback PUD requirement.

3. Generally the PUD Design Guidelines prefer not more than 45% of dwellings may be two-story. The applicant proposes 55% of the units be two-story plans, therefore not meeting the guideline. Staff feels because most of the lots are extremely large and the underlying zoning is RA-20 and R-1-7, the normal guidelines should not apply and the proposal of 55% two-story plans should be accepted.
4. Front yard setbacks should vary between 18' – 25' with front loaded garages and 15' for side entry garages; rear yards shall be at least 10', and each side yard shall be 5; for single-story homes and 10' and 10' for two-story homes. Front porches are as close as 13.5' in front yard setback. The overall plot plan states that "actual front and side setbacks will vary on a per lot basis. **All footprint locations and orientations are conceptual and are for exhibit purposes only.** The actual individual plot plans are dependent upon final design of improvements and final map". The proposed setbacks meet the intent of the PUD for front, rear and side yards, so long as they continue to vary so setbacks do not create a straight line down a street.
5. Single-story and two-story homes should mix to form an interesting skyline and architectural interest (for this purpose, not more than 3 dwellings on adjoining lots should be two story.) The proposed overall plot plan needs to be amended to show only three two-story homes on adjacent lots 17, 18, 19, and 20 to meet this requirement. **Lot 17 should be changed to a single story plan and have been reflected in the table below.**
6. Not more than three (3) dwelling units on facing or adjoining lots should be of the same model floor plan and building elevations ("the six-pak rule") with the same floor plan on adjoining lots should have elevation features that sufficiently vary from each other. **Plans 5B and 6B are very similar and should not be located within the 6-pak rule, therefore, any future changes should not located these two plans near one another. The table below shows the modifications that need to be made to meet this requirement.**
7. Dwellings on corner lots are encouraged to have a wrap-around building elevation with similar aesthetics so that both adjoining streets are taken into consideration. **Plans 2 and 3 do not have very good side elevations and should not be used on corner lots.** Therefore, lots 33, 26, 18 and 19 in Phase I, lots 1 and 28 in Phase II, and lots 21 and 20 in Phase III need to be changed so that Plan 2 or 3 are not on corner lots (see the chart below for suggested changes).

Lastly, staff has noticed in many new subdivisions, fences are being installed directly in back of sidewalks without any landscaping areas to provide pedestrians more room to walk or room to place utilities or a visual relief be provided from 80-100' of fencing. Therefore, **staff recommends that all corner lot fencing be placed at least 3-5' in back of the sidewalk and side yard setbacks be from the fence not the property line.**

The proposed overall plot plan shows the construction of 9 Plan 1's (9%), 17 Plan 2's (17.5%), 17 Plan 3's (17.5%), 18 Plan 4's (18.5%), 17 Plan 5 (17.5%), and 19 Plan 6's (19.6%).

In reviewing the elevations, staff recommends the following modifications be made to the layout of the overall footprint plan to meet the intent of the PUD:

Lot # Phase #	Original Plan	Problem	Recommended New Plan
Lot 1, Phase I	6A	FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 41.8%	2A
Lot 2, Phase I	5B	FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 36.18%	3B
Lot 11, Phase I	6B	FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 37.99%	5B
Lot 16, Phase I	4C	Duplicates Lot 21 within 6 pak	2C
Lot 18, Phase I	2A	Poor side elevation	6B
Lot 19, Phase I	2A	Poor side elevation	1A
Lot 23, Phase I	6B	Duplicates Lot 11 within 6 pak & FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 37.14%	2A
Lot 24, Phase I	1C	Duplicates Lot 10 within 6 pak	1B
Lot 26, Phase I	2B	Poor side elevation	5B
Lot 29, Phase I	6B	FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 38.96%	2B
Lot 33, Phase I	2A	Poor side elevation	5A
Lot 1, Phase II	2C	Poor side elevation	4A
Lot 5, Phase II	4B	Duplicates Lot 23 within 6 pak	4C
Lot 8, Phase II	6B	FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 35.97%	1B
Lot 13, Phase II	5A	Due to lot 14 & 29 change	6A
Lot 14, Phase II	6B	FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 36.73%	5C
Lot 18, Phase II	4C	Duplicates lot 10 within 6 pak	4B
Lot 19, Phase II	5A	Duplicates Lot 9 within 6 pak	5C
Lot 20, Phase II	6B	Duplicates Lot 8 within 6 pak & FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 39.57%	1C
Lot 21, Phase II	2C	Duplicates Lot 7 within 6 pak	2B
Lot 22, Phase II	3A	Duplicates Lot 6 within 6 pak	3C
Lot 26, Phase II	6A	FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 41.49%	2A
Lot 27, Phase II	4A	Change due to lot 28 change	6A
Lot 28, Phase II	2C	Poor side elevation	4A
Lot 29, Phase II	6B	FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 37.52%	5B
Lot 11, Phase III	3C	Duplicates Lot 29 within 6 pak	6B
Lot 15, Phase III	2A	Duplicates Lot 25 within 6 pak	6B
Lot 21, Phase III	2B	Poor side elevation	4A
Lot 24, Phase III	3B	Duplicates Lot 16 within 6 pak	3A
Lot 26 Phase III	6C	FAR ratio exceeds 35%, 39.57%	1C
Lot 30, Phase II	2B	Poor side elevation	4B

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the staff review the project, Commission hold a public hearing, take comments, and pass the attached resolution approving the overall plot plan, floor plans, and elevations with conditions as stated in the resolution. However, the City Council should not ratify the Planning Commission's decision until a revised overall plot plan is submitted as it has 32 changes needed.