

From: [Steve Golden](#)
To: [Joe Mueller \(Verizon\)](#); [John McKay \(Yahoo\)](#); [Liam Downey](#); [Michael Orosco](#); [Pat Toombs](#); [Pat Toombs 2](#); [Rene Spring \(mail.com\)](#); [Wayne Tanda \(Charter\)](#); [Wayne Tanda \(Cloud\)](#)
Cc: [Terry Linder](#); [Jenna Luna](#); [Leslie Little](#)
Subject: RE: PC Mtg. Questions
Date: Monday, August 22, 2016 4:58:07 PM

Please see below for responses to Agenda Items 6 and 7.

Steve Golden
Associate Planner
Community Development Department
steve.golden@morganhill.ca.gov
408-778-6480

From: Terry Linder
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2016 3:16 PM
To: Steve Golden; Tiffany Brown; Gina Paolini; John Baty
Subject: FW: PC Mtg. Questions

Attached is a list of questions from Commissioner Mueller. Please respond to all questions for your respective agenda item(s). Remember to CC the rest of the Planning Commission, Jenna, me and Leslie with your response.

Terry

From: Leslie Little
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2016 10:37 AM
To: Terry Linder
Subject: Fwd: PC Mtg. Questions

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Joe Mueller" <JoeMueller@verizon.net>
Date: August 22, 2016 at 9:02:21 AM PDT
To: "Leslie Little" <leslie.little@morganhill.ca.gov>
Subject: PC Mtg. Questions

Leslie,

Good morning,
My questions for Tuesday's meeting follow:

1. Agenda 2
 - 1.1 DA Resolution, Section 3(p19): I believe this should be Exhibit A not Exhibit

A-C.

- 1.2 What are the amenities along the southern boundary of this project and the project to the east?
 - 1.3 Who will own and operate the programmable park on Lot B?
 - 1.4 Are there any restrictions on the programming of this space?
 - 1.5 How will the list of private and private/public facilities be documented?
 - 1.6 What is a minor change in the amenities?
 - 1.7 Where are the BMR units?
 - 1.8 Why does the drawings show a lap pool when the DA indicates a swimming pool?
 - 1.9 DA Section 1.2.7 Project Definition: 168 units in project but phasing diagram shows 182. Why? The DA should reflect the complete project.
2. Agenda 3
 - 2.1 Tentative Map Resolution Edit: Chair Title.
 - 2.2 Tentative Map Resolution, Exhibit A, Condition 5 Public Works: Does this condition need to be changed due to the dropping of the building requirement.
 - 2.3 Tentative Map: Why is lot B still required?
3. Agenda 4
 - 3.1 Edit for all DAs: The RDCS Commitments Tables are chopped.
4. Agenda 6
 - 4.1 What Development Standards are we using for this project?

The Development Standards are those found in the R3 zoning district.

- 4.2 Do we have data that supports the use of pervious pavement in this location?

Pervious pavement can be used on this site, however, based on preliminary review of a percolation test submitted, the site may not entirely benefit from the use of pervious pavement (staff did not request pervious pavement). The development of the site will need to provide improvements to support/comply with the storm water standards for minimum storm water retention/detention and water quality standards, which will be reviewed as part of the Design Permit and building permit(s).

- 4.3 Drawings seem to indicate that additional ROW will be needed for W. Dunne. When will this be required?

No street dedication will be required. A 10 foot public service easement will need to be provided.

- 4.4 How do we keep the new 2 story building from dominating the site and

existing home?

The structure is proposed to be setback 12 feet from property line (18.5 feet from residence). The standard sideyard setback is 5 feet. Also the structure is 2 stories (standard allows up to 3 stories). The FAR is approximately 34%.

5. Agenda 7.

5.1 Can we pin down the licensing requirements?

The use will require a Residential Care Facility for the Elderly license from the Department of Social Services, State of California per the change to the zoning code definition of Residential Care Facility. See Resolution Conditions of Approval, Planning III. Other Conditions, Section D (page 4).

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks for the help.

Joe