



October 23, 2016

**RE: RDSCS2016-0013 COCHRANE – CALATLANTIC- RESPONSE TO STAFF EVALUATION**

Dear Planning Commissioners,

While generally we feel staff has done a good job reviewing the narrative and evaluating for the CalAtlantic (CA) Cochrane Rd project. We however have a few clarifications we would like to add and request that Planning Commission review points which CA originally applied for.

The Points for consideration are:

- 18.78.210 SCHOOLS 3d – Project within 1.5 mi to lineal walking distance to high school – 2 pts
- 18.78.230 ORDERLY AND CONTINGIGOUS DEVELOPMENT 4 – Continuing Project – 2 pts
- 18.78.290 LOT LAYOUT AND ORIENTATION 3a – 5' front yard setback and 3b – 5' rear yard setback – 1 pt
- 18.78.300 CIRCULATION EFFICIENCY 1d – Short Block – 1 pt
- 15.78.335 LIVABLE COMMUNITIES – 1b Superior Project – 2 pts

The reason we are requesting the above modifications are as follows:

***18.78.210 SCHOOLS 3d – Project within 1.5 mi to lineal walking distance to high school p 11 – 2 pts***

There is public right of way on the west side of Mission View Drive and Live Oak High School is within 1.5 miles from the Cochrane Rd Project. The CA has offered to construct temporary paving on the west side which would provide a safe route along a paved sidewalk to Live Oak High School. Staff has indicated that there is not an approved right of way path not included in narrative. In actuality our narrative included the offer, we have demonstrated the pathway and are happy to work with Public Works staff to achieve approval. This approval would be no different from the improvement plan approval needed for internal streets and allocations included in the remainder of the RDSCS Narrative. We would respectfully request the reassignment of these two (2) points.

***18.78.230 ORDERLY AND CONTINGIGOUS DEVELOPMENT 4 – Continuing Project p 20 – 2 pts***

This project has been through five previous RDSCS competitions, successfully achieving allocations each year under highly competitive odds. Land development is actively underway for all approved lots (83 lots or 62% of the project) and grading has been completed for the entire project (100% of the project 135 lots). The 2013 RDSCS completion was for two projects (Roland 28 allocations and Barbara 13 allocations – 41 total allocations for the 2015-16 yr), combined three (3) years later when ownership was consolidated. CA has pulled 21 building permits by September 15 (over ½) of the combined two first phases and all units are under construction. While there were no “previous” phases, clearly the two phases combined implies a previous phase. For this reason we would respectfully request that the reassignment of the two (2) points requested.

***18.78.290 LOT LAYOUT AND ORIENTATION 3a – 5' front yard setback p 47 – 1 pt and 3b – 5' rear yard setback p48 – 1 pt***



The objective of this section is to achieve a variety of setbacks which complement the overall design of the project. The project meets the 5' front yard setbacks as required through the use of various design planes, plan variation (12 unique plans), and street undulation demonstrated in the Site Plan MC 4-6. This project was partially approved for twelve (let than 10%) 4500sf duet lots, while these twelve lots may not always meet the total 5' criteria they are typically within 0.5' foot of that criteria and still provide significant variation. For this reason we would respectfully request the reassignment of the one (1) point requested. The same is true for rear yard setbacks and for this reason we would respectfully request the reassignment of the one (1) point requested.

**18.78.300 CIRCULATION EFFICIENCY 1d – Short Block p 53– 1 pt**

The nature of this site is long and narrow. Originally the project was approved under separate ownerships as two projects roughly 350' x 2500'. Each project comprised of separate product type. Once CA gained ownership of both projects there was a requirement to combine the projects while still retaining the original product separation. CA worked with Staff and Planning Commission to gain approval of the current configuration while still meeting previous RDCS obligations. To the extent practical short blocks were avoided given the narrow nature of the site. There are five blocks which are less than 250'. Three are project the entries (White Moon Dr, Black Hawk Dr, and Morning Star Dr) which are an allowed exception, and two (Golden Eagle Dr and Moring Star Dr) are for extensions into future development parcel, so ultimately will not be short blocks when fully built out. For this reason we would respectfully request the reassignment of the one (1) point requested.

**15.78.335 LIVABLE COMMUNITIES – 1b Superior Project p 71 – 2 pts**

Applicant respectfully requests the superior project allocation of two points granted by Planning Commission by a Super Majority Vote. In the 2015 RDCS completion the project was awarded one point based on the redesign of the two original projects while still maintaining all previous RDCS commitments, retaining product segmentation, retaining a large central park area and adding a Central Green/walking corridor. During the Initial Planning Commission review and approval, Planning Commission requested that the Central Green/walking corridor have view fencing to provide an "eyes on" safety factor which the applicant agreed to. While this detail was incorporated, it was not specifically mentioned in the 2015 narrative. This year's 2016 narrative includes this reference in several locations. It is the request of the applicant that PC will vote a two (2) point award for Superior Project this 2016 RDCS competition.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the facts above. It is our hope that the Planning Commission will find agreement with the logic above and restore the points originally claimed by the applicant.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Bridgit Koller', written over the word 'Respectfully,'.

BRIDGIT KOLLER

Vice President Forward Planning

cc Gina Paolini