



TOWN OF TIBURON
 1505 Tiburon Boulevard
 Tiburon, CA 94920

Planning Commission Meeting
 August 11, 2010
 Agenda Item: **1**

STAFF REPORT

To: Members of the Planning Commission

From: Community Development Department

Subject: Trestle Glen Circle Conceptual Master Plan; File #40901; Trestle Glen Boulevard between Tiburon Boulevard and upper Juno Road; Conceptual Master Plan to Create Four Building Sites on a 14.46 Acre Parcel; Trestle Glen Terrace, LLC, Owner; IPA, Inc., Applicant; Assessor’s Parcel No. 039-061-91

Reviewed By: _____

PROJECT DATA

Address: South side of Trestle Glen Boulevard between Tiburon Boulevard and upper Juno Road

Assessor Parcel Number: 039-061-91

File Number: 40901

Lot Size: 14.46 acres

General Plan: PD-R-c (Planned Development-Residential - up to 0.3 dwellings/acre)

Zoning: RPD (Residential Planned Development)

Current Use: Vacant

Owner: Trestle Glen Terrace, LLC

Applicant: IPA, Inc. (Scott Hochstrasser)

SUMMARY

The owner of a vacant 14.46 acre parcel has submitted an application for Conceptual Master Plan review of a proposal to subdivide the vacant parcel into four lots. The Trestle Glen Circle property is situated along the south side of Trestle Glen Boulevard between Tiburon Boulevard and the upper entrance to Juno Road. A single-family dwelling would be developed on each of the four lots.

CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN REVIEW

Section 16-52.070 (A) of the Tiburon Zoning Ordinance states that the purposes of the Conceptual Master Plan are as follows:

1. To encourage cooperative, good faith, participatory efforts by the public, the Town, the project proponent, and all other involved parties in addressing difficult land development issues;

2. To determine controversial aspects of a site or a potential development proposal and attempt to reach consensus on ways in which the controversial issues may be reasonably addressed. Public input shall be encouraged;
3. To obtain preliminary review and evaluation by Staff and related agencies regarding general consistency of the proposal with the General Plan and other applicable ordinances and regulations. The specificity of the review must necessarily reflect the specificity of the submittal;
4. To obtain preliminary public review and comment on a relatively schematic development proposal in order to assist project proponents in designing a Precise Development Plan that may be acceptable to the community and the Town;
5. To establish an informational foundation for any subsequent Precise Development Plan submittal.

In summary, the Conceptual Master Plan review is a pre-application process only. The Conceptual Master Plan review is not a permit or an entitlement, and is not binding on the Town in any way. The Conceptual Master Plan review process is intended to obtain preliminary public and Town of Tiburon review and comment on a development proposal in order to assist the project proponents in designing a Precise Development Plan that may be acceptable to the community and the Town.

BACKGROUND/PROJECT HISTORY

In 1999, a previous property owner filed an application for a Precise Development Plan (the Lower Trestle Glen Precise Development Plan, File #39908) to subdivide the property into four lots; a single-family dwelling was proposed for each of the four lots (please see **Exhibit 4** for a site plan). Access was proposed from Trestle Glen Boulevard. All homes were proposed as 5,000 square feet, plus garages. The Planning Commission reviewed the application at the September 27 and November 8, 2000 meetings and expressed significant concerns with the density, house sizes, home positioning and neighborhood compatibility. The applicant subsequently withdrew the application prior to further public hearings on the project. Planning Commissioner comments from the minutes of both meetings are attached as **Exhibits 2 & 3**.

In 2008, the current property owner submitted an application for a Precise Development Plan (File #30805) to subdivide the property into three lots. Access for two lots was proposed from Silverado Drive, with access for the third lot proposed from Trestle Glen Boulevard. During the preliminary review of the application, several neighboring property owners raised concerns about the proposed project, including the appropriateness and legal status of access to the site from Silverado Drive. Due to the potential controversy regarding this and other site planning issues, Staff recommended that the applicant withdraw the Precise Development Plan application and instead submit for a Conceptual Master Plan review to obtain preliminary public and Town of Tiburon comment on the project design. The applicant subsequently withdrew the Precise Development Plan application and submitted the subject Conceptual Master Plan with a revised

project design that would subdivide the property into four lots, two with access from Silverado Drive and two with access from Trestle Glen Boulevard.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project would subdivide a 14.46 acre parcel into four lots, with a single-family dwelling on each lot. One of the lots (Lot 3) would also allow a secondary dwelling unit.

The subject property is described as follows in the Land Use Element of the Tiburon General Plan:

PD-R-c (Trestle Glen Lower): This 14.5 acre property is located along the south side of Trestle Glen Blvd due west of Tiburon Court. The current landscape is comprised of a steep, grass-covered hillside with large areas of dense brush and scattered oak, bay, and pine trees. Hillside slopes range from approximately 5 percent near the bottom of the property to greater than 40 percent near the upper reaches of the property. Elevations range from 40 feet above mean sea level (MSL) along Trestle Glen Boulevard to approximately 300 feet MSL near the top of the ridge. Poor access, steep slopes, a significant ridgeline, and high visibility combine to make achievement of the maximum density unlikely.

Maximum allowable density: 0.3 du/acre

Approximate maximum units: 4

The site consists of an irregularly-shaped parcel located along Trestle Glen Boulevard approximately one quarter mile east of the intersection of Tiburon Boulevard and Trestle Glen Boulevard. The site is bordered by a series of single-family residential neighborhoods, including the Little Reed Heights (Silverado and Comstock Drives) and Tiburon Knolls subdivisions to the south, the Trestle Glen Terrace subdivision to the southwest and the Belveron East neighborhood to the north. The Tiburon Court Precise Development Plan for the currently vacant 14-acre property to the northeast allows for the development of three single-family dwellings, all deriving access from a single private roadway leading from Trestle Glen Boulevard.

The property slopes up from Trestle Glen Boulevard, with relatively level portions near the bottom of the site and slopes greater than 40% near the top. A significant ridgeline runs through the upper portion of the property from southeast to northwest, ending in a knoll approximately in the center of the site. Most of the site is vegetated with grassland, brush, French broom and scattered trees, with a stand of oak trees in the upper and lower central portions of the property.

Three landslide complexes are present on the site, the larger two in the lower (northern) portions of the property and a smaller slide area in the southwest portion of the site. A biological assessment submitted by the applicant indicates that there are no wetlands areas on the site, but recommends a 300 foot buffer from a seasonal stream on the adjacent Tiburon Court property.

The parameters for the four proposed lots in the Trestle Glen Circle Conceptual Master Plan are described as follows:

Lot 1

- The 50,224 square foot (1.15 acre) lot would be situated in the upper, southern portion of the site, accessed by a private roadway connecting to the cul-de-sac at the end of Silverado Drive.
- A 27,481 building envelope would be established. Conceptual house designs indicate a 4,183 square foot single-family home, with 750 square feet of garage space.
- A 7,284 square foot secondary building envelope would also be established and would allow development of secondary improvements, typically including such items as swimming pools, terraces, walkways, retaining walls and fences up to 6 feet in height.
- The remaining 15,459 square foot portion of the lot would be designated as private open space.

Lot 2

- This 49,217 square foot (1.13 acre) lot would also be situated in the upper, southern portion of the site, accessed by a private roadway shared with Lot 1 and connecting to Silverado Drive.
- The lot would include an 18,695 square foot primary building envelope. Conceptual house designs indicate a 5,144 square foot single-family home, with 721 square feet of garage space.
- A 27,750 square foot secondary building envelope would be established.
- The remaining 3,272 square foot portion of the lot would be designated as private open space.

Lot 3

- This 143,019 square foot (3.28 acre) lot would occupy the lower, northwestern portion of the site along Trestle Glen Boulevard and would be accessed by a private roadway connecting to the street near the intersection of upper Juno Road.
- The lot would include a 70,044 square foot primary building envelope. Conceptual house designs indicate an 8,484 square foot single-family home (including 1,572 square feet of basement area) with 2,177 square feet of garage space and a two-story, 1,089 square foot proposed secondary dwelling unit.
- A 59,005 square foot secondary building envelope would be established.

- The remaining 13,965 square foot portion of the lot would be designated as private open space.

Lot 4

- This 43,148 square foot (0.99 acre) lot would be situated to the east of Lot 3 in the northeastern portion of the site and would be accessed by a private roadway shared with Lot 3 and connecting to Trestle Glen Boulevard.
- The lot would include a 30,590 square foot primary building envelope. Conceptual house designs indicate a 5,579 square foot single-family home (including 1,204 square feet of basement area), with 1,082 square feet of garage space.
- A 9,340 square foot secondary building envelope would be established.
- The remaining 3,218 square foot portion of the lot would be designated as private open

Lot A

- Lot A would consist of a 7.74 acre parcel running through the center of the site, between the upper Lots 1 & 2 and the lower Lots 3 & 4. This area would be designated as open space and would remain in an undeveloped state. The application indicates that this lot would be dedicated to the Town as open space, but it is unlikely that the Town would accept this dedication.

Access would be provided to Lots 1 & 2 from a 14 foot wide private roadway extending from the end of Silverado Drive. Access would be provided to Lots 3 & 4 from a 14 foot wide private roadway extending from Trestle Glen Boulevard, aligned with the current “upper” intersection with Juno Road to form a 4-way intersection.

Water for Lots 1 & 2 would be provided by extending a new water line to the east, connecting to an existing water main at the end of Comstock Drive. Water for Lots 3 & 4 would be provided by extending a new water main to the north, connecting to an existing water main on Trestle Glen Boulevard.

To illustrate the potential housing construction on each of the proposed lots, the applicant has submitted conceptual plans for the houses on all four lots. Although these plans are only conceptual in nature, they are probably representative of the type of construction that would be expected for each lot, given the building envelope constraints and house sizes proposed.

Each of the proposed homes would have a two-story design, with a maximum height of 30 feet. As previously noted, the size of the proposed dwellings ranges from a 4,183 square foot house on Lot 1 to an 8,484 square foot house and a 1,089 square foot secondary dwelling unit for Lot 3. The homes on Lots 1 & 2 would have a contemporary design, while the homes on Lots 3 & 4 would have a more traditional, Mediterranean influenced design.

As noted above, each lot is proposed to include a primary building envelope for the construction of the residence, and a secondary building envelope for construction of recreational amenities. The area outside the building envelopes would be designated as private open space. This open space area is intended to remain in a natural, undisturbed condition, with an open space easement dedicated to the Town to protect these spaces. Fencing on the site would be limited to the residential use areas defined by the boundaries of the primary and secondary building envelopes. In all areas outside the building envelopes and not designated as private open space for both lots, improvements would be limited to the roadway, driveways and associated retaining and entry walls, walkways, decorative features, solar panels, landscaping and lighting.

There are pre-existing recreational easements across the property for the adjacent houses on Trestle Glen Terrace. The future Precise Development Plan for this property should include guidelines directed to the Design Review Board for any further improvements in those easements.

ISSUES

A number of issues have been raised by the design of the proposed Trestle Glen Circle Conceptual Master Plan, including the following:

Traffic and Access.

Silverado Drive. Access to Lots 1 & 2 would be provided by a 14 foot wide private roadway extending from the cul-de-sac at the end of Silverado Drive. The roadway would split after a short distance into separate driveways for each of the two lots.

Silverado Drive is currently a dead-end street connecting to Stewart Drive. The applicant contends that the subject property has access rights to connect to Silverado Drive, but he is currently in a legal dispute with the property owners at 528 & 529 Silverado Drive who disagree with this contention. Town Staff encouraged the applicant to employ the Conceptual Master Plan process to determine whether access from Silverado Drive would seriously be considered by the Town prior to engaging in costly litigation over the issue.

Numerous residents along Silverado Drive have objected to the proposed access at the end of this street. The residents have raised concerns about additional traffic during construction and afterwards, noting that the existing street roadway narrows before the cul-de-sac and occasionally becomes congested with on-street parking. Silverado Drive does not have sidewalks and several residents have expressed concerns about pedestrian safety hazards resulting from project traffic.

Trestle Glen Boulevard. Access would be provided to Lots 3 & 4 via a 14 foot wide private roadway extending from Trestle Glen Boulevard, aligned with the current “upper” intersection with Juno Road. This alignment is intended to avoid the creation of an entirely new roadway intersection along Trestle Glen Boulevard.

Numerous Belveron East residents have expressed concerns about the amount of additional traffic that would be caused at this intersection, noting that only two intersections serve the entire Belveron East neighborhood. Safety concerns have also been cited due to the high speeds of traffic along Trestle Glen Boulevard and limited visibility of the intersection for oncoming traffic.

Vehicular access is a critical issue for the Planning Commission to address with this application. The property has unquestioned legal access from Trestle Glen Boulevard, and there are probably at least two locations where a suitable entry roadway could be established from Trestle Glen Boulevard. The first location would create a 4-way intersection with the current 3-way intersection at upper Juno Road; and the second would be located closer to Tiburon Boulevard, approximately 300 feet from the westernmost property line of the subject parcel, roughly opposite 10 & 12 Juno Road. The latter location was the access location proposed as part of the Lower Trestle Glen Precise Development Plan application filed in 1999, and is depicted in **Exhibit 4**. The Conceptual Master Plan proposes access from the upper Juno Road intersection.

Legal vehicular access also exists from Comstock Drive, where that public street terminates at the property line of the subject parcel. However, a prior owner of the subject property granted an easement to the property at 208 Trestle Glen Terrace that effectively rules out vehicular access from Comstock Drive without the Trestle Glen Terrace owner's permission, which is apparently not forthcoming. The subject property also does not have legal access from Trestle Glen Terrace, which is a privately-owned and maintained street.

Vehicular access from Silverado Drive is undetermined at this point, and the subject property owner is currently in litigation with the owners of lots at 528 and 529 Silverado Drive as to whether the Trestle Glen Circle property has access rights over 20 foot wide "road easements" on each parcel dating from the 1951 Little Reed Heights Unit Two subdivision map that created those two lots (see **Exhibit 5**). The subdivision map left unclear the purpose or beneficiaries of these "road easements". Both sides in the dispute appear to have plausible arguments, and Town Staff has no idea which side might prevail should the litigation proceed to a judicial ruling.

Town Staff is clear upon one legal concept, which is that when multiple legal access points exist for a property, the local land use agency has the authority to choose which access point or points will be used, provided that the access is reasonably feasible. At this time, Staff believes that the property has two feasible vehicular accesses: Silverado Drive and Trestle Glen Boulevard, with potentially multiple feasible access points from the latter street. The outstanding question is whether one or both of these accesses is acceptable to the Town as part of the land development review process. Resolving the vehicular access issue during the Conceptual Master Plan review process would be of great benefit to all persons involved.

General transportation planning principles offer some guidance. All other things being equal, it is generally preferred that driveways accessing small numbers of lots be connected to local streets (such as Silverado Drive) rather than arterial streets (such as Trestle Glen Boulevard). In other words, direct access by small driveways onto arterial streets such as Trestle Glen Boulevard is generally considered poor transportation planning; a preferred solution is to have driveways connect to local streets, such as Silverado Drive, which then feed into collector streets, such as Stewart Drive, which then feed into arterial streets such as Tiburon Boulevard. That said, the Stewart Drive/Tiburon Boulevard intersection is not typical and is generally considered one of the more challenging major intersections in the Town of Tiburon. This factor alone may outweigh any advantage normally associated with general transportation planning principles regarding arterial streets and driveways.

With respect to Trestle Glen Boulevard access points, general transportation planning principles encourage the creation of 4-way intersections where possible (for instance, at upper Juno Road), rather than the creation of a new 3-way intersection where no intersection currently exists. Town Staff has therefore encouraged the proposed 4-way Juno Road intersection option as part of this project rather than a new and independent entry roadway location closer to Tiburon Boulevard, on the belief that both intersections could meet minimum line-of-sight and intersection safety standards. Such determinations would be finalized through the review process on a formal land development application such as the Precise Development Plan.

The Town will likely require dedication of property along the edge of Trestle Glen Boulevard to establish a bicycle lane on the southern side of the roadway. The Town has already required a similar dedication for the adjacent Tiburon Court project to allow for the eventual construction of bicycle lanes on both sides of this roadway, as designated in the Town's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, to accommodate the bicycle usage of this street.

Neighborhood Compatibility. The low density single-family development proposed on the site would be consistent with the land use designation for the site, but would be much lower than the density of other single-family subdivisions in the vicinity, with the exception of the yet-unbuilt Tiburon Court project. That project would have a similarly low density.

The following General Plan policies and Zoning Ordinance principles guide the design of residential developments:

- General Plan Land Use Goal LU-I encourages “intensity of development, density, and house sizes/architectural styles that are consistent and compatible with surrounding neighborhoods.”
- Land Use Policy LU-5 states that “new development shall be in harmony with adjacent neighborhoods and open spaces.”
- Open Space and Conservation Policy OSC-6 states that “the Town prefers clustering of lots in new subdivision design to maximize the preservation of open space to the greatest extent feasible. However, where the Town determines that a project would better conform to the goals and policies of the General Plan, ‘estate lot’ type development (i.e., large homes on large lots) may be considered. Easement, deed restriction, or other appropriate mechanism acceptable to the Town shall be used to preserve open space within common areas or individual lots.”
- Section 16-52.060 (E[10]) of the Zoning Ordinance (Principles for Precise Development Plans, attached as **Exhibit 6**) further states that “proposed arrangement of residential units and design of circulation system shall provide harmonious transition from and be compatible with neighboring development and open space. Monotony in design, and massive or inordinately large or bulky structures and site coverage that overwhelm or that are inconsistent with the surrounding area, shall be avoided.”

The 4,183 to 5,579 square foot houses proposed for Lots 1, 2 & 4 would be substantially larger than other single-family homes in the vicinity, and the 8,484 square foot house proposed for Lot 3 would be among the largest homes in Tiburon. The adjacent Tiburon Court project limited the floor area for each home to a maximum of 4,300 square feet, and further required that the homes closely resemble the conceptual house designs submitted with that application. Those designs depicted homes that would blend into the natural environment and strongly resemble those shown on submitted photosimulations. However, through extensive use of below grade space, the homes in Tiburon Court could possibly achieve another 1,000 square feet of usable floor area.

Some of the proposed building envelopes appear to be inordinately large. In particular, the 1.6 acre primary building envelope and 1.35 acre secondary building envelope proposed for Lot 3 would be substantially larger than any building envelopes approved under recent Precise Development Plans in Tiburon. The size of the envelopes allows for flexibility in the placement of homes and other improvements on each lot, but makes it more difficult to comprehend the visual appearance of future improvements on each lot.

Ridgeline Protection. A significant ridgeline, as identified in the Tiburon General Plan, traverses the upper portion of the center of the subject property from southeast to northwest. The edge of the primary building envelope on Lot 1 would be situated approximately 60 feet from the ridgeline and the secondary building envelope would extend to within approximately 45 feet of the ridgeline. No improvements would cross the ridgeline itself and the private open space on Lot 1 and Lot A would ensure that the ridgeline itself would remain intact and undisturbed.

Land Use Policy LU-7 states that “special emphasis shall be placed on keeping significant ridgelines open and unobstructed to the maximum extent feasible.” Open Space and Conservation Policy OSC-9 further states that “undeveloped ridgelines have overriding visual significance to the Town. In balancing open space interests with development interests, the protection of predominantly undeveloped ridgelines shall have the highest priority.” Section 16-52.060 (E[5]) of the Zoning Ordinance further states that “location of development well below ridgelines shall be achieved, in compliance with the General Plan and other Town policies.”

This ridgeline is visible from areas to the north of the site, including the Belveron East, Perini Preserve and Reedlands neighborhoods. The ridgeline does not connect neighborhoods or open space and contains no sensitive environmental habitat, therefore reducing some of the potential effects of placing development near the ridgeline. The location of the ridgeline on the subject property does not appear to enhance the potential visual prominence of the proposed homes on the site; the visibility of the homes would have more to do with their specific placement on the site, rather than their proximity to the ridgeline. However, the proximity of the building envelopes for Lot 1 to the ridgeline on the site would not appear to keep the ridgeline “open and unobstructed to the maximum extent feasible” nor give the protection of this undeveloped ridgeline “the highest priority.”

Visual Impacts. The project design would not appear to substantially interfere with views from any surrounding homes. The proposed residences on Lots 1 & 2 would be visible from the adjacent homes at the end of Silverado Drive (528 & 529 Silverado Drive), but would not appear to block substantial views from the primary living areas of these neighboring residences.

The homes on Lots 1 & 2 would be somewhat visible from the nearby homes on Trestle Glen Terrace to the west, but would be screened by existing vegetation and the difference in topography between the home sites. The proposed houses would be more visible from the neighborhoods to the north, including Belveron East and the Reedlands neighborhood along Reed Ranch Road. Lots 1 & 2, on the upper portions of the site, would be more visible from afar, but would likely appear as extensions of the existing development pattern above the site along Stewart Drive, Redding Court and the Little Reed Heights and Trestle Glen Terrace subdivisions. The conceptual house designs for Lots 1 & 2 indicate homes that would generally follow the contours of the site, lessening the visual prominence of the buildings.

The conceptual home designs for Lots 3 & 4 would be more vertical and less contemporary than the house designs for Lots 1 & 2. The applicant has indicated that the proposed homes for Lots 3 & 4 would be screened from view by the slopes and vegetation below the building envelopes. Story poles have been erected at the corners of the proposed primary building envelopes to allow the Planning Commission and neighboring property owners to better evaluate the potential visibility of the proposed houses on the site. A major neighborhood objection to the Lower Trestle Glen 4-unit project during the hearings in 2000 was that the large homes would “loom” over Belveron East. The Planning Commission is encouraged to view the story poles from the end of Silverado Drive, Juno Road and the Belveron East neighborhood, the Perini Preserve subdivision (Turtle Rock and Indian Rock Courts) and the Reedlands neighborhood (Reed Ranch Road and connecting streets).

Open Space and Conservation Policy OSC-29 states that “open space views from key roadways, including Tiburon Boulevard, Trestle Glen Boulevard, and Paradise Drive, shall be protected through the permitting process.” Policy OSC-8 states that “where appropriate, greenbelts shall be required to separate development areas or to link open space areas.” The proposed Lot A would establish a band of open space between the lower homes on Lots 3 & 4 and the upper homes on Lots 1 & 2. Although this open space area would visually connect with the open space on the adjacent Tiburon Court property, when viewed from Trestle Glen Boulevard this would leave only a relatively narrow band of open space on the subject site, in contrast to the connecting open space, which stretches the height of the hillside from Trestle Glen Boulevard to the top of the property.

Environmentally Sensitive Areas. The biological assessment submitted by the applicant indicates that the project site does not support any sensitive plant or animal species. Most of the native trees and vegetation on the site would remain. The assessment indicates that there are no wetlands areas on the site, but recommends a 300 foot buffer from a seasonal stream on the adjacent Tiburon Court property.

Three landslide complexes are present on the site, the larger two in the lower (northern) portions of the property and a smaller slide area in the southwest portion of the site. One lower landslide would extend across most of the proposed Lot 4, including much of the primary building envelope for that lot. The other lower landslide would extend across the central portion of Lot 3, including portions of the primary and secondary building envelopes. The smaller landslide would extend into the primary and secondary building envelopes of the proposed Lot 2.

Safety Goal SE-B states that the Town should “discourage to the maximum extent feasible development of areas subject to hazards, including, but not limited to, geotechnical hazards, unstable slopes and flood-prone areas.” Land Use Policy LU-7 also states that “development should be located on the least environmentally sensitive areas... and least hazardous portions of the land wherever feasible to promote sound land development and planning practices.” Section 16-52.060 (E[7]) of the Zoning Ordinance further states that “due consideration shall be given to avoid, eliminate or reduce areas posing geologic and non-geologic hazards.” The landslide areas on the site would need to be repaired in conformance with the Town Landslide Mitigation Policy, eliminating the landslide hazards on the site and making these locations acceptable for building envelopes and development of the site.

Usable Open Space. The proposed project would preserve 55.9% of the site as open space, including both Lot A and the private open space on Lots 1-4. This would conform to the requirements of Open Space and Conservation Policy OSC-5 to preserve at least 50% of the site as permanent open space. Section 16-52.060 (E[1]) of the Zoning Ordinance further states that “significant open space shall be permanently preserved through dedication or other means acceptable to the Town, consistent with policies of the General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element.” Lot A would border the private open space area on the adjacent Tiburon Court property. Most of the open space would serve as a visual buffer between lots 1 & 2 and Lots 3 & 4 but would not serve as a buffer between the proposed building envelopes and existing homes that border the subject property. No public trail easements are proposed and Staff sees little public benefit from any such trail easements on the property.

Grading and Preservation of Natural Features. Grading for the project would not create any new slopes exceeding 30% and would result in final contours and slopes that would generally reflect existing landforms on the site. The submitted plans indicate that there would be 10,180 cubic yards of cut and 8,470 cubic yards of fill associated with the project. It should be noted that over 76% of the proposed fill would occur on the proposed Lot 3, which would likely serve to raise the building pads of this lot and make any structures more noticeable from afar.

A temporary construction road is proposed as part of the project that would lead from the western end of Lot 3 up to the upper portion of Lot 2 (shown on Sheet C19 of the submitted plans). This temporary road is intended to allow construction traffic to access the entire site from Trestle Glen Boulevard, reducing or eliminating construction traffic from Silverado Drive and Stewart Drive. The construction of this temporary roadway is likely to require substantial additional grading and could leave a lasting visual scar on the hillside.

Open Space and Conservation Policy OSC-35 states that “to the maximum extent feasible, grading shall be kept to a minimum and every effort shall be made to retain the natural features of the land including ridges, rolling landforms, knolls, vegetation, trees, rock outcroppings, and water courses.” Although the project design would generally retain the natural features of the land (with the exception of the proposed fill on Lot 3), the amount of grading proposed for the homes sites and temporary construction road do not appear to keep the grading to a minimum “to the maximum extent feasible.”

PUBLIC COMMENT

As of the date of this report, numerous comment letters have been received regarding the proposed conceptual master plan. The Town also received 57 copies of a form letter submitted by individual residents raising objections to the proposed project; one copy of the form letter is attached as **Exhibit 7**, along with copies of the form letter that include individualized comments from residents.

FUTURE ACTIONS REQUIRED

No formal action is necessary for the proposed Conceptual Master Plan. The Planning Commission should provide input to the applicant regarding the merits of the conceptual project design. The intent of the Conceptual Master Plan process is for the applicant to consider the input gathered from the public and the Commission before preparing a Precise Development Plan application for this property. Once submitted, that application will undergo CEQA review and appropriate public hearing before the Planning Commission and Town Council. If the Precise Development Plan is approved by the Town Council, subsequent Town permits would likely include a Tentative Subdivision Map, Parcel Map, Subdivision Improvement Drawings, Site Plan and Architectural Review approval for all lots, and Building Permits for all lots.

CONCLUSION

The Town's General Plan policies and zoning regulations regarding this property have not materially changed since a prior application was reviewed by the Planning Commission in 2000. The four-lot project design would appear to be inconsistent with the character of other neighborhoods in the vicinity. The proposed house sizes are substantially larger than other homes in the area. The project design does not minimize grading on the site, particularly for the largest house on Lot 3. The legal right to use Silverado Drive for vehicular access to the site has not been demonstrated at this time and could be disruptive to the surrounding neighborhood and feed additional trips into the already challenging intersection at Stewart Drive and Tiburon Boulevard.

Town Staff believes that a more appropriate project design would include only one access point from Trestle Glen Boulevard with three homes that are closer in size to those approved for Tiburon Court. The building envelopes for the three lots would occupy the general location currently shown for the envelopes for Lots 3 & 4. Such a project design would be consistent with the development pattern on this side of Trestle Glen Boulevard, would lessen the visual impacts of the currently proposed larger homes on the site and leave much of the upper portion of the property as visual open space. The single access point from Trestle Glen Boulevard would eliminate traffic through Silverado Drive and the Little Reed Heights neighborhood and avoid any addition strain on the intersection of Stewart Drive and Tiburon Boulevard.

Other possible project design options would include the following:

- Four homes on the lower portion of the site, accessed by a single roadway from Trestle Glen Boulevard (this would be similar to the 1999 Lower Trestle Glen application and could have many of the same problems identified by the Planning Commission at that time);

- One home on the lower portion of the site and two homes accessed from Silverado Drive on the upper portion of the property;
- Two homes on the lower portion of the site and one home accessed from Silverado Drive on the upper portion of the property;
- Two estate-style homes located on the lower portion of the site

Staff believes that a three-lot project with smaller homes and a Trestle Glen Boulevard/upper Juno Road access would be most compatible with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, as follows:

- The three-lot design would be most “consistent and compatible with surrounding neighborhoods,” as called for in Goal LU-I and would most “be in harmony with adjacent neighborhoods and open spaces” as called for in Policy LU-5, by limiting unit sizes to levels closer to neighboring properties and placing dwellings only on the lower portions of the site, consistent with the adjacent Tiburon Court project.
- This design would “cluster the lots to preserve open space to the maximum extent feasible” as called for in Policy OSC-6, while other project designs would split the development of the site into two separate areas on the upper and lower portions of the property. An “estate lot” development would be inappropriate at this location, as the size of such homes would be substantially larger than the size of other residences in the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Placement of homes only on the lower portion of the site would avoid the areas of the site with slopes exceeding 40% on the upper portions of the property, consistent with Policy OSC-27 and protect “open space views from key roadways, including... Trestle Glen Boulevard...” as called for in Policy OSC-29. Other project designs involving development of the upper portion of the site would be closer to steeply sloped areas and would interfere with open space views from Trestle Glen Boulevard and Tiburon Boulevard.
- Placement of the homes on the lower portion of the site would avoid the significant ridgeline on the property, consistent with Policy LU-7 (“special emphasis shall be placed on keeping significant ridgelines open and unobstructed to the maximum extent feasible”), Policy OSC-9 (“undeveloped ridgelines have overriding visual significance to the Town.”), and Policy OSC-12 (“development shall be set back from Significant Ridgelines”), along with the principle of Section 16-52.060 (E[5]) of the Zoning Ordinance that “location of development well below ridgelines shall be achieved, in compliance with the General Plan and other Town policies.” Other project designs that would include lots on the upper portion of the site would place homes much closer to the ridgeline.
- Limiting home locations to the lower portion of the site and allowing only three moderately-sized homes instead of four such homes or two estate-sized residences

would also reduce the amount of grading necessary for the project, consistent with Policy OSC-35 for “grading [to] be kept to a minimum.” The preferred project design would likely require less grading than a project that includes lots on both the upper and lower portions of the site.

- Placement of the homes on the lower portion of the site would maximize the visual greenbelt of the middle and upper portions of the property, consistent with Policy OSC-8 to require “where appropriate, greenbelts... to separate development areas or to link open space areas.”

Development of the site would provide benefits, including, but not limited to, landslide elimination, improved fire management and wildland fire fuel load reduction, and enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facility potential along Trestle Glen Boulevard. The cost of these and other site improvements impose an economic burden on the applicant that may not be recovered without development of a reasonable number of homes on the site.

The Planning Commission should give specific direction to the applicant on the merits of the project design and recommendations for possible changes that would make the project more acceptable and compatible with the character of other surrounding neighborhoods. In particular, specific recommendations should be made for the following aspects of the project design:

- Vehicular access from Trestle Glen Boulevard, Silverado Drive, or both;
- Appropriate number and general location of homes on the site;
- Appropriate floor area limits and envelope sizes for homes;
- Avoidance of, or enhanced setbacks from, the significant ridgeline on the site; and
- Adequacy of proposed open space.

The Planning Commission should also feel free to comment upon any other aspect of the Conceptual Master Plan within its land use purview.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

1. Hold a public meeting on this item and hear and consider all testimony, and
2. Provide input to the applicant on the Trestle Glen Circle Conceptual Master Plan.

EXHIBITS

1. Project description
2. Excerpted Minutes of the September 27, 2000 Planning Commission meeting
3. Excerpted Minutes of the November 8, 2000 Planning Commission meeting

4. Site plan for Lower Trestle Glen Precise Development Plan application filed in 1999
5. Little Reed Heights Unit Two subdivision map
6. Section 16-52.060 (E) of the Zoning Ordinance (Principles for Precise Development Plans)
7. Form letters from residents
8. Letter from Margot Geitheim, dated January 29, 2010
9. Letter from Becky Pringle, dated February 24, 2010
10. Letter from Richard Petrick, dated March 3, 2010
11. Letter from Christopher Hartung, dated March 10, 2010
12. Letter from Greg Bulliung, dated March 31, 2010
13. Letter from Daniel Amir, dated July 6, 2010
14. Letter from Margot Geitheim, dated July 8, 2010
15. Letter from Holly Hudson and Christopher Berg, dated July 10, 2010
16. Letter from Alexander and Marlis Miglietta, dated July 13, 2010
17. Letter from Ann Hunt, dated July 20, 2010
18. Letter from Margot Geitheim, dated July 27, 2010
19. Letter from Marti Andrews, dated July 28, 2010
20. Letter from Anne Lettrich, dated July 28, 2010
21. Letter from Karen Rose, dated August 4, 2010
22. Letter from Jan Vazquez, dated August 4, 2010
23. Submitted plans from Adobe Associates and Miles Berger

Prepared By: Daniel M. Watrous, Planning Manager

\\shared\planning\pc\staff reports\2010\August 11 meeting\Trestle Glen Circle CMP.report.doc