

Meeting summary, March 21, 2013 11:00 a.m. – 11:55 a.m. at city hall

Attendees: City: Niroop Srivatsa, Planning & Building Director; Tony Coe, City Engineer
HVHIA: Don Thielke, Richard Kostyrka, Ed Bradley, Scott Christie

Purpose: Informational –the Lennar development review process

Planning related topics:

- RE the “15%” low income housing component in the project:
 - Housing Element is the only part of the City’s General Plan that requires State approval and Certification
 - ABAG (Association of bay area governments) is the regional agency which allocates the housing element quantities to cities, and Lafayette was allotted 400 units over the next 8 years (=”RHNA” regional housing needs allocation)
 - the 400 units are divided into 4 income levels, :
 - based on county 95K median income for a 4 person family currently
 - very low income family makes 50% median
 - lower income 50-80%
 - moderate 80-120%
 - above moderate over 120%
 - City is required to provide an inventory of housing sites and cannot prevent housing development
 - City had relied on redevelopment funding in projects to impose such requirements, but now that State took away redevelopment, City must impose where it can on developments that come in
 - to meet the RHNA, City does on an inclusionary basis (rather than a segregated all low income housing). For example, the x-Hungry Hunter site (Signature Properties development) has 3 (low income) units
 - For Lennar, this translates to 15% of the 70 units = 10
- RE the State’s Density bonus ordinance- only kicks in if over a threshold % affordable housing is in the project and it is likely that the 15% proposed by Lennar does not trigger. (If it is triggered , the project is eligible for certain concessions or waivers)
- Lennar went from a 47 townhome project (no commercial) to a 70 unit condo plus a retail (restaurant) to meet some requests/feedback from the city study session to have an “activated” retail corner
- Per CEQA process, an initial study checklist is done for the project, and depending on findings, it could be found that-
 - exempt (e.g. home addition project)
 - Negative Declaration
 - Mitigated Neg Dec (Woodbury and Lafayette Mercantile projects had this)
 - EIR (unlikely for this project)
- When Lennar submits an application to the city, it will ask for:
 - Design review
 - subdivision approval
- no land use permit as consistent with Zoning in City (use by right in downtown area)
- max units per acre is 35, so with a 2 acre site, 70 units is the max
- Re access points- city would evaluate these factors:
 - traffic and circulation
 - frontage

- meeting with Lennar: city encourages applicant to discuss project with community. typically occurs after application is submitted (which has not yet happened). She will contact Lennar as to email contacts. Believes in face to fact meetings. Not appropriate for city to participate in such meeting at this point, as they are the regulator.

Traffic Engineering related topics:

- Protocol here is typical for Lennar- first they do CEQA review (initial study) which includes a traffic study
 - Level of service and operational factors (review of signalized intersection at Dolores/Mt. D)
 - review project plan (configuration, entrance/exits, and trip generation)
 - will include study intersections to be discussed with city (Dolores/Mt. D and possibly others)
 - then assess level of impact
 - for a project this size, would expect to look at:
 - existing condition
 - existing plus project
 - The above cases are reviewed, and if a significant or noticeable impact, cumulative scenarios are also analyzed:
 - cumulative without project
 - cumulative plus project
 - cumulative assumes all city built out per General Plan
 - cumulative –typically looks at traffic modeling background conditions at future horizon date per county forecast 2035?
 - city will review and comment when it is presented to circulation committee; public comment is also welcome
- Note re traffic counting tubes placed on Dolores (north of the office bldg. driveway) earlier this month – that was just part of the data which only covers one segment. Tube only counts one link or segment of interest – this will be combined with turning movement counts at the intersection of Mt. D and Dolores –a person counts all movements during peak hours.
- Understood that more cars would exacerbate operational problems, like delivery truck partially or fully blocking Dolores.
- Crosswalk on Dolores – city would ask that study look at sight distance and other issues and possible mitigations

Other comments:

- Dick brought up concern re safety/risk management with underground parking with one access point.