

3.2 LAND USE AND PLANNING

3.2.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is located on Burton Ridge, one of two prominent ridgelines in the City of Lafayette. Burton Ridge is designated a Class I Ridge in the City of Lafayette *General Plan (General Plan)* and is characterized by steep slopes, grass covered hillsides, scattered native and non-native trees, and several prominent swales and knolls. Except for a cellular communications facility and a fire access road, the project site is undeveloped, composed primarily of open grasslands that are used for livestock grazing. The project site is surrounded by single-family residential uses to the west and south; undeveloped land to the north; and the Rossmoor residential community in the City of Walnut Creek to the east. A PG&E electrical transfer station and an East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) water tank are located adjacent to the project site's southern property line.

3.2.2 Regulatory Setting

3.2.2.1 City of Lafayette General Plan

The *General Plan* is based on the following four guiding principles:

- Preserve and enhance the character of Lafayette as a semi rural community;
- Create and maintain a strong sense of community in Lafayette;
- Protect the natural and scenic quality of our surrounding hillsides and ridgelines, creek areas, trees and other vegetation; and
- Encourage the involvement of citizen volunteers in land use and policy planning.

Land Use Designation

The *General Plan* designates the project site as Rural Residential Single Family, which is described as follows.

Rural Residential: This designation is intended to retain hillsides in as nearly a natural condition as is feasible while allowing residential development which is subordinate to and supportive of preserving scenic views and the natural hillside character of the area. Houses shall be sited, designed and of such a size so as to blend into the natural environment and have minimal impacts on it. Visibility of any development shall be kept to a minimum. Development density shall not exceed 0.1 dwelling units per acre.

General Plan Policies

The *General Plan* contains a variety of goals and policies. Section 3.2.3.3 (General Plan Policy Analysis) lists the policies that are applicable to the proposed project and analyzes the project's consistency with applicable policies.

3.2.2.2 City of Lafayette Zoning Regulations

The project site is zoned Low Density Residential - 10 (L-R-10) and Hillside Overlay District (H-O-D). The sections of the City of Lafayette Municipal Code (LMC) that would regulate development of the

project site are described below. Section 3.2.3.4 (Zoning Analysis) analyzes project conformance with the applicable zoning provisions of the LMC, particularly the Hillside Development regulations. The analysis is based on the project with the addition of mitigation outlined in this EIR.

Low Density Residential District (L-R-10)

According to Section 6-7202 of the LMC, the purpose of the L-R-10 District is to:

- a. Provide for areas of low-density residential uses consistent with the General Plan and with the City's primary objective of preservation and enhancement of its semi-rural residential character;
- b. Promote the health, safety and welfare of the community by protecting the land in the L-R-10 District from uses that would disturb the natural environment and increase geologic, pedologic, seismic, hydrologic or other inherent hazards; and
- c. Preserve and maintain the scenic, recreational, biotic, historic and other resources of land in the L-R-10 District.

LMC Section 6-7203 identifies the following as permitted uses within the L-R-10 District:

- a. A single-family residence and an accessory structure and use normally auxiliary to it;
- b. The keeping of livestock, consistent with recognized principles of range management and in compliance with Sections 6-523 and 6-524;
- c. Small farming, including the raising of poultry or rabbits or other grain-fed rodents exclusively for home consumption in compliance with Section 6-524; and
- d. A home occupation.

Chapter 6-20: Hillside Development

LMC Chapter 6-20, Hillside Development, regulates the development of hillsides and ridgelines. According to LMC Section 6-2001(B), the purpose of the Chapter is to:

- a. Maintain the semi-rural character and beauty of the City by preserving its open and uncluttered topographic features in their natural state;
- b. Encourage an alternate approach to conventional flat land development practices;
- c. Minimize grading and cut-and-fill operations consistent with the retention of the natural character of the hillsides;
- d. Achieve land use densities in keeping with the General Plan while retaining the significant natural features of hillside areas through densities that diminish as the slope of terrain increases;
- e. Minimize water runoff and soil erosion when terrain is graded to meet on-site and off-site development needs;
- f. Maintain steep slopes, riparian areas and woodlands in as nearly natural a condition as is feasible;
- g. Prohibit development on significant ridgelines and prohibit development which when viewed from lower elevations protrudes above these ridgelines;

- h. Preserve the predominant views both from and of the hillsides;
- i. Regulate the development of hillside and ridgeline areas by imposing standards for ridgeline setbacks, streets, trails and other improvements consistent with the purpose of this Chapter; and
- j. Regulate the development of hillside and ridgeline areas in a manner so as not to take private property without just compensation.

The main regulations and policies from the Hillside Development Chapter that relate to the proposed project are described below.

Article 2: Hillside Overlay District:

Article 2 of Chapter 6-20 establishes the Hillside Overlay District. According to LMC Section 6-2011, the Hillside Overlay District is “intended to protect the health, safety and welfare of the City by establishing regulations for the development of ridgeline, hillside and other rural residential areas within the City. The District is created and established to implement the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan that relate to hillside and ridgeline development, development hazards and protection of open space lands and hillside residential areas.”

The Hillside Overlay District is an overlay-zoning district that adds additional regulations, policies and requirements to the established regulations of the principal or underlying land use district. For example, the development of property that is zoned Low Density Residential and that is located in the Hillside Overlay District would be regulated by the policies and standards of both the Low Density Residential Zone and the Hillside Overlay District.

According to LMC Section 6-2014 of Chapter 6-20, the uses permitted in the Hillside Overlay District are those uses permitted in the underlying principal zoning district. Furthermore, according to LMC Section 6-2015, development within the Hillside Overlay District requires a Hillside Development Permit, as prescribed in Article 6, Sections 6-2061 et seq.

Article 3: Ridgeline Protection

Article 3 establishes three classes of protected ridges in the City (Class I, Class II and Class III). The classification of a protected ridge is based on its location, height, significance in relation to other nearby topographic features, and the impact that development on or near the ridgeline would have on scenic views and the protection of open space, wildlife corridors, native grasslands, oak woodlands, chaparral and riparian areas. LMC Section 6-2023 establishes the following restrictions on Class I and II Ridgelines:

- a. Class I Ridge setback: No development may take place within 400 feet (measured in plan view) of the centerline of a Class I Ridge.
- b. Class II Ridge setback: No development may take place within 250 feet (measured in plan view) of the centerline of a Class II Ridge.
- c. Declination. No portion of a structure may be erected adjacent to a Class I or Class II Ridge that is higher than a plane sloping downward at a declination of 15 degrees from the horizontal intercept of the ridge. The measurement shall be made at the nearest point of the development to the ridgeline and measured perpendicular to the

ridgeline or as a radius from the endpoint of the ridgeline. The declination line terminates at the boundary line of the Hillside Overlay District.

According to LMC Section 6-2025, the following activities are exempt from the development restriction listed above:

- a. A development proposal for a structure that received approval before July 8, 2002;
- b. A fence of an open agricultural nature approved by the manager;
- c. An activity required in the interest of public safety such as removal of poisonous or noxious plants, the controlled removal or thinning of vegetation as a part of a fire protection program required by the fire district, or other public safety purpose approved by the manager;
- d. Construction of a trail which comprises a component of the City's adopted Master Trails Map or adopted regional trail plan;
- e. Construction of a road and attendant utilities that cross a ridge if the Planning Commission finds that the crossing is necessary for orderly development.

According to LMC Section 6-2028, new or replacement vegetation in a restricted ridgeline area described in LMC Section 6-2023 must be native to the surrounding area and must be approved by the Planning and Building Services Manager, after review by the City's landscape consultant or as approved in the Hillside Development Permit approval process. This requirement does not apply to a restricted area within 100 feet of a home that existed on December 8, 1993.

Article 5: Development Requirements for Subdivisions in the Hillside Overlay District

Article 5 applies to proposed subdivisions in the Hillside Overlay District. As described in LMC Section 6-2041, the purpose and intent of Article 5 are as follows:

- a. The City recognizes the intrinsic value and sensitive nature of its scenic hillsides and major ridgelines. They constitute significant natural topographical features and comprise a large part of the natural open space and rural residential areas of the City because of their physical dominance of the City's landscape.
- b. Clustered development provides an opportunity for development that best serves the purpose of preserving the City's hillsides and ridgelines.
- c. By minimizing grading for roads and grouping dwelling units in areas where visibility to the public is minimal, habitat for wildlife and vegetation can be protected, usable public open space can be provided and hillsides can be maintained in as nearly natural a condition as feasible consistent with development.
- d. Each property has its own unique characteristics, including but not limited to topography, tree-cover and visual impact. The regulations in this article are intended to provide flexibility in the treatment of the development of individual properties as indicated by their uniqueness rather than to provide a fixed set of strict standards applicable in the same manner to all properties.
- e. These regulations are intended to allow a diversity in the relationship of buildings, structures, lot sizes, building site requirements and open spaces while ensuring compliance with the General Plan and observing adequate standards necessary to

satisfy the requirements of the public health, safety and general welfare without unduly inhibiting the advantages of integrated site planning.

The main development regulations of Article 5 are described below.

Lot Area and Density

According to Section LMC 6-2043, the maximum density in the Hillside Overlay District for a subdivision approved after July 8, 2002, is the maximum density permitted in the underlying land use district (0.1 dwelling units per acre in this case) or as shown in Table 3.2-1 (Maximum Permitted Density in the Hillside Overlay District by Slope), whichever is less.

Table 3.2-1: Maximum Permitted Density in the Hillside Overlay District by Slope

Average Slope	Maximum Density*	Average Slope	Maximum Density*
15 – 15.9%	1.43 du / acre	28 – 28.9%	0.42 du / acre
16 – 16.9%	1.25 du / acre	29 – 29.9%	0.38 du / acre
17 – 17.9%	1.11 du / acre	30 – 30.9%	0.36 du / acre
18 – 18.9%	1.00 du / acre	31 – 31.9%	0.32 du / acre
19 – 19.9%	0.91 du / acre	32 – 32.9%	0.29 du / acre
20 – 20.9%	0.83 du / acre	33 – 33.9%	0.26 du / acre
21 – 21.9%	0.77 du / acre	34 – 34.9%	0.23 du / acre
22 – 22.9%	0.71 du / acre	35 – 35.9%	0.20 du / acre
23 – 23.9%	0.67 du / acre	36 – 36.9%	0.17 du / acre
24 – 24.9%	0.63 du / acre	37 – 37.9%	0.14 du / acre
25 – 25.9%	0.56 du / acre	38 – 38.9%	0.13 du / acre
26 – 26.9%	0.50 du / acre	39 – 39.9%	0.11 du / acre
27 – 27.9%	0.45 du / acre	40% and over	0.10 du / acre
du = dwelling unit(s) * The density calculator disregards any fractional remainder in the calculated number of dwelling units. Source: City of Lafayette Municipal Code			

There is no minimum lot area requirement for new lots created within the Hillside Overlay District, However, the total number of lots in the subdivision cannot exceed the specified density.

Clustering

According to LMC Section 6-2046, development within a subdivision in the Hillside Overlay District must be clustered in a manner consistent with the purpose and intent of LMC Section 6-2041 and with findings required in LMC Section 6-2071. The lots may not exceed the density established by LMC Section 6-2043. The interior setbacks of each clustered lot within a subdivision are the setbacks established by an approved subdivision map and are set forth in recorded covenants, conditions and restrictions. The exterior setbacks (setbacks that abut properties adjacent to the project) are the setbacks of the underlying zoning district.

Building Site Requirements and Exceptions

According to LMC Section 6-2047, each lot must have a suitable naturally contoured building site of thirty percent or less slope. A “naturally” contoured building site does not include a man-made site unless it was created through a permit process before January 1, 1988. The following standards apply to each building site:

- a. Each structure, including access facility such as a parking apron or required fire equipment turn-around, shall be sited so as to require minimal grading and to preserve the natural features of the site such as swales, rock outcroppings and vegetation;
- b. Construction shall take place within the designated 30 percent slope area with the exception of:
 1. An access road or driveway (not parking area) which shall be designed to require minimum grading;
 2. An ancillary structure, such as deck supported by posts or cantilevered, and where the natural grade is undisturbed;
- c. The 30 percent slope area shall be of reasonably regular configuration; and
- d. A conceptual siting, massing and design study is required where the 30 percent slope area is less than 15,000 square feet.

Off-Site Visibility

LMC Section 6-2048 establishes off-site visibility requirements for proposed subdivisions in hillside area. The section requires each structure to be “located away from a prominent location such as a ridgeline, hilltop, knoll or open slope and shall be substantially concealed by vegetation or existing terrain when viewed from lower elevations from publicly owned property (including freeways, roadways, open space, parks and trails).” In addition, within 100 feet of a restricted ridgeline area (ridgeline setback) or where an exception is granted to allow development within a ridgeline setback, each structure is required to be substantially concealed by existing vegetation or terrain when viewed from lower elevations from publicly owned property (including freeways, roadways, open space, parks and trails). The requirements of LMC Section 6-2048 are intended to protect views of the open and highly visible portions of the scenic hillsides and ridgelines so that they appear essentially undeveloped as viewed from below the dwelling.

Trails

Where applicable, LMC Section 6-2049 requires proposed subdivisions to provide portions of a trail that is designated either on the City’s adopted Master Trails Map or an adopted regional trail plan. The trail is to be dedicated and improved as allowed by law in accordance with adopted City standards.

Steep Slopes

LMC Section 6-2050 prohibits grading; the removal or alteration of a natural feature such as a stream, rock outcrop, ridgeline, or drainage swale; and the removal of vegetation or other activity related to the preparation of the site for development in areas of a lot that have a slope in excess of 35 percent. However, the following exceptions apply:

- a. As may be required in the interest of public safety, such as the removal of poisonous or noxious plants, the controlled removal or thinning of vegetation as a part of a fire protection program required by the fire district, or other public safety purpose approved by the Planning and Building Services Manager;
- b. Provision for a trail comprising a component of the City's adopted Master Trails Plan or an adopted regional trail plan; or
- c. When the Planning Commission finds that an exception is necessary in order to provide the least-intensive or least damaging access to an approved building site.

Vegetation

LMC Section 6-2051 requires that new or replacement vegetation in an area adjacent to open space and natural areas (such as oak woodland, chaparral, grassland and riparian areas) to be native to the surrounding area. However, plantings for erosion control or land stabilization do not have to be native.

Open Space, Scenic and Conservation Easements

LMC Section 6-2052 gives the Planning Commission the authority to require the dedication of open space, scenic and/or conservation easements to protect natural riparian vegetation, terrain, a scenic vista, trail corridor, stream or watercourse, wildlife, or other area of ecological significance or to limit a drainage or erosion problem. The section does not specify a required percentage of open space. However, the development must be planned and designed for the preservation of open space and the open space must be a significant feature of the development. Open space areas are required to be planned in mass rather than in "left-over" fragments and must be physically and visually linked to form a system of open space to the extent feasible. Where appropriate, trails should link the open spaces.

Utilities

LMC Section 6-2053 requires all utilities to be installed underground in accordance with applicable underground utility ordinances and with the rules and regulations of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

Streets

LMC Section 6-2054 requires each street right-of-way (ROW) to conform to adopted City standards. However, the Planning Commission may permit a pavement width less than the adopted standard for a two-way street after consideration of each of the following factors:

- a. Steepness of terrain;
- b. Depth of cut, amount of cut-and-fill required, height, and appearance of required retaining walls;
- c. Type and quantity of trees and vegetation, either existing or required to be installed;
- d. Ability to grade required cut-and-fill areas to give the appearance of a natural slope;
- e. Ability to landscape cut-and-fill areas to give the appearance of a natural slope;
- f. Existence of off-street parking to compensate for parking not provided on the street;
- g. Existence of adequate turn-arounds every 500 to 1,000 feet;

- h. Adequacy of sight distance and safety of driveway entrances;
- i. The maximum number of homesites that can ultimately be served by the street; and
- j. Whether the street is or can become a through street.

Fire Safety

LMC Section 6-2055 requires each dwelling unit to be accessible by a road or driveway that adequately meets fire safety requirements. A narrow road or driveway is preferred in order to protect valuable trees or to minimize grading. However, Fire Department standards require fire equipment turn-around areas, fire hydrants, and access to large, isolated areas.

Additional Requirements

LMC Section 6-2056 gives the Planning Commission the authority to impose additional requirements if it finds that the parcel requires protection because of its prominence and location, or determines that there may be exceptional hazards to its development.

Article 6. Hillside Development Permit Approval Process

General Findings for a Hillside Development Permit

Pursuant to LMC Section 6-2067, the following findings are required to approve a Hillside Development Permit:

- a. The development is consistent with the applicable goals and policies of the General Plan and is in conformance with applicable zoning regulations;
- b. The development will preserve open space and physical features, including rock outcroppings and other prominent geological features, streams, streambeds and ponds, native vegetation, native riparian vegetation, animal habitats and other natural features;
- c. The development and each associated improvement is located and designed to complement the natural terrain and landscape of the site and surrounding properties, and relates to the development pattern, including density and distribution, of the surrounding neighborhood;
- d. Structures in a Hillside Overlay District will, to the extent feasible, be located away from prominent locations such as ridgelines, hilltops, knolls and open slopes;
- e. Development grading will be minimized to reduce cut and fill, preserve existing geologic features, topographic conditions and existing vegetation, reduce short and long-term erosion, slides and flooding, and abate visual impacts;
- f. Each structure proposed complies with the City's Residential Design Guidelines, and development landscaping will ensure visual relief and complement each proposed structure to provide an attractive environment;
- g. The development will not create a nuisance, hazard or enforcement problem within the neighborhood or the City, nor require the City to provide an unusual or disproportionate level of public services; and

- h. The new or replacement vegetation for the development is native to the surrounding area in areas abutting open space and natural areas, such as oak woodland, chaparral, grassland and riparian areas, excluding planting for erosion control or land stabilization.

Findings Required to Grant Exception Permitting Development within a Class I Ridgeline Setback

LMC Section 6-2068 identifies the following findings required to grant exceptions permitting development within a Class I ridgeline setback:

- a. The strict application of Section 6-2023 has the effect of depriving the property of all economically viable use;
- b. The density does not exceed the density permitted by the underlying zoning district or the slope density formula, whichever is less; and,
- c. The density permitted does not exceed that necessary to provide the property with an economically viable use.

Findings Required to Grant Exception Permitting Development within a Class II Ridgeline Setback

According to LMC Section 6-2069, to grant an exception to the prohibition of development on a Class II ridge imposed by LMC Section 6-2023 or on a Class III ridge imposed by LMC Section 6-2024, the Planning Commission must find either that:

- a. Special conditions and unique characteristics of the subject property exist and a site plan and design is such that the proposed development would provide a result that satisfies the policies in Sections 6-2067 and 6-2070 or 6-2071, as the case may be, and that would otherwise satisfy the strict standards of Section 6-2023 or 6-2024; or
- b. An exception is necessary to allow an economically viable use of the property and the development meets the standards Section 6-2070 or 6-2071, as the case may be. In granting an exception under this subsection the density:
 1. Shall not exceed the density permitted by the slope density formula or the underlying zoning district, whichever is less; and
 2. Shall not exceed that necessary to avoid an unconstitutional taking of the property.

Findings Required for Approval of Subdivision in the Hillside Overlay District

The findings required to approve a subdivision in the Hillside Overlay District are the findings set forth in LMC Section 6-2067 and the following findings:

- a. The design of the subdivision and the proposed development are derived from naturally contoured sites of reasonably regular configuration, do not create building sites on slopes exceeding 30 percent nor result in the need for construction of primary structures outside the areas of 30 percent or less slopes;
- b. The design of the subdivision and the proposed development will result in each structure being substantially concealed, as required by LMC Section 2-2048, when viewed from lower elevations from publicly owned property (including freeways,

- roadways, open space, parks and trails), using the viewing elevation map as a guide to establish locations from which views are considered;
- c. The design of the subdivision provides for a trail or portions of trails in conformance with the City's adopted Master Trails Map or an adopted regional trail plan, and the trail is dedicated and conditioned for improvement in accordance with adopted standards;
 - d. The design of the subdivision and proposed development use clustering or other site planning techniques to preserve hillsides, ridgelines and open space, minimize grading and impacts on wildlife habitats to the extent feasible, and provide for the preservation of on-site open space and vegetation, terrain, scenic vistas, trail corridors, streams or water courses, or other areas of ecological significance through dedication, easement, land trust or suitable regulation;
 - e. The design of the subdivision and the proposed development are arranged so that no portion of the lot exceeding a slope of 35 percent, is proposed to be altered by grading removal or alteration of a natural feature, the removal of vegetation or other activity related to the preparation of the site for development, except fire protection, or other measures necessary for public safety, slope or geologic stabilization or the provision of a trail in conformance with the City's adopted Master Trails Map or an adopted regional trail plan or where the Planning Commission finds that an exception is necessary to provide the least intrusive or damaging access to an approved building site;
 - f. The development, including site design and the location and massing of all structures and improvements, will preserve the open and uncluttered topography of the City, and not interfere with a ridgeline corridor or compromise the open space or scenic character of the corridor;
 - g. Each proposed house location and the location of each related structure is sited to minimize loss of privacy and not unduly impact, restrict or block significant views;
 - h. The design of streets, streetlights, storm drainage, utilities and other common improvements incorporated into the subdivision comply with adopted City standards and are designed to preserve the character of the site and surrounding area, minimize visual impact and avoid adverse impacts on surrounding properties and neighborhoods;
 - i. Street right of way incorporated into the design of the subdivision is based on the following conditions;
 1. Steepness of terrain;
 2. Depth of cut, amount of cut and fill, height and appearance of retaining walls;
 3. Type and quantity of existing and proposed trees and vegetation;
 4. Ability to give the appearance of a natural slope after grading and landscaping;
 5. Adequacy of off-street parking to compensate for any lack of on-street parking;
 6. Adequacy of required turn-around spaces every 500 – 1,000 feet;
 7. Adequacy of sight-distances around curves and near driveway entrances;
 8. Number of home sites to be served by the street;

9. Potential for future extension of the street; and
- j. The design of the subdivision and the proposed development provide adequate emergency vehicle access, including turn-around space, to each building site and surrounding undeveloped areas, while protecting valuable trees, minimizing grading and preserving the natural hillside character of the site and vicinity.

3.2.3 Environmental Analysis

3.2.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The proposed project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Physically divide an established community;
- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

3.2.3.2 Impacts and Mitigation

Potential Impact 3.2-1: Would the proposed project physically divide an established community? (No Impact)

The proposed project would not divide an established community. In general, projects that introduce physical barriers that divide an existing community into separate areas or districts have the potential to result in significant impacts. An example of this type of project would be the construction of a freeway or highway through an established residential neighborhood. The proposed project would not involve the construction of any physical barriers through an existing community. The 87.90-acre project site is primarily undeveloped, except for a cellular communications facility and a fire access road and is planned for low-density single-family residential uses. Development of eight single-family residences on the proposed project site would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact. No mitigation is required.

Potential Impact 3.2-2: Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Potentially Significant Impact)

The City's *General Plan* outlines policies that govern development in ways that reflect the community's values and protect the City's environment. The proposed project's consistency with applicable policies of the *General Plan* is presented below in Table 3.1-2 (General Plan Policy Analysis). As proposed, the project is not wholly consistent with applicable *General Plan* policies. Potential impacts could occur. Mitigation would be required in some instances to ensure consistency with applicable *General Plan* policies (as identified throughout Chapter 3) and reduce impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the following mitigation measure would further reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-2a: Prior to Final Map approval, the project sponsor shall submit for review and approval a master plan and design guidelines for the proposed project consistent with the *Lucas Ranch Master Plan and Design Review Guidelines Report (Master Plan and Design Guidelines)* prepared by Zimmerman Welschmeyer Architects (December 25, 1999).

Mitigation Measure 3.2-2b: Plans for each new home, including lot grading, architecture, exterior colors and materials, lighting and landscaping shall be subject to review and approval through the City's Design Review and Hillside Development Permit process.

Potential Impact 3.2-3: Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or other natural community conservation plan? (No Impact)

There are no habitat conservation or community conservation plans that apply to the project site. There would be no impact. No mitigation is required.

3.2.3.3 General Plan Policy Analysis

Table 3.2-2 presents an analysis of project consistency with the applicable policies of the *General Plan*.

Table 3.2-2. General Plan Policy Analysis

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
Land Use		
<p><u>Policy LU-1.1 Scale:</u> Development shall be compatible with the scale and pattern of existing neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. Although the project includes custom homes on lots larger than those typically found in Burton Valley, the proposed project would include a <i>Master Plan</i> and <i>Design Guidelines</i> for the future construction of homes.</p> <p>The <i>Design Guidelines</i> propose providing a transition between the existing residential neighborhood and the natural topography of the hillside, by proposing two “Area Overlays.” The Area Overlays are differentiated by their elevation, environmental integration with the natural topography and vegetation, and adjacency to existing residential uses. The 675-foot elevation line is the boundary between Area 1 and Area 2. Homesites below the 675-foot elevation (Area 1) would have minor visibility and would be predominantly in areas near existing residential uses. Because of this, Area 1 would provide guidelines that would create a visual and physical transition between the adjacent residential neighborhood and the homes in Area 2. In Area 1, traditional residential forms and styles that are typical of ranch, bungalow, prairie, and other traditional architectural styles that embody outdoor living would be allowed.</p> <p>The intent of Area 2 (above the 675-foot elevation and further away from the adjacent existing traditional neighborhoods) is to encourage forms and styles that fit well with the natural environment while retaining detail and articulation. In general, hip and gable roof shapes (traditional forms) are discouraged, while shed and parapeted roof shapes are encouraged. In general, the form of the houses should be designed to be visually subordinate to the topography and natural environment.</p> <p>To ensure that development of the project site is compatible with the scale and pattern of existing neighborhoods, new homes shall be subject to the City’s Design Review and Hillside Development Permit process.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.2-2a and 3.2-2b.</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-1.2 Design:</u> Development should respect the architectural character of the neighborhood.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. The project has been designed with the intent of integrating the project with the existing environment and preserving the scenic qualities of the site (both off- and on-site views). The proposed project would include <i>Design Guidelines</i> for the future construction of custom homes on the site. The <i>Design Guidelines</i> are intended to minimize the visual impacts of the development of custom homes on the site by controlling building form and orientation, the location and extent of yard landscaping, the design of retaining walls, and the maintenance of large areas of natural terrain and landscaping.</p> <p>The residential neighborhoods located to the west and south of the project site primarily consist of homes designed in traditional architectural styles. One of the goals of the proposed project’s <i>Design Guidelines</i> is to provide a</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.2-2a and 3.2-2b.</p>

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
	<p>transition between the existing residential neighborhood and the natural topography of the hillside by creating two distinct “Area Overlays,” as described above in Policy LU-1.1.</p> <p>In Area 1 (closest to adjacent existing traditional neighborhoods), traditional residential forms and styles that are typical of ranch, bungalow, prairie, and other traditional architectural styles that embody outdoor living would be allowed.</p> <p>Homesites above the 675-foot elevation (Area 2) would be more visibly apparent than homesites in Area 1 and, therefore would have additional environmental design constraints. The intent of Area 2 is to encourage forms and styles that fit well with the natural environment while retaining detail and articulation. In general, hip and gable roof shapes (traditional forms) would be discouraged, while shed and parapeted roof shapes would be encouraged. In general, the form of the houses should be designed to be visually subordinate to the topography and natural environment.</p> <p>To ensure that the custom homes respect the architectural character of the neighborhood, new homes shall be subject to the City’s Design Review and Hillside Development Permit process.</p>	
<p><u>Policy LU-1.3 Privacy:</u> Development shall respect the privacy of neighbors.</p>	<p>Consistent. The proposed custom homes would be sited and oriented pursuant to the project’s <i>Master Plan</i>. One of the design goals of the <i>Master Plan</i> is to site and orient each custom home to optimize privacy between adjacent homesites. In all cases, the development of each lot and home would require approval by the City.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.2-2a and 3.2-2b.</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-2.1 Density of Hillside Development:</u> Land use densities should not adversely affect the significant natural features of hill areas.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project proposes 0.1 dwelling units per acre (or one unit per ten acres), consistent with the Rural Residential land use designation of the site. Furthermore, one of the basic criteria of the proposed project’s <i>Master Plan</i> and <i>Design Guidelines</i> is orientation of buildings in a manner that would minimize cut-and-fill operations.</p> <p>The <i>Master Plan</i> and <i>Design Guidelines</i> propose accomplishing this by orienting buildings either parallel or perpendicular to the grade of the slope. Parallel-sloped homes would be long and narrow, with the length of the home running parallel to the slope or topography. Perpendicular-sloped homes would also be long and narrow, but with the length of the home running perpendicular to the slope or topography.</p> <p>The proposed project would cluster seven of the eight proposed homes in the southern portion of the project site, while the eighth home would be located further north. Clustering the subdivision would allow the preservation of approximately 59.62 acres of open hillside (approximately 68 percent of the project site).</p> <p>Development of the proposed project would result in approximately 17,000 cubic yards (cy) of cut and approximately 17,000 cy of fill to balance earth-moving activities.</p> <p>No other significant features of the natural topography, such as rock outcroppings or oak woodland, would be removed.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-2.2 Cluster Development:</u></p>	<p>Consistent. The proposed project would cluster seven of the</p>	<p>No mitigation is</p>

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
<p>Preserve important visual and functional open space by requiring development to be clustered on the most buildable portions of lots, minimizing grading for building sites and roads.</p>	<p>eight proposed homes in the southern portion of the project site, while the eighth home would be located further north. Clustering the subdivision would allow the preservation of approximately 59.62 acres of open hillside (approximately 68 percent of the project site).</p> <p>Although the Vesting Tentative Map identifies an open space parcel, it is not shown as being protected by a conservation easement.</p> <p>Therefore, as a condition of project approval, the project sponsor would be required to enter into an agreement with the City to establish a conservation or open space easement for the 59.62 acre parcel that is not proposed for development.</p> <p>In addition, to permanently protect portions of the private residential lots from development and retain those lands as open space, the project sponsor would be required to enter into an agreement with the City (as a condition of project approval) to establish conservation easements for portions of the private residential lots that are not proposed for development.</p> <p>Conservation or open space easements would be used to permanently protect these areas from development, grading, or vegetation removal.</p>	<p>required. As a condition of project approval, conservation easements would be required to permanently protect areas of open space.</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-2.3 Preservation of Views:</u> Structures in the hillside overlay area shall be sited and designed to be substantially concealed when viewed from below from publicly owned property. The hillsides and ridgelines should appear essentially undeveloped, to the maximum extent feasible.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. The proposed project is located on a prominent hillside that is visible from public viewpoints at lower elevations. The portions of the project site that have been proposed for development contain open and visible hillsides and ridgelines. One of the goals of the proposed <i>Master Plan and Design Guidelines</i> is to minimize the visual impacts of the construction of custom homes on the site by controlling building form and orientation. Special design techniques that would be implemented include orienting the homes either parallel or perpendicular to the grade of the slope. Perpendicular-sloped homes would have split levels to integrate the mass of the home with the sloping topography.</p> <p>Additionally, most of the project would be clustered on the southern portion of the site near the terminus of Lucas Drive, except for Lot 8, which would be more centrally located at the terminus of Lucas Circle. Therefore, much of the hillside and ridgeline area (approximately 68 percent) would be undeveloped and would remain in its natural state. When viewed from many of the locations identified on the City’s Viewing Evaluation Map, the area of the project site proposed for development is blocked by topography, residences, landscaping and/or natural vegetation. The visual analysis contained in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics) of this Draft EIR studied the project from four public view points and found that many of the homes would be concealed when viewed from below.</p> <p>Furthermore, mitigation would reduce impacts associated with preservation of views.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a and 3.3-1-b, in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics).</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-3.1 Design:</u> Development should be characterized by good functional design.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Hillside Development Permit process includes review of project design to ensure quality and functionality.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-4.1 Infrastructure Design:</u></p>	<p>Consistent. The intent of the proposed project is to integrate</p>	<p>No mitigation is</p>

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
Public and private infrastructure should reinforce the semi-rural qualities of residential neighborhoods.	the development with the existing environment and preserve the scenic qualities of the site (both off- and on-site views). The proposed project would incorporate topographic berms, graveled sidings, boulders, and natural landscape amenities to reduce the visual impacts of conventional hillside grading for roadways and driveways. Retaining walls along the driveways of Lots 6 and 8, if required, would be designed to appear as natural land formations rather than have a traditional vertical design. In addition, LMC Section 6-2053 requires utilities to be installed underground in accordance with applicable underground utilities ordinances and with the rules and regulations of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The proposed project would install all utilities underground, in compliance with LMC Section 6-2053.	required.
<u>Policy LU-6.1: Appropriate Density:</u> Assure that areas formerly designated at a greater maximum number of dwelling units per acre that are now designated “Rural Residential” by the <i>General Plan</i> have the opportunity to seek a density consistent with the California and U.S. Constitutions.	Consistent. The project site is currently designated Rural Residential. As proposed, the project would be consistent with this land use designation, which permits 0.1 dwelling units per acre or a maximum density of eight units.	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy LU-20.1: Traffic Service Standards:</u> Consider the level of service (LOS) goals and standards set forth in the Circulation Chapter when evaluating development proposals.	Consistent. The traffic study prepared for the proposed project, which is summarized in Section 3.11 (Transportation/Traffic), evaluated the proposed project using traffic level of service (LOS) goals and standards in the Circulation Chapter. The LOS on area roadways would not be exceeded as a result of the project.	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy LU-20.4 Fire:</u> Review all development proposals for their impacts on standards for fire service specified in the <i>General Plan</i> : fire stations three miles apart in urban service areas, six miles apart in rural areas, with a five-minute response time. Require fair share payments and/or mitigation measures to ensure that these standards or their equivalent are maintained.	Consistent with Mitigation. Section 3.10 (Public Services, Utilities, and Services Systems) of this EIR reviews the proposed project’s potential impacts on fire service standards specified in the <i>General Plan</i> . Project implementation would not affect the response times or performance objectives of the City’s fire protection services. The project would be required to implement all Contra Costa County Fire Protection District conditions of project approval.	Mitigation Measure 3.10-1, in Section 3.10 (Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems).
<u>Policy LU-20.6 Sewage Treatment and Disposal:</u> Coordinate planning with the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District for the continued availability of adequate sewage collection, treatment, and disposal facilities to meet the needs of future development. The standard for development review shall be the capability to transport and treat residential and non-residential waste, as indicated by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District.	Consistent. The proposed project could adequately be served by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District without the need to increase its system capacity and without impacting its ability to serve existing and future users.	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy LU-20.7 Water:</u> Coordinate planning with the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) to ensure the availability of an adequate potable water supply to meet the needs of the future	Consistent with Mitigation. The project site is currently located within the EBMUD’s ultimate service boundary, but is outside of the current service area. Therefore, the project site would be required to be annexed into the service area of the EBMUD, which would require approval from the Contra	Mitigation Measure 3.10-9, in Section 3.10 (Public Services, Utilities, and

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
<p>population. The standard for development review shall be the capacity to provide sufficient water to all residents and businesses in the City, as indicated by EBMUD.</p>	<p>Costa County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). To provide adequate water to the project and the adjacent residential neighborhood, the project would include construction of a new water main and underground residential water pumps or boosting systems for homes that are above 670 feet in elevation. Prior to construction, the project applicant would be required to incorporate water-conserving features into the project to the satisfaction of EBMUD. This would reduce the project’s incremental increase in demand for domestic water to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Service Systems).</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-20.8 Parks:</u> Apply the maximum standard for parks to new development.</p>	<p>Consistent. The proposed project would be required to comply with all City requirements regarding the provision of parkland or the payment of fees in lieu of the provision of parkland.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-20.9 Solid Waste:</u> Review all development projects for their impacts on the City’s goals contained in the Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element. Require fair share payments and/or mitigation measures to ensure that these standards are not jeopardized.</p>	<p>Consistent. The proposed project would be required to adhere to all applicable provisions of the City’s Source Reduction and Recycling Element, including the recycling of construction debris.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-20.12 Growth Management Implementation:</u> Review development projects for conformance with adopted performance standards and require mitigation measures where necessary to maintain adopted standards. Capital improvements shall be in place at the time of project implementation when necessary to maintain adopted performance standards.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. This EIR would satisfy the requirement of Land Use Policy 20.12.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.10 (Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems).</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-20.14 Storm Drainage:</u> Require new development to mitigate its impact on the storm drainage system.</p>	<p>Consistent. The proposed project would not impact the storm drainage system. The project would be required to comply with all City regulations that pertain to storm drainage.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><u>Policy LU-22.1 Preserve Archaeological Resources:</u> Protect archaeological resources.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. The cultural and paleontological resources study prepared for the proposed project did not identify archaeological resources in the project area. However, paleontological resources and unknown resources could be present. The project would be required to implement mitigation measures identified in Section 3.6 (Cultural Resources) of this EIR to address the potential impact on unknown archaeological and paleontological resources that may be present on the site.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.6-1, 3.6-2, and 3.6-3, in Section 3.6 (Cultural Resources).</p>
Circulation		
<p><u>Policy C-1.2 Level of Service Standards and Goals:</u> Establish the following level of service (LOS) standards and goals. Transportation improvements must be consistent with the community’s strong desire to preserve Lafayette’s unique identity and quality of life. Intersections</p>	<p>Consistent. See discussion above (LU Policy 20.1).</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
outside downtown: LOS standard: Good D; CCTA Standard V/C ratio: 0.80 to 0.84; HCM Goal Stopped Delay At Peak Hours: 25 to 33 Sec.		
<u>Policy C-4.1 Balance Circulation and Land Use Patterns:</u> Limit development to that which can be adequately served by Lafayette’s circulation system.	Consistent. See discussion above (LU Policy 20.1).	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy C-4-2 Traffic Mitigation:</u> Require new developments to pay their fair share of circulation improvements.	Consistent. The proposed project would be required to pay its fair share of roadway improvements deemed necessary to support the proposed use.	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy C-5.1 Protect Irreplaceable Resources:</u> When planning new roads or roadway improvements, protect resources such as open space hillsides, ridgelines, riparian corridors, and recreational facilities. Circulation projects must be consistent with goals and policies of the Open Space and Conservation Element.	Consistent. The intent of the proposed project is to integrate the development with the existing environment and preserve the scenic qualities of the site (both off- and on-site views). The proposed project would incorporate topographic berms, graveled sidings, boulders, and natural landscape amenities to reduce the visual impacts of conventional hillside grading for roadways and driveways.	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy C-5.2 Aesthetics:</u> When planning road and circulation system improvements, require that views of and from the roadway are in keeping with Lafayette’s semi-rural character.	Consistent. See discussion above (Policy C-5.1).	No mitigation is required.
Open Space and Conservation		
<u>Policy OS-1.1 Protection of Major Ridgelines:</u> Preserve Major Ridgelines in their natural state as scenic resources and wildlife corridors.	Consistent with Mitigation. The project site contains Class I and Class II ridgelines. As proposed, three homesites (Lots 3, 7 and 8) would be constructed partially within 400 feet of the Class I ridgeline and two homesites (Lots 2 and 4) would be constructed partially within 250 feet of the Class II ridgeline. The majority of roadway would be constructed within the 250-foot development setback of the Class II ridgeline. Given the constraints of the site (see discussion of the No Exceptions Alternative in Chapter 5 of this EIR), maintenance of the ridgeline setbacks would create more significant impacts in other areas. As previously noted, much of the site, including ridgelines would not be developed and would remain in its natural state as scenic resources and wildlife corridors.	Mitigation Measure 3.3-1, in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics).
<u>Policy OS-1.2 Ridgeline Protection:</u> Protect all ridgelines consistent with their function as scenic resources for the community and as wildlife corridors.	Consistent with Mitigation. See discussion above (OS Policy 1.1). Because much of the site, including ridgelines, would remain in its natural state, animals traveling through the site would have the opportunity to move north - south along Burton Ridge. While the project’s <i>Design Guidelines</i> do not propose any fencing, Mitigation Measure 3.5-4, would ensure that if any fencing is installed by a future homeowner(s) at a later date, enough space would be maintained between fences to facilitate wildlife movement.	Mitigation Measure 3.5-4, in Section 3.5 (Biological Resources).
<u>Policy OS-1.3 Conserve a Variety of Open Space Features:</u> Protect areas of special ecological significance, including ridges, hillsides, woodlands, wildlife corridors, riparian areas, steep slopes, prominent knolls, swales, and rock	Consistent. See discussion above (Policy LU-2.2 and Policy OS-1.1).	No mitigation is required.

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
outcroppings.		
<u>Policy OS-1.4 Specific Open Space Use Criteria:</u> Leave in or restore open space areas to their natural state. Limit uses to those with minimal environmental impact.	Consistent. See discussion above (Policy LU-2.2).	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy OS-1.5 Open Space for Wildlife Habitat:</u> Preserve, protect, and where necessary, restore open space for wildlife habitat to assure the continued viability and health of diverse, natural animal and plant communities.	Consistent. See discussion above (Policy LU-2.2).	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy OS-1.7 Open Space for Wildlife Corridors:</u> Assure that adequate open space is provided to permit effective wildlife corridors for animal movement between open space areas, along watercourses, and on ridges.	Consistent. See discussion above (Policy OS-1.2).	Mitigation Measure 3.5-4, in Section 3.5 (Biological Resources).
<u>Policy OS-3.1 Protect Natural Features of the Lands:</u> The character and natural features of hills, steep slopes, riparian areas, woodlands, and open space areas will be preserved in as natural condition as feasible.	Consistent. See discussion above (Policy LU-2.2).	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy OS-3.2 Preserve the Predominant View of the Hill Areas:</u> Require that structures in identified environmentally sensitive areas be substantially concealed by existing vegetation or terrain when viewed from lower elevations, to the maximum extent feasible.	Consistent with mitigation. See discussion above (Policy LU-2.3)	Mitigation Measure 3.3-1, in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics).
<u>Policy OS-4.1 Riparian Vegetation:</u> Preserve, protect, and restore riparian habitat, particularly the native, riparian woodland species and associated understory plants.	Consistent with Mitigation. The proposed project would comply with the City stream setback guidelines for structures. Nevertheless, the willow riparian area on Lot 1 could experience direct and indirect impacts from its close proximity (12 feet) to the proposed home site. Infrastructure could also adversely affect the stand of willow trees on Lot 1 and those on Lots 5 through 7. The willow riparian areas of Lots 5 through 7 are located 60 to 75 feet away from the proposed homes. Mitigation Measures 3.5-1c, 3.5-1d and 3.5-1e would fully mitigate the impact on willow riparian vegetation to a less than significant level.	Mitigation Measures 3.5-1c, 3.5-1d and 3.5-1e, in Section 3.5 (Biological Resources).
<u>Policy OS-4.2 Ridgelines:</u> Protect native vegetation along ridgelines.	Consistent with Mitigation. The proposed project would not remove native vegetation within the development setback of the Class I or Class II ridgelines. Non-native vegetation would be removed to accommodate the proposed development. Mitigation identified in Section 3.5 (Biological Resources) would ensure that native vegetation within the project site would be protected from the proposed development.	Mitigation Measures 3.5-1a, 3.5-1b, 3.5-1c, 3.5-1d 3.5-1e, 3.5-5a, 3.5-5b, 3.5-5c, and 3.5-5d, in Section 3.5 (Biological Resources).
<u>Policy O-S4.3 Woodlands:</u> Preserve existing woodlands and their associated vegetation.	Consistent. The proposed project would preserve existing on-site woodlands and their associated vegetation.	No mitigation is required.

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
<p><u>Policy OS-4.4 The Developed Landscape:</u> Protect important groves of trees and significant existing vegetation. Encourage the planting of native, drought tolerant and fire resistant species, as well as the planting of herbaceous species that have a high wildlife value. Avoid the cutting of mature trees.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. Mitigation identified in Section 3.5 (Biological Resources) would ensure that the proposed project would have less than significant impacts on existing vegetation. The project sponsor would be required to comply with the current City of Lafayette Efficient Landscape Requirements and Water Conservation Ordinance.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.5-1a, 3.5-1b, 3.5-1c, 3.5-1d 3.5-1e, 3.5-5a, 3.5-5b, 3.5-5c, 3.5-5d, and 3.10.5c, in Section 3.5 (Biological Resources).</p>
<p><u>Policy OS-4.5 Biotic Resource Analysis:</u> Require a biotic resource analysis prior to development of properties located within, or adjacent to, identified environmentally sensitive areas.</p>	<p>Consistent. A biotic resource analysis was conducted for the proposed project and is referenced in Section 3.5 of this Draft EIR.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><u>Policy OS-5.1 Stream bank stability:</u> Protect stream bank stability.</p>	<p>Consistent. Implementation of the proposed project would not impact the perennial drainage and several seasonal drainages located on the project site.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><u>Policy OS-6.1 Reduce Watercourse Pollution:</u> Minimize pollutants in storm water runoff.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. A combination of project design and mitigation measures identified in Section 3.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality) would ensure that the proposed project would meet or exceed all applicable water quality standards.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).</p>
<p><u>Policy OS-7.1 Control Soil Erosion:</u> Control soil erosion to prevent flooding and landslides, maintain water quality, and reduce public costs of flood control and watercourse maintenance.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. See discussion above (Policy OS-6.1).</p>	<p>Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).</p>
<p><u>Policy OS-10.2 Air Quality Standards:</u> Seek to Comply with State and Federal Standards for Air Quality.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. The proposed project would incrementally contribute to PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, and ozone emissions during and after construction. The Bay Area is currently in violation of both Federal and State standards for these constituents; however, the proposed project's contribution to levels of these constituents is expected to be virtually imperceptible within the region's air shed.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.4 (Air Quality).</p>
<p><u>Policy OS-11.1 Energy Conservation Measures in Buildings:</u> Encourage energy conservation in new development and the retrofit of existing structures.</p>	<p>Consistent. The proposed project would be required to comply with all provisions of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). Title 24 establishes minimum performance standards for new buildings with regard to energy conservation and use.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
Parks, Trails and Recreation		
<p><u>Policy P-3.1: Complete the Trail System:</u> Complete the trail system as shown on the Lafayette Master Trails Plan on file at the City offices and the Parks and Recreation Department.</p>	<p>Consistent. The proposed project would include a public hiking trail along Burton Ridge as shown on the Lafayette Master Trails Plan on file at the City offices and the Parks and Recreation Department.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
Safety		
<p><u>Policy S-1.1 Slope and Soil Stability:</u> Consider slope and soil stability when reviewing future projects. Development</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation. A geotechnical study was performed for the proposed project and is referenced in Section 3.7 (Geology and Soils) of this EIR.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures identified in</p>

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
proposals in areas with landslide hazards shall be reviewed by an engineering geologist to determine whether the proposed development is feasible, and to define the required construction standards and mitigation measures.		Section 3.7 (Geology and Soils).
<u>Policy S-1.2 Density and Location of Buildings:</u> Limit building in areas with significant risk potential. Intensity of development shall be minimal in areas of high risk. Consider potential seismic or geologic hazards when determining building density and in siting dwellings.	Consistent with Mitigation. See discussion above (Policy S-1.1).	Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.7 (Geology and Soils).
<u>Policy S-1.3 Roadways and Roadway Improvements:</u> Prohibit new roadways or roadway modifications that would create unstable geological conditions.	Consistent. The proposed project's roadways would not create unstable geologic conditions.	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy S-2.1 Seismic Hazards:</u> New development, including subdivisions, new construction, and remodels or expansions of existing structures, shall minimize exposure to seismic hazards through site planning and building design.	Consistent. The proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current California Building Code and other applicable standards and practices of earthquake resistant construction.	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy S-3.1 Reduce Flood Hazards:</u> Reduce flood risk by maintaining effective flood drainage systems and regulating construction.	Consistent. The proposed project would be required to comply with all City requirements regarding reduction of flood risk.	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy S-3.3 Storm Drainage System:</u> Maintain unobstructed water flow in the storm drainage system.	Consistent with Mitigation. A combination of project design and mitigation measures identified in Section 3.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality) would ensure that the proposed project would maintain unobstructed water flow in the storm drainage system.	Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).
<u>Policy S-4.2 Reducing Fire Risk from Development:</u> Take measures to reduce fire risks from new and existing development as well as natural fire hazards.	Consistent with Mitigation. The proposed project would be required to incorporate all of the conditions of project approval required by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District.	Mitigation Measure 3.10-1, in Section 3.10 (Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems).
<u>Policy S-4.5 Vegetation Management Plan:</u> Require development in a high fire risk area to have an approved vegetation management plan that includes native, drought tolerant, and fire resistant species.	Consistent. The proposed project would be required to comply with all City requirements as they pertain to development in high fire risk areas and preparation of a vegetation management plan.	No mitigation is required.
<u>Policy S-6.1 Consider EMF's in land use decisions:</u> Consider information regarding EMF radiation from existing and new electrical transmission lines and substations in making land use decisions.	Consistent. LMC Section 6-2053 requires utilities to be installed underground in accordance with applicable underground utilities ordinances and with the rules and regulations of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The proposed project would install all utilities underground in compliance with LMC Section 6-2053.	No mitigation is required
<u>Policy S-7.1 Demand for Police Services:</u> Review development proposals for their	Consistent. The proposed project has been reviewed by the City Police Department, who has determined that there are	No mitigation is required.

General Plan Policy	Consistency Determination	Mitigation
demand on police services and require mitigating measures, if necessary, to maintain the community’s standard for police services. Levy police impact fees for capital facilities and equipment, if warranted.	adequate existing resources to serve the proposed project.	
Noise		
<u>Policy N-1.3 Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards:</u> Ensure that all new noise sensitive development proposals be reviewed with respect to Figure 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards. Noise exposure shall be determined through actual onsite noise measurements.	Consistent with Mitigation. The proposed project’s potential noise impacts are reviewed in Section 3.9 (Noise) of this EIR. The proposed project would comply with the City’s established standards for noise exposure with the addition of mitigation identified in Section 3.9 (Noise).	Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.9 (Noise).
<u>Policy N-1.4 Residential and Noise Sensitive Land Use Standards:</u> Require a standard of 40 – 45 LDN (depending on location) for indoor noise levels for all new residential development including hotels and motels, and a standard of 55 LDN for outdoor noise, except near the freeway. These limits shall be reduced by 5 dB for senior housing and residential care facilities.	Consistent with Mitigation. See discussion above (Policy N-1.4).	Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.9 (Noise).
<u>Policy N-2.2 Mitigate Noise Impacts:</u> Mitigate noise impacts to the maximum feasible extent.	Consistent with Mitigation. See discussion above (Policy N-1.4).	Mitigation Measures identified in Section 3.9 (Noise).

3.2.3.4 Zoning Analysis

Table 3.2-3 presents an analysis of project conformity with the applicable provisions of the Lafayette Municipal Code (LMC), particularly the Hillside Development regulations.

Table 3.2-3. Zoning Analysis

Code Section	Compliance Determination	Mitigation
<u>LMC Section 6-2067</u> <u>Findings required for approval of a hillside development permit.</u>		
a. The development is consistent with the applicable goals and policies of the <i>general plan</i> and is in conformance with applicable zoning regulations.	Compliant with Granting of Exceptions. The proposed project would be consistent with the <i>General Plan</i> (refer to Table 3.2-2). However, the project would not meet the Hillside Development regulations pertaining to development within Class I and Class II Ridgeline setbacks and development on slopes exceeding 30 percent without exceptions to those requirements. Such exceptions may be granted by the City Planning Commission if: a. The prohibition of LMC Section 6-2023 has the effect of depriving the property of all economically viable use; b. The density does not exceed the density permitted by the	No mitigation is required.

Code Section	Compliance Determination	Mitigation
	<p>underlying zoning district or the slope density formula, whichever is less; or</p> <p>c. The density permitted does not exceed that necessary to provide the property with an economically viable use.</p> <p>As required by CEQA, alternatives to the project were studied in Chapter 5 of this Draft EIR and included an alternative that would not require exceptions to the Hillside Development regulations. Based on analysis in Chapter 5 (Alternatives), the No Exceptions Alternative was deemed infeasible given that there are only small, isolated acres of the site that could be developed without exceptions and these areas are subject to other environmental constraints that would create greater environmental impacts if developed. Strict conformance to the requirements of LMC Section 6-2023 and avoidance of those environmental constraints would deprive the property of all development potential.</p>	
<p>b. The development will preserve open space and physical features, including rock outcroppings and other prominent geological features, streams, streambeds and ponds, native vegetation, native riparian vegetation, animal habitats and other natural features.</p>	<p>Compliant with Mitigation. The proposed project would cluster seven of the eight proposed homes in the southern portion of the project site, while the eighth home would be located further north. Clustering the subdivision would allow preservation of approximately 59.62 acres of open hillside (approximately 68 percent of the project site). Portions of the private residential lots would also be protected from development and would remain as open space.</p> <p>Conservation easements would be required as a condition of project approval to permanently protect the areas not proposed for development. The natural visual character of the project site outside the development area would remain intact.</p> <p>Mitigation identified in Section 3.5 (Biological Resources) would ensure that development of Homesites 1 and 5-7 would not result in impacts on native willow trees located on the project site.</p> <p>There are no rock outcroppings or other prominent geological features, streambeds, ponds, animal habitats, or other natural features that would be affected by the proposed project.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.5 (Biological Resources).</p>
<p>c. The development and each associated improvement is located and designed to complement the natural terrain and landscape of the site and surrounding properties, and relates to the development pattern, including density and distribution, of the surrounding neighborhood.</p>	<p>Compliant with Mitigation. The project has been designed with the intent of integrating the project with the existing environment and preserving the scenic qualities of the site (both off- and on-site views). The proposed project would include <i>Design Guidelines</i> for the future construction of the custom homes on the site. The <i>Design Guidelines</i> are intended to minimize the visual impacts of the development of custom homes on the site by controlling building form and orientation, the location and extent of yard landscaping, the design of retaining walls, and the maintenance of large areas of natural terrain and landscaping.</p> <p>Special design techniques that would be implemented include orienting the homes either parallel or perpendicular to the grade of the slope. Perpendicular-sloped homes would have split levels to integrate the mass of the home with the sloping topography.</p> <p>The residential neighborhoods located to the west and south of the project site primarily consist of homes designed in traditional architectural styles. One of the goals of the proposed project's <i>Design Guidelines</i> is to provide a</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.2-2a and 3.2-2b.</p>

Code Section	Compliance Determination	Mitigation
	<p>transition between the existing residential neighborhood and the natural topography of the hillside by creating two distinct “Area Overlays.”</p> <p>The Area Overlays are differentiated by their elevation, environmental integration with the natural topography and vegetation, and adjacency to existing residential uses. The 675-foot elevation line is the boundary between Area 1 and Area 2.</p> <p>Homesites below the 675-foot elevation (Area 1) would have minor visibility and would be predominantly in areas near existing residential uses. Because of this, Area 1 would provide guidelines that would create a visual and physical transition between the adjacent residential neighborhood and the homes in Area 2. Area 1 would allow traditional residential forms and styles that would be typical of ranch, bungalow, prairie, and other traditional architectural styles that embody outdoor living.</p> <p>Homesites above the 675-foot elevation (Area 2) would be more visibly apparent than homesites in Area 1, and therefore would have additional environmental design constraints. The intent of Area 2 is to encourage forms and styles that fit well with the natural environment and yet retain detail and articulation. In general, hip and gable roof shapes (traditional forms) would be discouraged, while shed and parapeted roof shapes would be encouraged. In general, the form of the houses would be designed to be visually subordinate to the topography and natural environment.</p> <p>To ensure that development of the project site complements the natural terrain and landscape and relates to the development pattern and character of the surrounding neighborhood, the new homes would be subject to the City’s Design Review and Hillside Development process.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed project would cluster seven of the eight proposed homes in the southern portion of the project site; the eighth home would be located farther north. The natural visual character of the site outside the areas proposed for development would remain intact. Conservation easements that would protect the scenic qualities outside the development area would be required as a condition of project approval.</p>	
<p>d. Structures in a Hillside Overlay District will, to the extent feasible, be located away from prominent locations such as ridgelines, hilltops, knolls and open slopes.</p>	<p>Compliant with Mitigation. The portions of the project site that have been proposed for development contain open and visible hillsides and ridgelines. However, most of the project would be clustered on the southern portion of the site near the terminus of Lucas Drive except for Lot 8, which would be more centrally located at the terminus of Lucas Circle. Therefore, to the extent feasible, the proposed development would be located away from prominent ridgelines, hilltops, knolls and open slopes because much of the hillside and ridgeline area (approximately 68 percent) would be undeveloped and would remain in its natural state. Additionally, when viewed from many of the locations identified on the City’s Viewing Evaluation Map, the area of the project site proposed for development is blocked by topography, residences, landscaping and/or natural vegetation. The visual analysis contained in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics) of this EIR studied the project from four public</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a and 3.3-1b, in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics).</p>

Code Section	Compliance Determination	Mitigation
	viewpoints and found that many of the homes would be concealed when viewed from below. Furthermore, mitigation would reduce impacts associated with preservation of views.	
<p>e. Development grading will be minimized to reduce cut and fill, preserve existing geologic features, topographic conditions and existing vegetation, reduce short and long-term erosion, slides and flooding, and abate visual impacts.</p>	<p>Compliant. One of the basic planning requirements of the proposed project’s <i>Master Plan</i> and <i>Design Guidelines</i> is orientation of buildings in a manner that would minimize cut-and-fill operations.</p> <p>The <i>Master Plan</i> and <i>Design Guidelines</i> propose accomplishing this by orienting buildings either parallel or perpendicular to the grade of the slope. Parallel-sloped homes would be long and narrow with the length of the home running parallel to the slope or topography. Perpendicular-sloped homes would also be long and narrow, but with the length of the home running perpendicular to the slope or topography.</p> <p>Development of the proposed project would result in approximately 17,000 cubic yards (cy) of cut grade and approximately 17,000 cy of fill to balance earth-moving activities. This is a relatively minimal amount of grading for the overall 87.9-acre site.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p>f. Each structure proposed complies with the city’s residential design guidelines, and development landscaping will ensure visual relief and complement each proposed structure to provide an attractive environment.</p>	<p>Compliant. As required by the City’s Design Review and Hillside Development Permit process, the proposed project would comply with the City’s Residential Design Guidelines. As proposed by the <i>Master Plan and Design Guidelines</i>, the development would employ the use of topographic berms, graveled sidings, boulders, natural landscape amenities, and vegetation to screen views of the project.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.2-2a and 3.2-2b.</p>
<p>g. The development will not create a nuisance, hazard or enforcement problem within the neighborhood or the city, nor require the city to provide an unusual or disproportionate level of public services.</p>	<p>Compliant with Mitigation. With the implementation all of the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District conditions of project approval, the proposed project would not create a nuisance, hazard, or enforcement problem for the City’s emergency service systems and personnel, nor require an unusual or disproportionate level of public services.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.10-1, in Section 3.10 (Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems).</p>
<p>h. The new or replacement vegetation for the development is native to the surrounding area in areas abutting open space and natural areas, such as oak woodland, chaparral, grassland and riparian areas, excluding planting for erosion control or land stabilization.</p>	<p>Compliant with Mitigation. The proposed project would include the planting of native and/or City approved plantings in ravines, swales, north-facing slopes, and other locations where trees, shrubs, and grasses would normally occur. The purpose of the plantings would be to increase the stability of the slopes, reduce erosion, improve stormwater runoff conditions, and provide natural screening of the proposed custom homes. The main types of native plantings would be coast live oak and bay laurel trees; black sage, chamise and buck bush shrubs; and annual rye, rattlesnake, wild oats and fox tail grasses.</p> <p>The project would also include non-native plant material, including tan bark oak, Catalina ironwood, alder and big leaf maple trees; and Catalina cherry, holly leaf cherry and western hazelnut shrubs. Non-native plantings would be used to accelerate the growth rate of the overall site. Other native and non-native trees and shrubs that work well in chaparral environments would also be used where appropriate. The use of non-native vegetation would conflict with the vegetation requirements for Hillside Development. Therefore, mitigation measures would be required.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a and 3.3-1b, in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics).</p>

Code Section	Compliance Determination	Mitigation
<p><u>LMC Section 6-2068</u> <u>Findings required for grant of exception permitting development class I ridgeline setback.</u></p>		
<p>a. The prohibition of Section 6-2023 has the effect of depriving the property of all economically viable use.</p>	<p>Compliant. LMC Section 6-2023 prohibits development within 400 feet (measured in plan view) of the centerline of a Class I Ridge and within 250 feet (measured in plan view) of the centerline of a Class II Ridge. In addition, LMC Section 6-2023 prohibits a structure being erected adjacent to a Class I or Class II Ridge that is higher than a plane sloping downward at a declination of 15 degrees from the horizontal intercept of the ridge.</p> <p>Development on the project site would be located along the southern end of the Burton Ridge, which is classified as a Class I Ridge. In addition, the southern portion of the project site also includes a Class II Ridge that extends west from Burton Ridge. Approximately two-thirds of the 87.9-acre project site is within the 400-foot development setback of Burton Ridge and the 250-foot development setback of the Class II ridge that extends west from Burton Ridge.</p> <p>The remaining approximately one-third of the project site contains extremely steep slopes within ravines and riparian zones, as well as prominent knolls, and is not suitable for residential development.</p> <p>Prohibiting development within the 400-foot development setback of Burton Ridge and the 250-foot development setback of the Class II ridge that extends west from Burton Ridge would require development to occur in other portions of the site subject to greater environmental sensitivities. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Alternatives), conformance with the requirements of LMC Section -2063 and avoidance of these more significant environmental impacts would entirely preclude site development.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p>b. The density does not exceed the density permitted by the underlying zoning district or the slope density formula, whichever is less.</p>	<p>Compliant. The underlying zoning district, L-R-10, allows up to 0.1 dwelling units on the property. The slope density formula could allow a density of up to 20 dwelling units on the property. Since the project proposes eight homes on an 87.9-acre site, the density is approximately 0.09 dwelling units per acre and complies with the lesser underlying zoning density standard.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p>c. The density permitted does not exceed that necessary to provide the property with an economically viable use.</p>	<p>Compliant. See discussion above under LMC Sections 6-2068 (a-b).</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><u>Findings Required to Grant Exception Permitting Development within a Class II Ridgeline Setback</u></p>		
<p>a. Special conditions and unique characteristics of the subject property exist and a site plan and design is such that the proposed development would provide a result that satisfies the policies in Sections 6-2067 and 6-2070 or 6-2071, as the case may be, and that would otherwise satisfy the</p>	<p>Compliant with Granting of Exceptions and Mitigation. Refer to the discussion above under LMC Sections 6-2067 (a- h) and Section 6-2068 (a).</p>	<p>Refer to the discussion above under LMC Sections 6-2067 (a- h) and Section 6-2068 (a).</p>

Code Section	Compliance Determination	Mitigation
strict standards of Section 6-2023 or 6-2024; or		
b. An exception is necessary to allow an economically viable use of the property and the development meets the standards in Section 6-2070 or 6-2071, as the case may be. In granting an exception under this subsection the density:	Compliant with Granting of Exceptions and Mitigation. Refer to the discussion above under LMC Section 6-2068 (a) and below under Sections 6-2071 (a-j).	Refer to the discussion above under LMC Section 6-2068 (a) and below under Sections 6-2071 (a-j).
1. Shall not exceed the density permitted by the slope density formula or the underlying zoning district, whichever is less; and	Compliant. Refer to the discussion above under LMC Section 6-2068 (b).	No mitigation is required.
2. Shall not exceed that necessary to avoid an unconstitutional taking of the property.	Compliant. Refer to the discussion above under LMC Sections 6-2068 (a-b).	No mitigation is required.
<p><u>LMC Section 6-2071</u> <u>Findings required for approval of subdivision in the hillside overlay district.</u> <u>The findings required to approve a subdivision in the Hillside Overlay District are the findings set forth in Section 6-2067 and the following findings.</u></p>		
a. The design of the subdivision and the proposed development are derived from naturally contoured sites of reasonably regular configuration, do not create building sites on slopes exceeding 30 percent nor result in the need for construction of primary structures outside the areas of 30 percent or less slopes.	Compliant. The proposed building sites are substantially within areas of 30 percent slope or less. While the access roads to Lots 2 and 8 appear to encroach into areas with slopes greater than 30 percent, according to LMC Section 6-2047 (2)(A), “Construction shall take place within the designated 30 percent slope area with the exception of an access road or driveway (not parking area), which shall be designed to require minimum grading.” The proposed project would be required to comply with all City grading requirements.	No mitigation is required.
b. The design of the subdivision and the proposed development will result in each structure being substantially concealed, as required by Section 2-2048, when viewed from lower elevations from publicly owned property (including freeways, roadways, open space, parks and trails), using the viewing elevation map as a guide to establish locations from which views are considered.	Compliant with Mitigation. The proposed project is located on a prominent hillside that is visible from public viewpoints at lower elevations. The portions of the project site that have been proposed for development contain open and visible hillsides and ridgelines. However, when viewed from many of the locations identified on the City’s Viewing Evaluation Map, the area of the project site proposed for development is blocked by topography, residences, landscaping and/or natural vegetation. The visual analysis contained in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics) of this EIR studied the project from four public viewpoints and found that many of the homes would be concealed when viewed from below. Furthermore, mitigation would reduce impacts associated with preservation of views.	Mitigation Measure 3.3-1, in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics).
c. The design of the subdivision provides for a trail or portions of trails in conformance with the city’s adopted master trails map or an adopted regional trail plan, and the trail is dedicated and conditioned for	Compliant. The proposed project would include a public hiking trail along Burton Ridge as shown on the Lafayette Master Trails Plan on file at the City offices and the Parks and Recreation Department. The proposed project would be required to abide by all City standards as they pertain to trail	No mitigation is required.

Code Section	Compliance Determination	Mitigation
improvement in accordance with adopted standards.	dedication and improvement.	
d. The design of the subdivision and proposed development use clustering or other site planning techniques to preserve hillsides, ridgelines and open space, minimize grading and impacts on wildlife habitats to the extent feasible, and provide for the preservation of on-site open space and vegetation, terrain, scenic vistas, trail corridors, streams or water courses, or other areas of ecological significance through dedication, easement, land trust or suitable regulation.	Compliant. The proposed project would cluster seven of the eight proposed homes in the southern portion of the project site; the eighth home would be located farther north. Clustering the subdivision would allow preservation of approximately 59.62 acres of open hillside (approximately 68 percent of the project site). Portions of the private residential lots would also be protected from development and would remain as open space. Conservation easements would be required as a condition of project approval to permanently protect the areas not proposed for development. The natural visual character of the project site outside the development area would remain intact.	No mitigation is required.
e. The design of the subdivision and the proposed development are arranged so that no portion of the lot exceeding a slope of 35 percent, is proposed to be altered by grading removal or alteration of a natural feature, the removal of vegetation or other activity related to the preparation of the site for development, except fire protection, or other measures necessary for public safety, slope or geologic stabilization or the provision or a trail in conformance with the city's adopted master trails map or an adopted regional trail plan or where the planning commission finds that an exception is necessary to provide the least intrusive or damaging access to an approved building site.	Compliant. See discussion above under LMC Section 6-2071 (a).	No mitigation is required.
f. The development, including site design and the location and massing of all structures and improvements, will preserve the open and uncluttered topography of the city, and not interfere with a ridgeline corridor or compromise the open space or scenic character of the corridor.	Compliant with Mitigation. See discussion under 6-2067 (d).	Mitigation Measure 3.3-1, in Section 3.3 (Aesthetics).
g. Each proposed house location and the location of each related structure is sited to minimize loss of privacy and not unduly impact, restrict or block significant views.	Compliant. The proposed custom homes would be sited and oriented pursuant to the project's <i>Master Plan</i> . One of the design goals of the <i>Master Plan</i> is to site and orient each custom home to optimize privacy between adjacent homesites. In all cases, the City would be required to review and grant design approval of each custom lot and home in the proposed project.	Mitigation Measures 3.2-2a and 3.2-2b.
h. The design of streets, streetlights, storm drainage, utilities and other common improvements incorporated into the subdivision comply with adopted city standards and are designed to preserve the character of the site and surrounding area,	Compliant. The proposed project would be required to comply with all City regulations pertaining to streets, streetlights, storm drainage, utilities and other common improvements incorporated into the subdivision. The intent of the proposed project is to integrate the development with the existing environment and to preserve	No mitigation is required.

Code Section	Compliance Determination	Mitigation
<p>minimize visual impact and avoid adverse impacts on surrounding properties and neighborhoods.</p>	<p>the scenic qualities of the site (both off- and on-site views). The proposed project would incorporate topographic berms, graveled sidings, boulders, and natural landscape amenities to reduce the visual impacts of conventional hillside grading for roadways and driveways.</p>	
<p>i. Street right of way incorporated into the design of the subdivision is based on the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Steepness of terrain; 2. Depth of cut, amount of cut and fill, height and appearance of retaining walls; 3. Type and quantity of existing and proposed trees and vegetation; 4. Ability to give the appearance of a natural slope after grading and landscaping; 5. Adequacy of off-street parking to compensate for any lack of on-street parking; 6. Adequacy of required turn-around spaces every 500 – 1,000 feet 7. Adequacy of sight-distances around curves and near driveway entrances; 8. Number of homesites to be served by the street; 9. Potential for future extension of the street. 	<p>Compliant. The Planning Commission may permit a street width that is less than the standard after considering a number of factors, including (but not limited to) access, slopes, grading requirements, landscaping, fire-fighting access, and availability of off-street parking. As a condition of project approval, the proposed project would be required to comply with the City’s standards for street design.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p>j. The design of the subdivision and the proposed development provide adequate emergency vehicle access, including turn-around space, to each building site and surrounding undeveloped areas, while protecting valuable trees, minimizing grading and preserving the natural hillside character of the site and vicinity.</p>	<p>Compliant. The proposed project includes the provision of paved drives that are of a sufficient width to allow easy access for emergency service providers.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>