



Date: February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021

To: Holly Pearson, Contract Staff Planner

Cc: Matthew Feske, Community Development Director

Project: Clayton Community Church  
1027 Pine Hollow Court; APN: 119-050-036  
(UP-05-16, SPR-06-16, TRP-38-16, and ENV-03-16)

From: Amy Felix  
5506 Sean Circle, #112  
San Jose, CA 95123  
p. 925.353.0363

Regarding: **Response to Planning Comments**

Enclosures/Attachments:

Drawings: Civil, Landscape and Architecture

Forms: Landscape Certificate of Completion, Landscape Project Application with  
Irrigation design checklist

Previously submitted: 2020-12-10\_ClaytonCommunityChurch\_Irrigation-  
DesignDevelopment

---

1.	<p>Comment: Site Plan Items</p> <p>The keynotes are missing for Sheet A-01 (Site Plan). It appears that the numbering is different for Sheets A-01 and A-02 (Community Plan), so a separate set of keynotes is needed for the site plan.</p> <p>Please clearly indicate the property lines on the site plan to facilitate verification of building setbacks.</p> <p><b>Response: Refer to Sheet A-01 (site plan) name of Sheet has been changed to Architectural Site Plan; keynotes have been updated with Sheet notes.</b></p> <p><b>Site plan revised and scope of work is revised on Sheet A-01 Architectural Site Plan</b></p> <p><b>Community plan sheet notes are updated on Sheet A-02 Community Plan</b></p>
----	---

---



**Comment: Building Height Measurement**

The building height on the east elevation needs to be measured from grade. See the definition of building height in the zoning code (§17.04.62): “The distance measured vertically from a point on the base plane to the highest point on the building or structure. The base plane is an imaginary plane created at the perimeter of the building or structure at the natural or finished grade, whichever is lower.” It is important to show this correctly on the east elevation because this is the point of maximum height for the building.

**Response:**

**See revised drawings. The highest parapet height from the average grade is 27'-4". Refer to Sheet A-07 for sections 1 and 2 and rendered East elevation. At the East elevation the parapet is 25'-4 from the Average grade, refer to detail 1/A-07**

**Comment: Parking Lot Design and Landscaping Standards**

Section 17.37.090 of the Clayton Zoning Code contains standards for parking lot design and landscaping. As currently proposed, the project does not fully comply with some of these standards, including:

- 17.37.090 (A): No portion of a parking lot or parking space may be located in a required setback. In the R-40-H zone the minimum front setback is 40 feet.
- 17.37.090 (H)(2): The parking lot is required to have internal planting areas equal to at least 10 percent of the total parking lot area. The internal planting area (3,010 sf) is about 5 percent of total parking lot area (59,982 sf).
- 17.37.090 (H)(3): Parking lot planting areas must have a minimum width of 5 feet. The center portion of the internal planting areas is about 4 feet in width.
- 17.37.090 (H)(5): A minimum of one tree (24" box or larger) for every three parking spaces must be evenly distributed throughout the parking lot. For 156 spaces this would be 52 trees. The number of existing and proposed trees that are reasonably adjacent to the parking spaces is about 40.

If it is not possible to comply with these standards due to physical site constraints, please provide an explanation of why the parking lot design does not meet the standards and how the proposed parking lot design is a reasonable solution given the site conditions. Note that the zoning code allows some flexibility for the parking lot landscaping standards (see 17.37.090(H)(9)), but approval of an alternative layout and design for parking lot landscaping will require an explanation and justification.

**Response:**

1. **17.37.090 (A): See A-01 Architectural Site Plan, the parking space is located 40 feet from the property line.**
2. **17.37.090 (H)(2): It has been difficult to comply with the standard because of the difficulty of the site, however we are providing the following in the interior and around the parking lot: (refer to Civil drawings for more information on the direct flow from each area to a stormwater treatment IMP and vegetation)**

BIORETENTION			LANDSCAPE
IMP	1	458	176
IMP	2	204	216
IMP	3	262	1505



IMP	4	277		32
IMP	5	1672		128
IMP	6	1318		40
IMP	7	1006		520
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>5197</b>		<b>2617</b>

The total interior area planting according to the architectural site plan is 4,729 SF. Other planting area around the parking lot is 1778 SF and about 1,500 SF below tree #0339.

3. 17.37.090 (H)(3): We have 4' feet of planting area due to the requirements of the parking lot and the width of the two way driving aisles, however we are providing 2327 sf of planting area within the space of row of cars.
4. 17.37.090 (H)(5): Refer to Landscape Drawings L-01 for the location of the 52 trees.

Comment: Signage – Dimensions

Indicate the dimensions of the wall sign over the sanctuary entrance (Sign 01) and the sign at the main driveway entrance (Sign 04).

**Response:**

**See revised drawings, dimensions have been added, 4'4" X 7-9" Refer to detail 4/A-20 Sign Schedule for detailed information on the signage.**

Comment: Parking Lot Lighting

Please indicate the height of the poles for the parking lot lighting fixtures.

**Response:**

**Height of the poles for the parking lot lighting fixtures is 10'-0". Refer to Sheet A-21 type "Calt" @10', lighting pole has been added in sheets A-06 at Parking lot where visible from the view.**

Comment: Exterior Building Lighting

If exterior lighting is planned, please add the fixtures to the elevation drawings.

**Response: Exterior lighting has been planned per Photometric Plan on Sheet A-21. Lighting has been added to elevations when visible from the view.**

**Refer to Sheet A-06 for wall mounted lighting at 8'-0",**

**Refer to Sheet A-07 for wall mounted lighting at 8'-0",**

**Refer to Sheet A-08 for wall mounted lighting at 8'-0",**

**Refer to Sheet A-09 for wall mounted lighting at 8'-0"**

Comment: Arborist Report and Tree Removal Plan

City staff may evaluate the Tree Removal Permit for the project and determine compliance with the Tree Replacement Plan requirements in Section 15.70.040 of the Tree Protection Ordinance of the Clayton Municipal Code, please submit the following information:

- An updated tree plan that clearly shows:
  - o Each existing tree proposed for removal, labeled with the tag number from the updated (December 2020) arborist report by Trees, Bugs, Dirt.
  - o Each existing tree proposed for preservation, labeled with the tag number from the updated (December 2020) arborist report by Trees, Bugs, Dirt.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• On the landscape plan, please indicate the species and size (diameter at breast height [dbh], in inches) of each proposed new tree to be planted.</li></ul> <p><b>Response:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Refer to Sheet A-13 Tree Plan with updates on the information shown:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Trees existing to remain (14) : 339, 345, 354, 365, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 396, 397, 393</li><li>b. Remove weeds (2) : 346, 337</li><li>c. Remove trees due to fire damage (9) : 341, 342, 344, 349, 348, 347, 353, 352, 355</li><li>d. Trees that burned from fire (3) : 343, 350, 351</li><li>e. Trees that are missing (6): 56, 54, 52, 51, 62, 63 because they were on an old report but our arborist couldn't account for those trees on the site</li><li>f. Removing because of Development (34): 340, 372, 373, 371, 370, 338, 368, 369, 375, 374, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 385, 386, 387, 389, 391, 390, 392, 394, 395, 363, 364, 398, 399, 400, 366, 367</li><li>g. Trees that are dead (2): 388, 384</li></ol></li><li>2. Refer to L-01 for the species, size and proposed new trees to be planted on the Landscape plan</li><li>3. Refer to L-02 for the schedule and images of the names of the plantings.</li></ol>
2.	<p>Comment: Existing Fencing at Front Property Line, Southern End Please confirm whether the section of existing fence along the front property line at the south side of the property (Fence Plan, Sheet A-15) will be removed or remain in place (it appears that this is an extension of the Type 4 fencing located along the private driveway/southern property line).</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <b>It is proposed to maintain the Fence Type 4 as it is, along the private driveway.</b></p>
	<p>Comment: Landscape Plan – Planting Palette However, the landscape plan on Sheet A-12 only shows the location and number of trees (existing and proposed), but not of the proposed shrubs and ground cover (except there appear to be labels indicating where shrub species types F and G (creeping mahonia and Baja fairy duster) are to be planted, but the notation is unclear). Please indicate the number, type and location for the shrub and groundcover species (F through M on the planting schedule) through symbols and/or labels on the landscape plan. Also, please include the sizes of proposed new trees on the landscape plan (note that trees provided as parking lot landscaping must be 24-inch box or larger).</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <b>See revised drawings, A-11 (Landscape Schedule) is now L-02 (Landscape Schedule) and A-12 (Landscape Plan) is now L-01. The previous Sheet A-11 is not used, and A-12 is now Material Finishes.</b></p>
	<p>Comment: Landscape Water Conservation Ordinance There are still two landscape water conservation forms needed during the planning review phase (per Holly Pearson’s email to Kara Simard and Amy Felix dated November 30, 2020) that have not yet been submitted – the “Certificate of Compliance – Landscape Design” and</p>



	<p>the “Water Allowance Work Sheets.” We are re-sending these forms for your convenience; please have your landscape architect/irrigation consultant complete them and submit them to the City.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <b>We are providing the Stamped Certificate of Compliance; Landscape Project Application with Irrigation design checklist; Landscape Design Drawings and we are providing the irrigation plans that were previously submitted on 12/11/20.</b></p>
3.	<p>Comment: Exterior Building Materials “fully dimensioned elevation drawings with building materials noted. Please also provide other relevant design detail drawings, such as window sections. Material samples would also be helpful.” The current plan set includes color elevations with building height indicated, but materials are still not indicated. Because the standards of review for the proposed project take building design into consideration, including materials and colors, these details are essential information for staff to complete review of the project.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <b>Refer to A-12 for color legend and materials. Detail 2/A-08 provides information on exterior material finishes. Refer to Sheet A-10 for detailed vignettes.</b></p>
	<p>Comment: Trash Enclosures The details for the trash enclosures are provided on Sheet A-19, but their location on the property is not shown on the site plan (or at least, since keynotes for the site plan are missing, it isn’t clear on the site plan where the trash enclosures are proposed to be located).</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <b>Refer to note 1, near the vehicular entry, on the Sheet A-01 Architectural Site Plan for location, also Refer to updated sheet A-14 Site Sections.</b></p>
	<p>Comment: Screening of Mechanical Equipment The City’s August 2, 2019 comment letter noted that “mechanical equipment will be required to be screened from the public view including backflow preventers and utility boxes.” In response the applicant team indicated that once a location had been coordinated with the fire department, PG&amp;E, and engineers, the exact location of mechanical equipment would be shown on the plans. The most recent submittal still does not appear to include the location of mechanical equipment or the proposed method of screening.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <b>Refer to Sheet A-28 Roof plan for proposed location of roof top units (RTU), refer to section 1 on Sheet A-06 for expected height (19’-0”) of parapet wall hiding roof top units. Backflow preventer and utility boxes will be hidden with a faux rock refer to Sheet A-14</b></p>
4.	<p>Comment: <u>Engineering Comments on December 11, 2020 Submittal</u> It is unclear from the plans whether the intent is to continue the curb, gutter and sidewalk from the point where they currently stop on Pine Hollow Court or if there is a property in between the existing facilities and the project site. The report doesn’t specifically say although it implies that the sidewalk is continuous. The curb-to-curb width of the roadway should meet the City standard, which is 34’ (this is the existing condition to the north).</p>



	<p>Walkways internal to the site are indicated as a minimum of 3' wide. 5' is the minimum for two people to walk side by side and would be better so that families wouldn't have to walk single file or people walk on the sidewalk and others in the drive aisles.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> <b>The sidewalk has been revised and the curb and street gutter to continue, at the vehicular entrance a driveway apron will be provided.</b> <b>The curb-to-curb width will continue per existing condition to the north.</b> <b>Internal walkways that leads to the building entrance will be five foot wide.</b></p>
	<p>EXISTING BARN</p> <p><b>The Clayton Community Church will provide a plaque in dedication to the Family</b></p>

END OF RESPONSE TO PLAN CHECK COMMENTS