

**VALLEY HUNT CLUB
MASTER PLAN
ATTACHMENT A**

FINDINGS OF FACT

For Master Plan (per §17.61.050 H)

1. *The proposed use is allowed with a Master Plan or within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable provisions of this Zoning Code* in that the Zoning Code defines and makes provisions for quasi-public entities including institutions as churches, private schools and private Clubs. The Valley Hunt Club is consistent with this definition. Furthermore, the Valley Hunt Club has operated at the subject location since 1906.
2. *The location of the proposed use complies with the special purposes of this Zoning Code and the purposes of the applicable zoning district* in that the proposed Master Plan affects buildings and land of an existing use in an established PS (Public/Semi-Public) zone district. The Master Plan would maintain the neighborhood character of Orange Grove Boulevard and Palmetto Drive in context with the surrounding properties.
3. *The proposed use is in conformance with the goals, policies, and objectives of the General Plan and the purpose and intent of any applicable specific plan;* in that the subject site is designated under the General Plan as Institutional. The existing use defined under the Master Plan is a private social Club, which is classified as an institutional use. Development envisioned under the Master Plan is contextual to its immediate setting. This supports Land Use Element Policy 1.1 by preserving the character, scale, and quality of established residential neighborhoods.

The Objective 24 of the Land Use Element of the General Plan states “provide long-term opportunities for growth of existing cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions in balance with their surroundings.” In addition, Policy 24.4 directs the City to “support specific plans, Master Plans, and other planning activities initiated by cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions.”

4. *The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use would not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use* in that the proposed Master Plan continues the established operation of an existing private social Club. The City has attached conditions of approval to the Master Plan to ensure that the continued operation of the Valley Hunt Club would not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the inhabitants in the surrounding area.

5. *The use, as described and conditionally approved, would not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City* in that the Master Plan includes provisions to provide additional off-street parking to meet the average daily peak parking demand to reduce dependence on public streets for employee and special event parking at the Club. The additional parking provided on-site will improve available parking on local streets for residents.
6. *The design, location, operating characteristics, and size of the proposed use would be compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity in terms of aesthetic values, character, scale, and view protection* in that the proposed Master Plan establishes development standards to ensure compatible future development between the existing private social Club campus and the surrounding residential neighborhood. The development standards are substantially consistent with the RS residential districts.

For Tree Removal [per §8.52.075 (A)]

- *The project, as defined in Section 17.12.020, includes a landscape design plan that emphasizes a tree canopy that is sustainable over the long term by adhering to the replacement matrix adopted by resolution of the city council and included in the associated administrative guidelines* in that the Master Plan includes a landscape plan depicting full tree matrix replacement on-site as required by the ordinance.

**VALLEY HUNT CLUB
MASTER PLAN
ATTACHMENT B**

DESIGN COMMISSION COMMENTS

NOVEMBER 8, 2010

1. Investigate the option of placing Building 1 on the east property line; how does this impact the oak tree on the adjacent property near the building pad? Is a 5-foot setback viable for this building?

The Club studied bringing Building 1 off the rear property line and into the middle of the eastern arm of the South Parking Lot. A 15-foot rear setback at the rear property line would pull the proposed building away from the drip line of an oak tree on the property adjacent to the east. This would result in the loss of two additional parking spaces in addition to the 11 from the footprint of Building 1, reducing the capacity at this lot from 52 to 39.

2. Move the footprint of the parking garage 20 feet to the east under the existing tennis courts to maintain existing trees on the site and landscape perimeter along Orange Grove Boulevard.

The Club prepared an alternative site plan to compare with the original proposal. Staff analysis of this alternative concluded that such a redesign would result in the following impacts:

- *The porte-cochere could not be reattached in its original location. Reattachment in the original location would interfere with cars queuing upon arrival to the club.*
 - *With the eastward shift of the parking garage, taken into context with the other recommended Master Plan changes from the Design Commission, the adjustments would result in the net loss of 15 additional parking spaces, which is one fewer than the identified peak parking demand.*
 - *Traffic patterns would be altered which would cause left-hand turn queuing along Orange Grove Boulevard to access valet services in South Parking Lot.*
 - *The ramp would have a tighter radius than the proposed design. The club is concerned that older members of the club would have difficulty negotiating the turn.*
 - *The redesign does not maximize parking on-site, which is the primary concern to neighbors.*
3. The landscape perimeter at Tennis Court 7 effectively blocks the view corridor for exiting at the employee parking lot. Recommend staff revisit the development standard for this site requiring a 10-foot setback, perhaps allowing a five-foot setback instead of ten.

In reexamining the sight lines at this location, staff concluded that allowing exiting mirrors in the parkway would satisfactorily address pedestrian-vehicle safety concerns for cars exiting from the East Parking Lot.

4. Clarify the findings that there is a unique circumstance at Building 2 requiring justification of usage of the residential encroachment plane standard. Explain why the residential design guidelines are better suited to the new construction proposed under the Master Plan as opposed to the commercial standard.

The Master Plan process is the procedure to establish appropriate development standards for institutional uses as the Zoning Code does not specify standards for the PS zone. The base zoning to consider setbacks is the encroachment plane requirements for when a non-residential structure abuts a residential zone. This standard was written for commercial and industrial uses. However, the club is a private lodge and recreational facility that is commonly found in residential areas. The Master Plan proposes accessory structures of the same height, massing, and scale of single-family residences found in the immediate neighborhood. Using the residential setback standard at this location would reinforce the residential feel at the transition of the club campus. This is explained in more detail in the staff report.

5. Explain the justification for allowing additional parking beyond the code-required minimum.

Throughout the Master Plan application process, which began in 2003, the club and staff have repeatedly heard from the surrounding neighborhood that there is a shortage of on-site parking at the Club. Under present conditions, employees and guests of the club park on Palmetto Drive throughout the day reducing on-street parking for other residents on the street. In response to these concerns from neighbors over the years, the Club has made increasing parking the main project of the Master Plan.

Staff acknowledges that it is City policy in the transit-oriented districts, such as the Central District, to reduce vehicle parking on-site in order to encourage travel by other modes of transportation. A parking reduction would not be appropriate for the club as it is not located in a transit-oriented district with a high level of available public transportation options. The Master Plan is attempting to park the club at the average peak parking demand. The peak demand is an average of parking use at the Club, and does not represent the highest demand. The additional parking spaces beyond the peak demand will allow the Club to continue to park additional vehicles on-site, sparing street parking for residents during larger events at the club. In light of the many comments received from the Club's neighbors, staff has determined that a parking overage would be appropriate and beneficial for neighbors sharing Palmetto Drive access with the Club.

6. Explain the franchise agreement, (City permission to excavate in the public right-of-way), along Orange Grove Boulevard and Palmetto Drive.

The City requires an applicant to obtain a license agreement from the City for the installation of any private improvements within the public right-of-way, including, but not limited to, soldier beams, tie-backs, utility conduits, decorative sidewalk and subterranean garage. The license agreement application for any private improvement within the public right-of-way is submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and is approved by the City Manager prior to the construction of the private improvement. The license agreement allows the applicant to install and maintain the private improvements within the public right-of-way with conditions. This item is only to gain approval by the City to encroach on/below City property during construction.

During the construction of the parking garage, the club may need to excavate beyond the north property line to allow for the clearances necessary for shoring, forming and building the garage. The parking garage will remain within the boundaries of the campus property upon completion.

7. Consider moving Building 2 forward to align with other single-family residences on Palmetto Drive.

The Master Plan depicts the Building 2 footprint in the rear 50% of the lot. This location is appropriate because it integrates Building 2 into the core of the club campus, concentrates club activities within the core of the campus, and maximizes parking at this location. Moving the building forward to the front 50% of the parcel would reduce overall on-site parking resulting in 2 – 3 spaces remaining, and would pull club activities closer into the neighborhood with this northerly location. Neighbors have expressed their preference to keep new club facilities away from Palmetto Drive. For these reasons, staff recommends the building footprint maintain its location as proposed.

For a different perspective on the setback of Building 2, the main clubhouse facing Palmetto is set back approximately 100 to 120 feet. The setback of the building area for Building 2 is approximately 80 to 95 feet depending on where the building is located within the potential building area. The building area is larger than the actual footprint of the building. In other words, the setback of the Valley Hunt Club buildings will be reasonably consistent along Palmetto Drive.