

Eric Luchini

From: Mahendra Jain
Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2014 1:21 AM
To: Eric Luchini
Subject: Bal family residence in Callippe

Eric

I am a resident of Callippe and reside at _____ I do not agree with the setback to be only 5 feet from the adjacent property line. It will seem like a congested housing area. All homes in the area have 10 ft separation from property line and we should maintain that, Granting a 5ft setback will block the view etc. We are not in favor of 5 ft separation.

Mahendra Jain

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Eric Luchini

From: Jewel Hunt
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 5:18 PM
To: Eric Luchini
Cc: Bruce Hunt
Subject: Callippe Homes - lot lines

My husband Bruce and I are homeowners at [redacted]. I understand you are thinking of approving the Bal home lot to have 5 foot variances vs. 10 feet. I recommend 10 feet be your guidance.

We will not be able to make the Feb. 12th planning commission meeting and we wanted to express our desire that lot setbacks remain at 10 feet for privacy, esthetics and guidelines in our Callippe neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Jewel and Bruce Hunt

"Email Firewall" made the following annotations.

Warning: All e-mail sent to this address will be received by the corporate e-mail system, and is subject to archival and review by someone other than the recipient. This e-mail may contain proprietary information and is intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient(s), you are notified that you have received this message in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately.

=====

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Maria Hoey

Subject: Objection to 5270 variance request (PUD-98-16-10M P13-2092)

From: Sue Sato
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 11:10 PM
To: Eric Luchini; Richard Lazansky; Sue Sato
Subject: Objection to 5270 variance request (PUD-98-16-10M P13-2092)

Hello Eric,

I just wanted to make sure that my strong objection to the Bal's 2 variance requests/major modifications at 5270 Clubhouse Dr (lot 14) in the Mariposa Ranch development is noted since I don't remember everything that we discussed.

The Mariposa Ranch development plan clearly provides guidelines for each lot and for the whole development. All the residences to date have followed the guidelines with just 3 needing variances. I believe those 3 houses needed variances because their lots were challenging and it was difficult to just fit a 2 or 3 car garage in. You had mentioned that you were inclined to recommend an approval to the Bals variances because side yard variances have already be granted. I beg to differ. I think the situations are completely different. The Bals are asking for side yard variances on BOTH sides to fit a 6 car street facing garage; unlike the other lots who only needed one side variance to fit a much smaller side-entrance garage to adhere to the guidelines. The Bals have the guidelines because they knew what type of house to design but for some reason they are choosing to ignore the required side yard set backs. If their request is granted, I believe the result would not be consistent with the look and feel that was intended for this neighborhood and will ultimately diminish the value of the houses and neighborhood. Also I believe a new precedent would be established which would allow the remaining lots to be built with variances on both sides with forward facing garages. This would further diminish the value our houses and ruin the look of the neighborhood.

If we are also allowed to comment on #2; the design, I would like to voice another objection. The Mariposa Ranch guidelines require that garages not be facing the street but the Bals design has 3 garage doors facing the street. (Isn't the side entrance garages a general rule for city of Pleasanton also?) I would request that the Bals redesign their garage to have side entrances. We have suggested this to them.

I object to the Bal's variance requests and would like to see a house design that would fit within the designated building envelope and to the Mariposa Ranch building guidelines. I think they can accomplish this with minimal redesign by removing the north tandem-bay garage, or a little more and creating a drive way and side garage doors on the north side of the house. This would also eliminate the need for a side yard space variance. However, if a six car garage is a high priority for them, then they could reduce the house living space and turn it into garage space. But either way, the design should adhere to the 10 ft property line set back, minimum 25 ft space between houses and no street facing garages per the Mariposa guidelines to preserve the intended look and feel of the development.

Thank you.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Maria Hoey

Subject: Alok Damireddy and Justin Chang and Concern - 1/16/14

From: Eric Luchini
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2014 11:41 AM
To: Eric Luchini
Subject: Alok Damireddy and Justin Chang and Concern - 1/16/14

Setbacks
Separation
Ignore Guidelines
Guidelines Should Be Strictly Adhered To

Eric Luchini
Associate Planner
City of Pleasanton
Community Development Department
Planning Division
P.O Box 520 / 200 Old Bernal Avenue
Pleasanton, CA 94566-0802
eluchini@cityofpleasantonca.gov
(p) 925-931-5612
(f) 925-931-5483

Maria Hoey

Subject: 5270 Clubhouse Variance

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 9:28 PM
To: Eric Luchini
Subject: 5270 Clubhouse Variance

Eric,

As the owners of _____ my husband and I would like to voice our concern over the proposed variance at 5270 Clubhouse. We are opposed to both the variance and the "change" to the design guidelines.

We are the latest homeowners to purchase in the Callippe development and while our lot is exempt from the guidelines laid out for the new homes there, we read them before making our hefty investment into the neighborhood and it weighed into our decision. Something that struck me when I was reading the design guidelines was the point about having side entering garages. There is nothing pretty about a garage door when driving around a neighborhood.

Secondly, if we wanted to live in a development that had the homes so close together we would move back to our home on Oak Vista in the Walnut Hills Development. We moved out of there several years ago because I was tired of staring at my neighbors house so close to mine. We were really confident that the Callippe development was going to be different. The lots are large but that does not mean that a house has to fill the entire lot.

When someone purchases a lot in a development that is not yet established, the one thing they can be confident in is the approved plot plan of their lot and the surrounding neighbors lots and the design requirements. The developers and city put in set-backs, boundaries and easements prior to development so that someone making a purchase there would have some sort of comfort in what the future would hold. While we understand that some variances are necessary in order to make a home work on a lot, we do not feel that this is the case in this matter.

As someone that will drive out of their "side entering" garage out to Clubhouse we do not wish to look directly at a home that is too big for the lot and does not follow the design specifications that we thought were going to be upheld by the city.

Thank you,

John & Cynthia Rocha

Cynthia Rocha
Realtor
Re/Max Accord
925.200.5600 Cell
925.484.0700 Office

Sent from my iPad

Maria Hoey

Subject: Lot14 Mariposa Ranch

-----Original Message-----

From: Bob Blocka
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 5:48 PM
To: Eric Luchini
Subject: Lot14 Mariposa Ranch

Eric,

Regarding the application to reduce the building-to-building setback on lot 14.

As you are aware a set of design guidelines are in place for the construction of homes in the Mariposa Ranch development, these design guidelines are in place to promote Hacienda and Ranch style homes in a rural environment. These guidelines also included minimum set backs and plot plans showing the allowable building envelope, and these documents were available to the lot buyer prior to purchase. It cannot be a surprise to the homeowner that a home must be built within the envelope.

It's my understanding after a telephone conversation with you today that your recommendation will be to allow a 5' variance because a precedent has been set due to the planning department allowing these variances in the past. We own a home on 6195 Clubhouse Drive and have 5 vacant lots adjacent to us. If the planning department allows a 5' variance on every lot the golf course will not be visible from the street and the community will resemble a commercial tract home subdivision.

The reason we purchased a lot and built a home in this area is that it would not turn into a tract home style environment with houses crowded together.

We request that you reject the application for the variance and uphold the current regulations.

Thank You,
Bob and Jean Blocka

Maria Hoey

Subject: 5270 Clubhouse Drive lot #14

From: Janis Farmer
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Eric Luchini
Subject: 5270 Clubhouse Drive lot #14

Mr. Luchini:

Having further reviewed the situation regarding this site, and with more specific information, I would like to raise an objection to the proposed variance changes.

My husband helped the owners of 5250 Clubhouse to visualize the proposed footprint to the building by staking it out and it is quite clear that it will be much too close to their property. And as this is not Dublin Ranch, but originally was a site where accordance with the environment is supposed to be strongly regulated, I object to properties being jammed in next to each other. Further, I now understand that the Manning's variance was approved on the south side of the house, there was no request for one on the north side. And finally, I don't think the variance should be allowed on the north side just to accommodate an oversize garage.

Once again, I would like to say when one purchases a lot, one is entirely aware of the size and topography of that piece of property. I personally don't understand why people then draw up plans that totally disregard those details. What's the point of the planning department defining setbacks in the first place?

Janis Farmer

Be the Change you wish to see in the world

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Denva Jordan

January 21, 2014

Eric Luchini
Associate Planner
City of Pleasanton

RECEIVED
JAN 21 2014
CITY OF PLEASANTON
PLANNING DIVISION
PUD-98-16-12M

RE: PUD-98-16-10M and P13-2092, Mannohan and Gurpreet Bal

Dear Mr. Luchini:

Reviewing our conversation concerning Mr. Bal application for a Major Modification to the approved Development Plan for Mariposa Ranch (Standards and Design Guidelines of June, 1999). As one of the original land owners of the Callippe Preserve Golf Course, we worked several years with City Planners, City Council and many others on the development plan and design guidelines for Mariposa Ranch.

Hopefully, a two-story house on a one-half acre level semi-rural lot on a beautiful City golf course, can be designed within the original standards and guidelines. A five (5) ft. minimum side-yard setback is usually a required minimum setback for a small city lot.

I strongly object to any variance from the original standards and design guidelines for Mariposa Ranch. To allow this variance would set a precedent for future building on existing vacant lots on Clubhouse Drive and Westbridge Lane.

I urge you to recommend denial of this variance.

Very truly yours,



Denva Jordan