



**ALAMEDA COUNTY CDA
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

STAFF REPORT – PRELIMINARY REVIEW

TO: CASTRO VALLEY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 28, 2016

GENERAL INFORMATION

APPLICATION: Site Development Review & Tract Map, PLN2016-00056

OWNER/APPLICANT: Todd Deutscher/Catalyst Development Partners

PROPOSAL: Construction of 27 two-story townhomes and corresponding subdivision into eight (8) building lots and four (4) common lots by Vesting Tentative Tract Map 8380, with a gross density of 14.4 units per acre. The townhomes would be 25 feet in height, with two-car garages in each, plus an additional 22 off-street guest parking spaces (including two handicapped-accessible spaces) and 8 on-street guest parking spaces, and provide total lot coverage of 42 percent.

ADDRESS, PARCEL NUMBER AND SIZE: 3544 Jamison Way (including also 3546, 3548, 3528 and 3530 Jamison Way), Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 84A-0076-020-01; 84A-0076-021-04; 84A-0076-021-06; 84A-0076-022-00; and 84A-0076-023-00. Combined area of parcels: 1.885 acre (82,125 sq. ft.).

ZONING: R-S-D-15 (Residential-Suburban, "D" Combining District requiring 1,500 square feet of building site area per dwelling unit) District.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: *Castro Valley General Plan, adopted March 2012: Residential Mixed Density (RMX) 29 du/ac.* The category is intended to provide a variety of housing types near commercial business districts while maintaining the existing character and development pattern of the neighborhood. The housing types include one-family dwellings, duplexes, townhomes, and two-story multi-family residential uses. Residential densities range from 8 to 29 units per net acre based on the lot width, depth, and size.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The project is subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, 1970 as amended). An Environmental Checklist/Initial Study and proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) is required for the project pursuant to State and County CEQA Guidelines, to evaluate the environmental effects of the development. The IS/MND will address potential impacts on air quality, cultural resources, seismic safety, water quality and management of urban stormwater runoff, flooding, construction noise and traffic, and identify specific mitigation measures as needed to reduce each significant impact to a *less than significant* level. The IS/MND will be subject to at least 30 days of public review, expected to begin by early January, 2017.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Council should review the staff report, take public testimony, deliberate as to its merits on a preliminary basis, and make recommendations to the applicant for any changes before detailed analysis and environmental review under CEQA occurs, and before the Council makes final recommendations on the project.

PARCEL ZONING HISTORY

June 21, 1951, the 12th Zoning Unit designated properties in the Castro Valley area to various Zoning Districts.

February 15, 1962, the 411th Zoning Unit designated specific parcels including the subject site to R-1 (Single Family Residential).

June 10, 1967, the 759th Zoning Unit designated properties in this vicinity to the CN (Neighborhood Commercial) District which was reversed on June 21, 1969, by the 878th Zoning Unit, back to the R-1 District.

Undetermined, 1970s era, redesignated to R-S-D-20 (Suburban Residence, 2,500 square feet m.b.s.a. per dwelling unit) District. A private street, P-51, was recorded at a similar time.

October 3, 2003, 1218th Zoning Unit redesignated the site and numerous sites to the current R-S-D-15 (Suburban Residence, 1,500 square feet m.b.s.a. per dwelling unit) District to promote implementation of the year 2000 Housing Element.

SITE AND CONTEXT DESCRIPTION

Project Site: The project site is composed of five parcels that have a combined frontage along Jamison Way of 219' and a depth of 375', forming a large rectangular site that is level and developed over time. There is a presently a duplex and a single family residence on the front two parcels, and three other single family homes on three lots to the rear on flag lots or lots accessible by a joint easement. The five parcels contain numerous trees and extensive landscaping, a swimming pool and driveways. The homes were built between 1940 and 1956. The frontage is not improved with curb, gutter or sidewalks.

Surrounding Context: The site is bordered on the west by single family homes (built circa 1950) along a cul-de-sac (Woodbine Avenue); more single family homes lie to the northwest of the site along Santa Maria and Lorena Avenues. Numerous two-story apartment complexes are directly north of the site along Lorena Avenue, and extending along the same side of Lorena Avenue to the east towards Redwood Road, and directly east of the site along Jamison Way. South of the site, and extending eastward to Redwood Road, and south to Castro Valley Boulevard is the Castro Village shopping center area, made up of many free-standing and attached commercial buildings with small to large stores, restaurants, a bowling alley, offices and other uses. Within the large area extending to Castro Valley Boulevard there is also a Safeway supermarket and a few small medical and dental offices on the south side of Jamison Way, towards Redwood Road. Southwest of the site, extending to Santa Maria Avenue to the west, is a small area of single family residences, partly along a short cul-de-sac. A major entry to the Castro Village area is near the southeast corner of the project site, while a main service road to the rear of many businesses is opposite the southwest corner of the project site.

Access to the site is along Jamison Way, which extends for a quarter of a mile west of Redwood Road to Santa Maria Avenue. Its intersections with Redwood Road and Santa Maria Avenue are stop-sign controlled only (i.e., not signalized). Santa Maria Avenue has a signalized intersection at Castro Valley Boulevard, and also extends north to Somerset Avenue, an east-west collector street across central Castro Valley. Sidewalk improvements in the vicinity are generally discontinuous.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is to clear the site, removing existing buildings, vegetation and pavements, and construct 27 new two-story townhome residences, in eight separate buildings, separated on a north-south axis by a pedestrian access aisle through the center of the site. Four rows of townhomes would be built,

with one row oriented towards Jamison Way, the next two facing each other and oriented toward a central wide greenway on an east-west axis. The rear-most row would face north to a more private common walkway along the north edge of the site. The front row nearest Jamison Way would contain six townhomes while the other three rows would contain seven units each. Driveway alleys between the first two and last two rows of townhomes would provide access to two-car garages for each townhome at the effective rear of each unit. The proposed density would be roughly 14.4 units per acre.

Two floor plans are proposed, but which are nearly identical in floor area and configuration, based on a three-bedroom, two-and-a-half bath, two-car garage concept, with 1,627 square feet of conditioned space per unit among each of the exterior units (16 units with only one common wall), and 1,670 square feet for interior units (11 units, with two common walls). Private yard areas would typically vary between 314 and 330 square feet, including porches of 66 to 78 square feet, except for the end-of-row units that would have some additional area on their sides. In total, the 27 townhomes represent approximately 44,400 square feet of two-story, 25'-tall residential construction. A total of 20 on-site guest parking spaces are proposed along the main driveway on the west side of the site as parallel spaces, as well as two head-in handicapped accessible parking spaces (including one van-designated space) and eight on-street (Jamison Way) guest parking spaces.

The front row of townhomes facing Jamison Way would have a 20' ostensible or superficial setback from the front property line, to the enclosed/indoor portions of the buildings, divided between common open space along the street (8' deep), and semi-enclosed yard areas (12' to 14' deep). However, unenclosed porches facing Jamison Way, with supporting columns, would extend 2' to 4' into the private yard areas, thus providing a total clear setback of only 18' from the front property line (*see Staff Analysis below for discussion*). At the rear of the site, a clear 20' setback is proposed, also split between 10'-deep private yards and a 10'-wide common pedestrian access corridor, for the effective front-facing side of the last row of townhomes. The east side of each townhome building row would have a 6.2' setback to the property line, and each building in a row would be separated from each other by 10' across the central walkway, with a 4'-wide sidewalk and 3' of landscaping on each side. The front and western building would have a 9.7' setback from the driveway and 8'-wide parallel parking spaces on the driveway; the three buildings behind the front row would be separated from the driveway by a 5'-wide landscaped setback and parallel parking spaces. The driveway would have a 5'-wide landscaped setback from the western property line, except along about 120' extending north from Jamison Way, where a bio-retention basin (or landscaped stormwater-treatment system) would be placed between the property line and the driveway, with a maximum width of 30'.

The middle two rows of townhomes would be separated across a 40'-wide common open space park area, as well as the 10' deep private areas in front of each home, thus separating the buildings by 60'. The park area would include a barbecue and picnic tables at the eastern end, and additional seating areas would be placed centrally, where the central walkway to the front and rear is proposed and would intersect with the park area. The project plans (Sheet 4 of the civil plans) indicate a total of 7,380 square feet of common open space, of which 4,500 square feet would be in the central park area, and another 2,880 square feet in the area of the bio-retention basin (*see Staff Analysis below for discussion*). Other potentially usable open space includes unenclosed yard areas along Jamison Way (approximately 1,260 square feet), at the rear of the site (an estimated 1,450 square feet), and between each building along the central walkway (a total combined area of 2,840 square feet).

The subdivision by Vesting Tentative Tract Map 8830 would create eight lots for each of the three-to-four unit buildings, varying in size according to the number of units in each, between 5,566 and 6,892 square feet. The four common lots would be the property of a homeowners association, and includes the main access driveway and alleys, the central park area, the rear and west side, and separately, the front yard area. Subdivision into condominium space "air" is part of the project, but may be deferred to a later date.

RESPONSE TO REFERRALS

Note: Preliminary project plans were referred to public agencies and neighbors for comment in April 2016. The plans accompanying this staff report (Exhibit "B") were received on November 14, 2016 and have not yet been reviewed by the same agencies or area residents. Updated responses to referrals will be included in a subsequent staff report after the MND/IS is complete, has been circulated for review as required by CEQA, and the project is ready for a final recommendation to the Planning Commission by the Council.

Public Works Agency, Permits Section: In the response dated April 20, 2016, comments were provided on a variety of topics, specifying that cement sidewalk, curb and gutter were required along the street frontage, that a storm drainage system was not clearly identified and such a system would need to meet County hydrology and design criteria, the driveway entrance must meet current Caltrans standards, and that a homeowners' association (HOA) with suitable covenants, conditions and restrictions for site maintenance mechanisms will be required. The HOA should provide for maintenance of the stormwater treatment system and the street lights for the access driveways. Other general comments noted the presence of trees in the street right-of-way that will need to be protected or replaced, but that available on-site space for such mitigation appears to be limited. More specific comments addressed the sizing of the bio-retention area, discouraging the inclusion of trees at the periphery of the bio-retention area, questionable use of "self-treating" or "self-retaining" areas, and lastly, the absence of a designated vehicle wash area, which is required for projects with 25 or more residential units or lots.

Public Works Agency, Building Inspection Department (BID): The Building Inspection Department noted in its comments, dated April 28, 2016 that a complete soils report and geotechnical analysis will be required, and that the new structures will be subject to the County's Green Building and Construction and Development Ordinances. A new address assignment for the building is required, and the trash enclosure must meet requirements for an overhead cover and a sanitary sewer connection. Lastly, the project must comply with building codes and submittal requirements that are in effect at the time the building permit application is submitted, expected to be the 2016 California Building Code that goes into effect in January of 2017. The construction documents must be submitted with a soils report and/or geological study to address any geological hazards, and separate building permits are required for the demolition of existing buildings, subject to the County's Construction & Demolishing Debris Management program. Other remarks reiterated the need for a covered trash enclosure, accessible path of travel for ADA compliance, a covered vehicle wash area (that discharges to the sanitary sewer) and revising the addressing of units on the site.

Public Works Agency, Grading Division: The response on May 2, 2016 advised that a grading plan, and erosion and sedimentation control plans must be reviewed and approved by the County, and that grading work is not normally allowed in the rainy season, between October 1 and April 30. Furthermore, the project size over an acre requires that a Notice of Intent and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) be submitted to the State Water Board under the provisions of the State construction general permit, prior to land disturbing activities.

Alameda County Fire Department: The Fire Department prepared a response dated April 22, 2016 that requested the applicant indicate that fire suppression sprinklers will be provided in the structures, signage to clarify the fire access road does not extend to the alleys (due to their length of more than 150', which exceeds access standards without a turnaround), additional information regarding existing and new fire hydrants, accessibility to each unit, and fire apparatus turnaround design parameters (70' 'legs' required to be shown). Resubmittal of information was requested; the new plans have not yet been reviewed by the Fire Department, and may or may not meet the requirements. The issues must be resolved in the final plans for review by the Council and the Planning Commission, and before their final recommendations.

Castro Valley Sanitary District (CVSD): The Sanitary District provided a response on April 19, 2016 to the referral, stating that the project would require installation of a new mainline sewer on the property, to connect to the Jamison Way sanitary sewer. However, the Jamison Way line was identified as a high priority for repair and/or replacement due to its age (built in the 1940s), and noted that the developer may be responsible for the costs of such work under the District's Sanitary Code.

Castro Valley Unified School District: The response dated April 19, 2016 indicated that students moving into the new homes should be aware that they may not be able to attend schools that are close to their home due to excessive demand at District schools. In addition, the applicant will be obligated to pay the necessary mitigation fees to the School District.

Public Comment: A resident at 3566 Jamison Way, east of the site indicated concerns with the potential for increased traffic on Jamison Way as a result of this project combined with other commercial development of the Castro Village area. She noted frequent speed violations that appeared attributable to the lack of lane dividers and speed bumps, and objected to recreational vehicles and trucks parking along the street and staying overnight. She requested measures to reduce these problems, and asked also that the demolition and construction process address the problem of nuisance urban wildlife, with traps and other controls instead of displacing them into the surrounding neighborhood.

GENERAL PLAN

The site is subject to the *Castro Valley Plan*, adopted in 2012, and which designates the site as "Residential Mixed Density" (RMX) allowing a maximum density of 29 dwelling units per acre. The RMX designation is provided with the following description:

This land use category is intended to provide a variety of housing types near commercial business districts while maintaining the existing character and development pattern of the neighborhood. The housing types include one-family dwellings, duplexes, townhomes, and two-story multi-family residential uses. Residential densities range from 8 to 29 units per net acre based on the lot width, depth, and size.

The project proposal is for approximately 14.4 dwelling units per acre, and therefore would be consistent with the RMX land use designation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

With respect to the General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance requirements and the *Residential Design Standards and Guidelines* adopted by the County in 2014 (effective January 1, 2015), the proposed project would be conforming with extremely few exceptions. Although the site is designated as R-S-D-15, for which the Multi-Family Residential Medium Density set of standards (Table 2.5-1) would or could apply, the proposal for two-story townhomes is more reasonably evaluated with regard to the Two-Story Townhomes (Table 2.4-1). A staff assessment of the project is provided in a three-page table attached at the end of this staff report, based on selected, applicable sections of Table 2.4-1 of the *Design Standards and Guidelines*. The assessment finds that the project fully meets all "development intensity and neighborhood compatibility" standards such as site size and width and unit width, all "building height and form" standards, and all "building relationship to the street" requirements.

However, under "setbacks for light, air, and privacy", two requirements would not be met by the project as presently designed, including a small, 2' encroachment of the porches of each of the six units facing Jamison Way, thus resulting in a setback of 18' where 20' is required. The porches are supported on columns that would be 18' from the front property line; such columns are not normally deemed as allowed architectural projections such as eaves, chimneys or small landings. In front of each Jamison Way-facing

townhome would be a 10'-deep clear private yard area, and in front of that, an 8' setback to a low fence from the front property line. In this case, the encroachment serves a desirable architectural objective, so it may be possible for the Planning Director to make a determination that the columns are an allowed projection into the front yard setback. Moving the columns back by 2' may also be an option, such that only an eave of the porch protrudes into the setback.

Secondly, with respect to the setback standards in the *Design Standards and Guidelines*, the project as proposed would have a 5'-wide landscaped setback between the ends of the three buildings and the driveway, or more specifically, parallel guest parking spaces, where the minimum setback from the access driveway is 10'. While it might be said that the parking spaces provide an additional 8' separation to the driveway itself, the *Standards and Guidelines* specifies that the setback "must be landscaped". It is not clear how this conflict may be resolved, as the driveway would have a relatively ample and desirable 8'-wide landscaped setback from the opposite, western side property line. A sidewalk along the side of the guest parking, within the 8' setback would also be desirable for access to the guest parking spaces.

Lastly, the assessment in the attached table noted that the required offset of windows facing each other for buildings that are 10' apart is not indicated in the architectural plans. It may be relatively easy to provide such offsets but they will need to be made conditions of approval of the project.

The plan sets also included, on the Tract Map (the first of seven civil drawings) a table showing "Zoning Conformity". Planning staff has evaluated the analysis as follows.

Zoning Conformity Analysis by Applicant

ALAMEDA COUNTY TOWNHOME STDS.	REQUIRED/ ALLOWED	PROPOSED
MIN. SIDE SETBACK	5'	6.2' AVE
MIN. FRONT/REAR SETBACK	20'	20'
MAX. BUILDING LENGTH	150'	60'
MIN. PRIVATE USEABLE OPEN SPACE	300 SF/UNIT	314 SF MIN/UNIT
MIN. TOTAL OPEN SPACE	600 SF/UNIT	652 SF/UNIT
MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT	25'	25'
MIN. PARKING REQUIREMENT	2/UNIT (1 COVERED)	2/UNIT (2 COVERED)
STD. GUEST PARKING SPACES	1/UNIT	1.04/UNIT 28 TOTAL
ACCESSIBLE GUEST PARKING SPACES	2*	2**
MIN. SITE LANDSCAPING	MIN. 35%	35%
MAX. CONDO AIR-SPACE DENSITY	22 UNITS/AC	14.52 UNITS/AC
MAX. BUILDING COVERAGE	MAX. 55%-60%	39%
FLOOR AREA RATIO	MAX 33%	56%

* 2 ACCESSIBLE SPACES REQUIRED FOR 26-50 UNITS, ACCORDING TO THE 2013 CALDAG MANUAL.

** 2 ACCESSIBLE SPACES PROPOSED- 1 AS VAN ACCESSIBLE.

*** PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS INCLUDED IN LANDSCAPE PERCENTAGE.

Staff Assessment

VERIFICATION OF STANDARD & DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE
5' required; 6.2' complies.
20' required; <i>see discussion in text.</i>
150' max length req'd; 88' max. proposed.
300 s.f. req'd; 314 s.f. is compliant.
600 s.f. req'd; <i>see discussion in text.</i>
30' allowed; 25' proposed; compliant.
2 spaces required; 2 spaces provided in each garage.
1 space required per unit; 28 guest parking spaces proposed.
2 accessible parking spaces.
35% required; 35% site is landscaped.
29 units/ac. allowed; 14.4/ac. proposed
55% max. applies; 39% proposed.
No floor area ratio is specified. ¹

¹ *Design Standards and Guidelines* do not define any floor area ratio.

In addition to the *Design Standards and Guidelines* requirements as stated in Table 2.4-1 and shown in the attached table of selected and applicable requirements, Chapter 3 of the *Guidelines - Design Guide-*

lines for Residential Projects – provides specific recommendations for residential design, addressing all of the topics considered in Table 2.4-1, but stated in broader, more general terms of design objectives (i.e., less quantitative and more qualitative). Planning staff has completed an assessment of the proposed project with respect to applicable guidelines from Chapter 3, and have prepared paraphrased and summarized statements of the Chapter 3 guidelines (see “Design Guidelines for Residential Projects – Project Evaluation”), with simple coded assessments of the project’s relative conformity to each. The overall result of the analysis is that the project would be in substantial conformity with the Chapter 3 guidelines for townhome projects.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, 1970 as amended), and staff has determined that an Initial Study (with an environmental checklist) should be prepared to evaluate the potential for the project to have significant adverse environmental impacts. It is expected that the Initial Study would find that all potentially significant impacts can be avoided or reduced to less than significant impacts with the adoption of mitigation measures and agreement by the applicant to carry them out. As a result, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is proposed to be adopted, in compliance with, and State and County CEQA Guidelines, at the time that the Planning Commission acts to approve or deny the Vesting Tentative Tract Map.

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) is currently being prepared for future circulation to public agencies and the public, for comment and subsequent consideration by the Municipal Advisory Council and the Planning Commission. The IS/MND will address potential impacts on visual and aesthetic considerations, air quality, cultural resources, seismic safety, hazardous materials, water quality and management of urban stormwater runoff, construction noise and traffic. The Council and the public may comment at the preliminary hearing on the scope or topic areas of the IS/MND and may direct staff to require specific analyses of other environmental topics. The IS/MND will incorporate materials provided by the applicant such as the preliminary grading and drainage plan and geotechnical analyses. The IS/MND will be subject to at least 30 days of public review, expected to be complete in January 2017. The Council and Commission would be expected to consider recommendations from Planning staff to adopt the MND after the public review period is complete.

RECOMMENDATION

The Council should review the staff report, take public testimony, deliberate as to its merits on a preliminary basis, and make recommendations to the applicant for any changes before more detailed analysis and environmental review under CEQA commences.

PREPARED BY: Andrew Young	SENIOR PLANNER
REVIEWED BY: Rodrigo Orduña	ASSISTANT PLANNING DIRECTOR

H:\APPLICATIONS - 2016\PLN2016-00056\Staff Reports\CVMAC-11-28-16_for PLN2016-56.doc

**STAFF ASSESSMENT – 3544 JAMISON WAY, PROPOSED TOWNHOMES
FOR SELECTED & APPLICABLE 2014 RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES**

Standard	R-S-D20	Additional Standards	Staff Assessment
Development Intensity and Neighborhood Compatibility			
Minimum Building Site Size (sq ft)	5,000		Site is 82,125 square feet; compliant.
Minimum Area per Dwelling Unit (sq ft)	2,000	Appropriate for three-story townhomes.	Over 3,000 square feet of building site area provided per dwelling unit; compliant.
Minimum Building Site Width (ft)			
Two-Story Townhomes	65		Lot width is 219'; compliant
Three-Story Townhomes	75		N.A. (Not Applicable). Two-story only.
Minimum Lot Width (ft)	25	A minimum lot width of 30 to 40 feet may be necessary for two story townhomes with double loaded attached garages in front, and to comply with Parking Location and Design requirements. Minimum lot width may be reduced to 20 feet if garages are single-car wide, detached and/or accessed from an alley.	Minimum unit width is 22'; however, access is from an alley, not the front of the unit, and is therefore deemed compliant.
Building Height and Form			
Maximum Height (ft)			See Figure 2.4-4.
Two-Story Townhomes	25		25' maximum height proposed.
Two-Story Exception	30	Provided that roof is pitched and the portion of the roof over 25 feet in height is at least 25 feet away from building site property lines.	N.A. as currently proposed.
Maximum Stories	2 - 3		Two-story only; complies.
Maximum Floor Area (Percentage of First Story Building Footprint)			
Second Story	80	The second story shall not exceed 80 percent of the first story building footprint area.	Second stories are 80% or less (79.5%) of the first-floor footprint, and therefore compliant.
Maximum Building Length (ft)	150	Exceptions may be approved by Staff if buildings are designed with many different setbacks (instead of a long flat wall), [etc.]	Maximum building length is 88', and therefore compliant.
Building Relationship to the Street			
Maximum Front Yard Paving (%)	50		N.A. Front yards have no paving.
Street Facing Façade Design		Required. Street facing facades must be designed to orient towards the public street, or private street if lot does not abut a public street. Windows, entry door, and other elements must be incorporated to create an attractive street appearance that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.	First row of townhomes faces and is oriented towards Jamison Way. Compliant, but does not have any orientation toward internal street. See <i>discussion in staff report text</i> .
Building Entrances on Streets		Required. The principal entry shall be located in a visible location facing the public street, or private street if lot does not abut a public street.	The front row of townhomes face Jamison Way. Other unit entries face either the central park area or the rear of the site. Compliant.
Covered Front Porch or Covered Recessed Entry		Required	
Minimum Depth (ft)	5		5' depth provided; compliant.
Minimum Area of Porch or Recessed Area (sq ft)		5 percent of the first story building footprint area; up to a maximum of 75 square feet	Each entry porch would provide 66 sq.ft. minimum, which is about 5.5% of the first story footprint; compliant.

Continued on following page

PLAN2016-00056 – PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW

Page 1

STAFF ASSESSMENT – 3544 JAMISON WAY, PROPOSED TOWNHOMES (Continued)
FOR SELECTED & APPLICABLE 2014 RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Standard	R-S-D20	Additional Standards	Staff Assessment
Setbacks for Light, Air, and Privacy			
Minimum Setbacks (ft)		Building setbacks apply along the perimeter of a building site and lot setbacks apply to individual lots [or townhome units] within a building site. In the event of conflict between building setback requirements and lot setback requirements, the project must comply with whichever standard results in the greater setback	(see discussion below)
Building Site			
Front (Facing Public Street)	20		20' provided facing Jamison Way. However, only 18' clear from front of porches, supported by columns; deemed compliant, but see <i>discussion in staff report text</i> .
Side (Facing Adjacent Neighboring Properties)	5	A minimum of 50 percent of the required bulk reduction shall occur along the building site side property line. If a building is within 5 feet of this property line, a minimum of 50 percent of the second story facade shall be stepped back a minimum of 5 feet from the first story facade and a minimum of half of that required amount shall occur along this side setback.	6.2' provided on east side; over 30' provided on west side. The upper story of the end units on the east side are stepped back by 5' (although not required, being over 5' from the property line). Compliant.
Side Exception	10	The building site side setback shall be a minimum of 10 feet if the project consists of three-story townhomes.	N.A. (two-story townhomes only).
Rear (Facing Neighboring Properties)	20		20' provided; compliant.
Lot/Unit Front	10		10' provided; compliant.
Lot/Unit Side	5	Required setbacks apply to the ends of rows of attached single-unit dwellings.	6.2' provided on east side; 10' between buildings; compliant.
Lot/Unit Rear	15		No 'rear' setbacks provided, or deemed to be required with alley access.
Minimum Distance Between Buildings (ft)		Front is considered any wall with windows into the primary living area of the unit.	
Front to Front or Rear	40		Over 40' provided between middle two rows of townhomes, that are 'front to front'.
Rear to Rear	30		30' provided across access alleys
Side to Front or Rear	20	If windows are clear and eye-level, they must be offset by at least 5 feet.	N.A.; no side to front or rear.
Side to Side	10	If windows are clear and eye level, they must be offset by at least 5 feet.	10' provided side to side. Architectural plans do not indicate offset; condition for compliance .
Minimum Setback From Access Driveway (ft)	10	Must be landscaped.	9.7' proposed for landscaped setback of front building (acceptable); 5' proposed for landscaped side of three buildings. Non-compliant .
Setback From Access Driveway Exception (ft)	7.5	The minimum setback from access driveway shall be 7.5 feet if building site width is less than 70 feet and greater than or equal to 6 feet; must be landscaped.	N.A. Site is 219' in width.

Continued on following page

PLN2016-00056 – PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW

Page 2

STAFF ASSESSMENT – 3544 JAMISON WAY, PROPOSED TOWNHOMES (Continued)
FOR SELECTED & APPLICABLE 2014 RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Standard	R-S-D20	Additional Standards	Staff Assessment
Auto Circulation: Site Access and Driveways			
Minimum Access Driveway/Private Street Width (ft)	20		20' wide driveway provides access to whole site and all garages.
Minimum Access Driveway/Private Street Width Exception	12	Minimum 12' if lots are narrow and driveways serve fewer than 5 units. Fire Department may consider this exception if the rear-most corner of the rear-most building is within 150' of the curb and alternative means and methods are incorporated to meet Fire Code safety objectives.	N.A. Lot is wide (219') and driveway serves 27 townhome units.
Maximum Curb Cuts (number per building site)	1	Exception may be granted by Staff if building site exceeds one acre, building site frontage exceeds 200 feet, or through lot.	Only one curb cut proposed; compliant.
Minimum Driveway Gates Setback (ft)	20	Gates across driveways shall be set back a minimum of 20 feet behind the property line, or greater depending on location in State Responsibility Fire Area and street travel speed.	N.A. No gates proposed.
Parking Location and Design			
Maximum Garage Width (ft)	20		Garage doors are 16' wide only, within 22'-wide unit facades.
Facing Public Street (%)		Where garage doors face a public street, garage width shall not exceed 50 percent of the width of the front facade of the building unit.	N.A. Garage doors only face alleys.
Facing Access Driveway/Private Street (%)		Where garage doors face a private street or access driveway, garage width for two-story townhomes shall not exceed 60 percent and three-story townhomes shall not exceed 70 percent of the width of the front facade of the building unit.	N.A. Garage doors are approximately 73% of each unit's width – 16' of 22'; however, units also 'face' opposite side from the access alley. Deemed compliant.
Facing Access Driveway/Private Street Exception (%)		Where garage doors face a private street or access driveway, garage width for two-story townhomes shall not exceed 70 percent and three-story townhomes shall not exceed 80 percent of the width of the front facade of the building if the garage (wall to wall) is set at least four feet behind the front door or a second story above the garage projects at least two feet forward in front of the garage.	N.A. Standard applies only to townhomes with garages and front facing features on the same facade.
Maximum Driveway Apron Width (ft)		Driveway apron widths shall not exceed the garage door width by more than one foot in either direction. See Figure 2.4-12.	16'-wide garage doors set within 17'-wide and 2'-deep 'micro-aprons'; compliant.
Unit parking (space per unit)	2	Minimum of one space must be covered. Tandem parking allowed for up to 25 percent of the units.	2 side-by-side parking spaces provided per unit; compliant.
Guest Parking (space per unit)		Space along the public street frontage of a building site can be counted toward guest parking requirements. However, guest spaces may be required to be on the building site if there is existing parking congestion, as defined by the Planning Director, on the street. A parking study may be required to determine existing parking congestion. Driveway aprons may be counted for the required guest parking.	See following.
Units ≤ 1,000 sq. ft.	0.5		N.A. All units exceed 1,000 sq. ft. in area.
Units > 1,000 sq. ft.	1		28 parking spaces provided in total, including 20 onsite and 8 off-site, on street.

DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS – PROJECT EVALUATION
27-UNIT TOWNHOME PROJECT, 3544 JAMISON WAY, PLN2016-00056

A. Development Intensity and Neighborhood Compatibility

- ✓ A-1: Respect the development pattern of the neighborhood
- ✓ A-2: Enhance appearance, contribute to existing visual context
- ✓ A-3: Site buildings to respect privacy, light, and air

B. Building Height and Form

- ✓ B-1: Respect adjacent buildings, transition by height and scale
- N B-2: Position higher masses away from adjoining properties
- ✓ B-3: Same, towards center of properties, pitched roofs & dormers
- ✓ B-4: Respect single-story development along public streets with stepbacks of second story mass
- N B-5: On hillside lots, step buildings down, step back upper stories

Building Form and Bulk

- ✓ B-6: Avoid boxy forms and large unrelieved surfaces
- ✓ B-7: Articulate surfaces on public, private frontages
- ✓ B-8: Use horizontal and vertical stepbacks to break apart long building walls and deviate in roof form and height
- N B-9: Continuous ground-level parking podiums and lobbies are acceptable if Guidelines B-6 through B-8 are met

C. Building Relationship to the Street

- ✓ C-1: Provide front setbacks that match other buildings on the block
- ✓ C-2: Maximize landscaping of front yards and minimize unnecessary paving
- ✓ C-3: Orient entry features toward the street, including front porch, entry door, major living room windows, etc.
- ✓ C-4: Primary entry to face public street or highlight entry with landscaping or structures
- N C-5: In a prevailing single family neighborhood, distinguish attached units by varying design treatment

D. Building Design

- ✓ D-1: Provide design integrity throughout components
- ✓ D-2: Avoid using different architectural styles
- ? D-3: Use high-quality, durable materials resistant to deterioration
- ? D-4: Use highest quality and most durable materials at the base
- ✓ D-5: Use stucco, wood siding, masonry, tile, wood shingles, metal and glass panels for siding; avoid scored plywood and aluminum
- ? D-6: Use complementary and high quality material on all sides
- ✓ D-7: Place changes in materials at interior corners or at least six feet from exterior corners, or other logical terminations
- ✓ D-8: Use coordinated not competing color schemes
- ✓ D-9: Use bright and dark colors only as accents and trim colors
- ✓ D-10: Exclude any fluorescent or neon colors
- ✓ D-11: Use colors compatible with the surrounding neighborhood as visible from the property
- ✓ D-12: Provide depth to architectural elements through decorative trim, varied roof forms, 18" roof overhangs, railings,
- ✓ D-13: Provide projections and recesses across façade
- ✓ D-14: Use projections to enhance and articulate the design
- ✓ D-15: Vary roof forms to avoid large, boxy, unrelieved masses and façades and parapets
- ✓ D-16: Vary roof forms among building or unit sections (*primarily related to attached/multi-family projects*)
- ✓ D-17: Design window features to enhance and add interest, and vary according to building or room parts

Simple 'scoring' system –

✓ = complies

○ = not compliant

-- = indeterminate

+/- = pluses outweigh negatives

N = not applicable

? = no information to assess

- ✓ D-18: Provide window recesses or decorative trim to create shadows and interest
- ✓ D-19: Highlight building entrances with architectural or landscape features
- ✓ D-20: Scale building entrances to be appropriate to the structure

E. Building Setbacks for Light, Air and Privacy

- ✓ E-1: Provide adequate light, air, and privacy
- ✓ E-2: Provide rear setbacks that have sufficient depth
- ✓ E-3: Combine or use lower building heights and increased side and rear setbacks when adjacent to lower density areas
- ✓ E-4: Separate buildings on single sites to ensure privacy and minimize shadows on open space
- ✓ E-5: Use design to protect privacy such as off-setting side-yard facing windows, placing minor windows above eye level

I. SITE LANDSCAPING (*No landscaping plans submitted for evaluation*)

J. USABLE OPEN SPACE

- ✓ J-1: Provide both common and private open space, for the sake of interaction, fresh air, gardening, grilling and dining
- ✓ J-2: Combine open space with stormwater treatment swales (grassy, etc.), flow-through planters and rain gardens
- ✓ J-8: Design private open space to be used by a single dwelling unit
- ✓ J-9: Locate private open space in patios, balconies, decks, or other outdoor spaces attached to the individual unit
- ✓ J-10: Provide adequate dimensions in private open space for a table and chairs
- ✓ J-11: Provide landscaped or soil areas suitable for private gardening

F. Auto Circulation: Site Access, Streets and Driveways

- ✓ F-1 Minimize number of curb cuts, to maximize sidewalk continuity and increase front yard landscaping
- ✓ F-2 Align curb cuts to optimize on-street parking and minimize paving
- N F-3 Maximize shared driveways when less than 50 feet apart, and provide minimum 5-foot wide landscaped buffer for any adjacent access driveways
- ✓ F-4 Design driveways and public and private streets to meet Engineering Design Guidelines
- ✓ F-5 Avoid gates unless strongly justified.

G. Parking Location and Design

- ✓ G-1 Locate parking to the side, rear or beneath buildings
- ✓ G-2 Do not locate parking between the building and the street or access driveway; maximize front yard landscaping
- N G-3 For ACBD RC (Res-Comm) Districts only, place resident parking at rear or out of sight from street unless limited to one garage door. Exposed parking spaces under apartments/residential units
- ✓ G-4 Minimize prominence of driveways and parking garages within the street/front façade and front yard.
- ✓ G-5 Place driveways to side of properties and avoid central placement.
- ✓ G-6 Disperse parking areas throughout a project instead of concentrating them in large lots
- ✓ G-7 Reduce prominence of garage doors by placing behind porch, living spaces, cantilever upper story over garage,