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## INTRODUCTION

This paper is focused on townhomes and small-lot single family homes on narrow lots (less than 75 feet wide). Extensive analysis was prepared to develop special rules to apply to the many narrow lots that exist in the Alameda County Unincorporated communities. We have also revised the draft guidelines for townhomes and small-lot single family homes on regular sized lots, to reflect input received at the February 2009 Taskforce Meeting. The guidelines will continue to be refined as we receive additional feedback and prepare the full Guidelines document.The analysis of existing zoning is contained in Section 1. The analysis for typical small-lot single family home projects is in Section 3 while the analysis for typical townhome projects is located in Section 4.

Recommendations for narrow lots are in Section 2 of this paper. Section 2 also contains revised recommendations for lots greater than 75 feet to reflect input received from Taskforce members at the February 2009 Taskforce Meeting. A copy of the comments received during that meeting is also included in Section 2 of this paper.

These recommendations are intended to be the basis for discussion by the Taskforce. Taskforce input that stems from these recommendations will assist in the development of draft design guidelines which will then also be open to public input.

The recommendations have been cateogrized into the following sections for greater organization: Density; Height and Building Massing; Front, Rear, and Side Yard Setbacks; Driveway Width; Driveway Landscaping, Sidewalks, and Paving; Open space; Building Length; Building Separation and Privacy; Building Design; Building Facade Facing the Street; and Garages and Parking.

Within each category are revised recommendations for small-lot single family and townhome projects on lots 75 feet wide and greater, followed by recommendations for special rules for lots less than 75 feet wide. A summary of major revisions and recommendations are as follows:

DENSITY. Density categories remain 8-12 units per acre for small-lot single
family homes; 12-17.5 units per acre for two-story townhomes, and 17.522 units per acre for three-story townhomes. Recommended procedures are described for applicants that want to request an exception. Development on narrow lots was analyzed and restrictions are recommended regarding height, number of units, and type of development.

HEIGHT AND BUILDING MASS. Recommended heights remain $25^{\text {, }}$ for small-lot single family homes and $30^{\prime}$ and 3 stories for townhomes between 17.5 to 22 units per acre. Recommendations have been revised to allow additional height while also limiting where the additional height can be located.

FRONT, REAR, AND SIDE YARD SETBACKS. The minimum setbacks for the front of the site and the rear of the site are recommended to be 20 feet. Recommendations also include greater setbacks for third stories. No special rules are recommended for narrow lots. Development on narrow lots should adhere to the recommended setbacks.

SEPARATION BETWEEN DRIVEWAY AND BUILDING. The recommendation of a 10 -foot landscaped area between buildings and driveways is maintained. For narrow lots, special rules are recommended.

DRIVEWAY WIDTH. The driveway width recommendation has been updated to reflect Fire Department standards.

DRIVEWAY LANDSCAPING, SIDEWALKS, AND PAVING. Recommendations regarding decorative paving have been incorporated as well as landscaping between the driveway and adjacent property. For narrow lots, special rules are recommended.

OPEN SPACE. New open space categories are recommended as well as requirements for private and common open space areas.

BUILDING LENGTH. The recommended maximum building length has been increased slightly and recommendations regarding exceptions have been added.

BUILDING SEPARATION AND PRIVACY. Recommendations regarding building separation have been updated and recommendations regarding privacy have been included. For narrow lots, special rules are recommended.

BUILDING DESIGN. Recommendations have been updated to allow more flexibility in features that are required to be incorporated.

BUILDING FACADE FACING STREET. Recommendations have been updated regarding porches and entry ways as well as paths to the door. Recommendations about electrical panels have also been added.

GARAGES AND PARKING. Transit stations have been defined.

## EXISTING ZONING REGULATIONS

## Existing Zoning Districts

The Existing Zoning District maps attached to Packet 1 show the zoning and density for the urbanized communities of the County. The zoning for Ashland, Cherryland, Hayward Acres, and San Lorenzo are shown in the first map. The following maps show the zoning for Castro Valley as well as Fairview and Fire Canyons.

Other areas are zoned for multi-family development, using R-S zones with D overlay districts. These zones are designed to encourage a range of multifamily housing types, including small lot single-family homes, townhomes, apartments, and condominiums. The allowed densities range from 12 units per acre to 35 units per acre, as follows:

- Ri/R-S: 8 Units/Acre
- R-S D35: 12 Units/Acre
- R-S DV: 12.5 Units/Acre or 22 Units/Acre (Min Lot Width of 100 ' and Min Lot Area of 20,000 sf)
- R-S D25: 17.5 Units/Acre
- R2: 17.5 Units/Acre
- R-S D20: 22 Units/Acre
- R3: 22 Units/Acre
- R-S D3: 29 Units/Acre
- R-S D15: 29 Units/Acre
- R4: 35 Units/Acre


## Existing Development Regulations: R-S Zone and Condo Guidelines

A summary of the existing development regulations that apply to the multifamily zoning districts in the County is shown in Table 1-1, and Figure 1-1. The table and figure summarize the provisions of the R-S Zoning District and the Condominium Guidelines. The combination of zoning requirements and condominium guidelines are the basis for the review of most multifamily projects in Alameda County.
TABLE I-I: EXISTING DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS: R-S ZONE AND CONDO GUIDELINES

| STANDARD | LOCATION | REQUIREMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Dimensions |  |  |
| Site area | 17.12 | Min 5,000 sf |
| Lot width | 17.12 | Min. 50' |
| Lot width, corner | 17.12 | Min. $60{ }^{\prime}$ |
| Height | 17.12 | Max. 25' |
| Stories | 17.12 | Max. 2 stories |
| Density |  |  |
| RS | 17.12 | 5,000 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $8 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) |
| RS-D35 | 17.12 | $3,500 \mathrm{sf}$ of building site per dwelling unit ( $12 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) |
| RS-D25 | 17.12, 17.24 | 2,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $17.5 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) |
| RS-D20 | 17.12, 17.24 | 2,000 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $22 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) |
| RS-D15 | 17.12, 17.24 | 1,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $29 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) |
| D-3 | 17.12, 17.24 | As specified in amendment creating district; in no case less than 1,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit (29 du/ac) |
| DV | 17.25 | 2,000 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $22 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) if Min. lot width 100 and Min. Lot area 20,000 sf; if min requirements not met, 3,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $12.5 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) |
| FAR | Condo Guideline 1 | Max. 1:3 (0.33) |
| Setbacks |  |  |
| Front | 17.12 | Min. 20' |
| Side (for three or more units) | 17.12 | Min. 10' |
| Side (for fewer than three units) | 17.12, 17.08 | Not less than five feet plus one foot for each full ten feet by which the median lot width exceeds fifty ( 50 ) feet up to a maximum requirement of ten feet, except that in every case the side yard on the street side of a corner lot shall have a width not less than ten feet. |
| Rear | 17.12 | Min. 20' |
| Setback from access driveway | 17.12 | Min. $10^{\prime}$ |
| Distance between main buildings | 17.12 | Min. ${ }^{2}{ }^{\prime}$ |
| Distance between walls at entry areas and parking/driveways | Condo Guideline 4 | Min. 12' |
| Unit orientation | Condo Guideline 5 | Units to be sited and screened to provide privacy from adjacent units and uses |
| Open Space |  |  |
| Useable open space | 17.12 | 600 sf per dwelling unit |
| Private open space for units on ground floor | Condo Guideline 3 | 300 sf |
| Minimum dimension for private open space for units on the ground floor | Condo Guideline 3 | $15 '$ |
| Private open space - units not on ground floor | Condo Guideline 3 | Adequate balconies; min. dimension $8^{\prime}$ |
| Play areas | Condo Guideline 13 | Play areas should be provided on a basis of $40 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} /$ child. |
| Parking |  |  |
| Unit parking | Condo Guideline 2 | 2 per unit; one must be covered |
| Guest parking | Condo Guideline 2 | 0.5 per unit for units $<1,000$ sf; 1.0 per unit for units $>1,000$ st |
| Apron | Condo Guideline 2 | Where practical, enclosed parking spaces should have an apron in front capable of providing a tandem space for alternate or additional use. |
| Parking Space | 17.52 | Min 180 sf, Min Dimensions 9' $\times 18^{\prime}$ |
| Width of access driveway, 4 or fewer spaces served | 17.12, 17.52 | Min 12' |
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## Fire Requirements:

- The minimum width of a driveway shall be 12 feet wide if the rearmost corner of the rear unit is within 150 feet of the street.
- The minimum width of a driveway shall be 20 feet if the rearmost corner of the rear unit is over 150 feet from the street. A fire turnaround must be provided if the rearmost corner of the rear unit is over 300 feet from the street.


FIGURE I-I: EXISTING R-S AND CONDO GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS


# FIGURE I-2: EXISTING R-S AND CONDO GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS FOR SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY HOMES 

Condo Guidelines -
Private open space:
Min. 300 sf/ground floor unit, min. dimension I5;



## TOWNHOMES AND SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY HOMES: RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis and recommendations for townhomes and small-lot single family homes are presented in the text below. This includes revised recommendations for development on lots greater than 75 feet wide to reflect input received from Taskforce members at the February 2009 Taskforce Meeting. Included are drawings that show how the recommendations would apply on typical sites for each of the density categories and development types.

## DENSITY

1. Establish maximum densities based on unit types and unit size, as follows:

- Small-lot Single Family Homes: 8-12 units per acre (R-S and R-S-D-35)
- Two-Story Townhomes: 12-17.5 units per acre (R-S-D-25 and R-2)
- Three-Story Townhomes: 17.5-22 units per acre (R-S-D-20 and R-3)
- Higher density zones and projects: Different guidelines will apply.

2. Establish different development standards for each density category.
3. Follow new density limits. Do not use the planned development zoning for small-lot single family or townhome projects. If an applicant requests a density that is greater than that allowed under existing zoning, the applicant must apply for a re-zoning to an existing higher density zoning district.
4. Follow the new development standards. Do not use the planned development zoning for small-lot single family or townhome projects. If an applicant requests an exception, the applicant must apply for a variance.

## Special Rules for Narrow Lots - Less than 75' wide:

5. Densities will typically be $15-30 \%$ less than the maximum density, due to setback requirements and the inefficiency of narrow lots.
6. Follow the new development standards for lots less than 75 feet wide.
7. Do not allow three-story buildings on lots less than 75 feet wide.
8. Do not allow townhomes on lots less than 65 feet wide.
9. If a lot is less than 60 feet wide, the maximum number of units allowed on the lot is two. The minimum lot size for two small-lot single family residential units is 8,500 square feet.

## HEIGHT AND BUILDING MASSING

10. Maintain and enforce the $25^{\prime}$ maximum height limit for smalllot single family homes. Allow a maximum of $30^{\prime}$ and 3 stories for townhomes between 17.5 to $22 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$, except for additional heights as follows:
11. Allow an additional five feet of height for portions of buildings in the center of the property, at least 25 feet away from any property lines. This could either be a by-right standard, or it could be allowed with a conditional use permit, where public notice would be required.
12. Limit second floors to a maximum of $80 \%$ of the ground floor building footprint. Encourage the second story to be located away from areas where it would be close to buildings on adjoining properties.
13. Limit third floors to a maximum of $60-75 \%$ of the ground floor building footprint.
14. Require the visual and shadow impact of third stories to be minimized in the project design, using one or more of the following design strategies:

- locating third stories in the center of the property at least 25 feet away from adjacent properties,
- tucking a third story inside a pitched roof,
- incorporating dormers for light and circulation, or
- stepping back the third story from the stories below.


## Special Rules for Lots less than 75' wide:

15. Do not allow three-story buildings on lots less than 75 feet wide.

## FRONT, REAR, AND SIDE SETBACKS

16. Require minimum 15 foot setbacks from the side or rear property line, when a primary façade (front or rear) faces the side yard or rear yard of the adjoining property.
17. Require 25 feet front, side, and rear setbacks for the third story.
18. Allow 5 foot setbacks for interior side yards, and side yards where the side of a unit faces the side yard of an adjoining property.
19. Require minimum 20 -foot rear yards.
20. Require 20 -foot landscaped front yard setbacks along the street.

Special Rules for Lots less than 75' wide: None

## SEPARATION BETWEEN DRIVEWAY AND BUILDING

21. Maintain and enforce the requirements for 10 foot landscaped areas between buildings and driveways. Garages can be within $4^{\prime}$ of driveway.

## Special Rules for Lots less than 75' wide:

22. Allow a minimum 7.5 -foot landscaped area (including curb) between buildings and driveways for small-lot single family homes on a 50 -foot wide lot.
23. Allow a minimum 7.5 -foot landscaped area (including curb) between buildings and driveways for townhomes on a lot less than 70 feet wide.

## DRIVEWAY WIDTH

24. Driveway widths are established as follows. However, these may be superseded by Fire Department requirements.

- 12 feet wide if the rearmost corner of the rear unit is within 150 feet of the street.
- 20 feet wide if the rearmost corner of the rear unit is over 150 feet from the street.
- Driveways narrower than 20 ' may be permitted in special situations with the incorporation of fire safety improvements over and above code requirements, with the approval of the Fire Department.


## Special Rules for Lots less than 75' wide: None

## DRIVEWAY LANDSCAPING, SIDEWALKS AND PAVING

25. Require a 5 -foot landscaped area between the driveway and the side property line.
26. Pedestrian walkways between the landscaped front yard and the driveway are required in projects with over 15 units. In projects with 20 units or less, a four-foot wide continuous pedestrian path of decorative paving along the entire length of the driveway may substitute for a sidewalk.
27. At least 35 percent of the driveway and parking area shall consist of decorative paving instead of asphalt, located in the following locations:

- The first 20 feet of the driveway closest to the street
- A four-foot wide pedestrian path along the length of the driveway
- Parking maneuvering areas and uncovered parking spaces that can function as outdoor courtyards.


## Special Rules for Lots less than 75' wide:

28. The requirement for a five-foot landscaped area between the driveway and the side property line may be waived for:

- Small-lot single family homes on lots less than 60 feet wide.
- Small-lot single family homes on lots less than 65 feet wide with required 20 foot driveways,
- Townhomes on lots less than 75 feet with required 20 foot driveways.


## OPEN SPACE

29. Establish different types of open space requirements:

- Minimum site landscaping - landscaped areas that are not paved or covered with buildings
- Private Open Space that is used exclusively by a single unit.
- Common Open Space that is a shared open space for use by all residents. These areas have larger dimensions than private open space, and should include children's play areas.

30. Require the total landscaped area of the site to be no less than 35 percent. On smaller lots, it will likely be more than $35 \%$, due to setback requirements.
31. Maintain and enforce the requirements for 600 sq . ft. of open space.
32. Maintain and enforce requirements for minimum 300 sq. ft. of private open space for each unit. Require at least $400-500 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. for smalllot single family home units. The minimum dimension for ground floor private open space is 15 feet. Balconies in the upper stories with a minimum dimension of 7 ' can be counted towards private open space.
33. Require common open space areas in projects with five or more units.

- The minimum dimension is 30 feet.
- The minimum size is 1,000 square feet, and no less than 200 square feet per unit.
- Common open space should include seating areas and other passive recreation facilities.
- Children's play areas should be included.
- Common open space should be located in a central location that serves all the units, not at an extreme edge of the property.


## Special Rules for Lots less than 75' wide:

34. Common Usable Open Space is not required for projects with four units or less, provided that each townhome unit has a minimum of 300 square feet of private open space or each small-lot single family unit has a minimum of 400 to 500 square feet of private open space.

## BUILDING LENGTH

35. Establish a maximum building length of 150 feet. Allow exceptions if buildings are designed with many different setbacks (instead of a long flat wall), changes in roof form or height, and major recesses (notches) along the length of the building, which successfully break up the massing of the building. The review of exceptions would require a conditional use permit or special site development review with public hearing.

## BUILDING SEPARATION AND PRIVACY

36. Building separation requirements should be as follows:

- At least 10 feet between walls with no windows, or walls with minor windows (bathrooms, clearstories, etc.) where windows can be offset typically by 5 to 10 feet and privacy is not an issue.
- At least 20 feet between walls with primary windows (bedroom, living room, dining area, kitchen) where the window locations can be offset typically by 5 to 10 feet for privacy.
- At least 40 feet between walls with the primary living room windows where windows are located directly opposite or offset typically by 5 to 10 feet from the windows of facing units.


## Special Rules for Lots less than 75' wide:

37. On lots with detached single family units, establish a minimum building separation of 40 feet. The separation should be increased to at least 50 feet when units are greater than 1,600 square feet in size.

## BUILDING DESIGN

38. Require all sides of buildings to incorporate at least three and typically four of the following features that provide articulation and design interest:

- Minimum depth of at least two inches from glass to exterior of trim or wall edge around windows,
- Trim of at least two inches deep around doors. The use of stucco or EIFS trim around doors and windows is strongly discouraged.
- Pitched / variegated roof forms,
- Roof overhangs at least 18 inches deep,
- Variety in use of materials, especially at ground level stories, for detailing at porches / entry areas, paneling at bays or at special parts of the building,
- Building base (bottom two feet) that is faced with a stone or brick material, or is delineated with a channel or projection; and/or
- Railings with a design pattern in wood, metal, or stone.


## BUILDING FACADE FACING STREET

39. Require that all street-facing facades are designed as a front façade with a front door, and windows on all floors. Exceptions may be granted on busy arterial streets with four travel lanes or more, provided that an attractive street façade design faces the street.
40. Require the design of the street-facing façade to include detailing and articulation equivalent or better in quality to the detailing of the unit fronts throughout the project.
41. Front porches and/or recessed front entry areas should be included on street facing facades.
42. Require a walkway from the sidewalk to the front door. This does not have to be located in a straight line; it may jog around the edge of the front yard to preserve landscaped areas.
43. Living space must front a public street, and be located at least 4 feet forward of the garage.
44. In lower density zones such as R-S or R-2, the front units must be detached from the rest of the units.
45. Maintain and enforce front yard fence height limits. Street facing fences and walls should comply with the zoning ordinance fence height requirements. ( 36 inches at corners in visibility triangle.)
46. Electrical panels must be located and designed so as to be an attractive part of the façade and to be well-screened with landscaping.

## GARAGES AND PARKING

47. Require that the garage (wall to wall) occupy no more than the following portion of the unit frontage on a driveway:

- $60 \%$ for $8-12 \mathrm{du} /$ ac and $12-17 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$, ( $70 \%$ if garage is set at least 4 to 5 ' behind the front door and second story is on top of the garage) ;
- $75 \%$ for $17-22 \mathrm{ac} / \mathrm{du}$;
- $50 \%$ for street-facing facades

48. Retain requirement for two spaces per unit. Retain the requirement of one guest parking space per unit for units greater than 1,000 sq. ft . However allow all apron parking spaces to count towards the requirement. Allow tandem parking for up to $25 \%$ of the units.
49. Limit the number of curb cuts to one per lot, unless the lot exceeds one acre or 200 feet in lot frontage.
50. Maximize the use of shared driveways when driveways are closer than 50' apart. Preserve on-street parking and minimize paving.
51. Allow reduced parking for projects that are near transit stations or major transit corridors, through a discretionary review process that includes public notice and opportunity for public input. Transit stations are defined as a BART station, light rail station, or other heavy rail transit station. Major transit corridors are defined as bus corridors with bus rapid transit, or corridors with bus service every 15 minutes or less throughout daytime hours.
TABLE 2-I: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED STANDARDS


## SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY

Site Area: 20,625 sf
Units: 3
Density: 8.3 DU/ac (6.3 DU/ac gross)

Driveway: 20’
Driveway Side Landscaping: 5'
Driveway and Bldg Separation: 10’
Side Setback: 5’

Site Landscaping: 48\%
Private Open Space: ~ I,325 sf/unit Usable Open Space: ~ I,347 sf/unit Common/Play Area: Not Required


20'

TOWNHOMES
Site Area: 24,375 sf
Units: 5
Density: I3.2 DU/ac (8.9 DU/ac gross)
Driveway: 20'
Driveway Side Landscaping: 5'
Driveway and Bldg Separation: 10 ’
Side Rear Setback: 15 ’
Site Landscaping: 44\%
Private Open Space: $\sim 625$ sf/unit
Usable Open Space: ~ 753 sf/unit
Common/Play Area: 2,000 sf total


SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY
Site Area: 19,250 sf
Units: 3
Density: 9.1 DU/ac (6.8 DU/ac gross)
Driveway: 20'
Driveway Side Landscaping: 5'
Driveway and Bldg Separation: 10 ' Side Setback: 5’

Site Landscaping: 48\%
Private Open Space: ~ 1200 sf/unit
Usable Open Space: ~ I,230 sf/unit Common/Play Area: Not Required


SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY
Site Area: 17,550 sf
Units: 3
Density: I0.6 DU/ac (7.4 DU/ac gross)
Driveway: 20'
Driveway Side Landscaping: 5’
Driveway and Bldg Separation: 10'
Side Setback: 5'

Site Landscaping: 48\%
Private Open Space: ~ I,068 sf/unit Usable Open Space: ~ I,075 sf/unit Common/Play Area: Not Required

TOWNHOMES
Site Area: 17,870 sf
Units: 4
Density: I5.5 DU/ac (9.7 DU/ac gross)
Driveway: 20’
Driveway Side Landscaping: 0'
Driveway and Bldg Separation: 7.5‘
Side Rear Setback: I5’

Site Landscaping: 36\%
Private Open Space: ~ 750 sf/unit
Usable Open Space: ~ 700 sf/unit
Common/Play Area: Not Required


SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY
Site Area: 10,200 sf
Units: 2
Density: II.8 DU/ac (8.I DU/ac gross)
Driveway: 12’
Driveway Side Landscaping: 5'
Driveway and Bldg Separation: 10'
Side Setback: 5'
Site Landscaping: 56\%
Private Open Space: ~ 1,400 sf/unit Usable Open Space: ~ I, II7 sf/unit Common/Play Area: Not Required


## SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY

Site Area: 9,350 sf
Units: 2
Density: I2.2 DU/ac (9.6 DU/ac gross)
Driveway: I2’
Driveway Side Landscaping: 0'
Driveway and Bldg Separation: 10 '
Side Setback: 5'
Site Landscaping: 52\%
Private Open Space: ~ I,302 sf/unit
Usable Open Space: ~ 988 sf/unit
Common/Play Area: Not Required

SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY
Site Area: 8,500 sf
Units: 2
Density: I3.5 DU/ac (10.2 DU/ac gross)
Driveway: 12'
Driveway Side Landscaping: 0'
Driveway and Bldg Separation: 8'
Side Setback: 5’
Site Landscaping: 46\%
Private Open Space: ~ I, 164 sf/unit
Usable Open Space: ~ 646 sf/unit
Common/Play Area: Not Required


## ALAMEDA TOWNHOMES AND SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY HOMES TASKFORCE MEETING TASKFORCE COMMENTS / PG. I OF 6

FEBRUARY 24, 2009

## TASKFORCE COMMENTS

- How are we defining townhomes? Is it common wall?
- Would like to see a comparison with Current zoning and General Plan Zoning to see if they are consistent.
- Is the purpose of including the zoning maps to give context to the discussion of density type?
- Issue of guidelines versus standards. How do you make people adhere to the standards?
- How will the guidelines apply to existing development? For example, rehabs and condo conversions? How will the guidelines apply to pending applications? And what about façade remodels?
- How do we get from standards to addressing design/style?
- What will the design review process be? Review process has to be enforceable.
- Axonometric/3D drawings showing the proposed project with adjacent properties should be part of the application. At minimum, a plan view should show adjacent properties.
- What is meant in the studies of recently built developments when it says required standards versus built conditions? Did the project not follow the plans submitted? (Required means basic standard and what was built was allowed through rezoning to a Planned Development zoning district.)
- Maubert - did not build to approved plans and building inspection did not catch it. What about issue of enforcement? Should the County make people tear down a building if it does comply with the plans?
- Issue with tearing a building down, creates a lot of waste. What do you do with it when you tear it down?
- There is a problem with implementation of existing rules; they are currently now followed.
- How can the new standards be forced to be followed? The Housing Element says that the standards for affordable housing are to be different from standards for market rate deve-lopment? How will that affect design?


## TASKFORCE COMMENTS ON RECOMMENDATIONS

## HEIGHT

- $25^{\prime}$ height limit for two stories is too low (does not allow for steeper roofs even though steeper roofs may sometimes look better)
- $30^{\prime}$ height limit for three stories is too low (roof will be flat, does not allow for steeper roofs)
- Certain architectural styles need a pitched roof (For example - two story Tudor style roof)
- Certain styles may need to be taller to look better, should allow height to do certain archi-tectural styles correctly
- May use rules of measurement to regulate
- Need to look at adjacent buildings during design to see if architecture/height fits into existing settings


# ALAMEDA TOWNHOMES AND SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY HOMES TASKFORCE MEETING TASKFORCE COMMENTS / PG. 2 OF 6 <br> FEBRUARY 24, 2009 

Leslie Gould (LG): Should there be a fixed height limit?

- Should have a height limit but if applicant can show how they work with neighbors and how the project will not block sunlight, then allow for a greater height; height limit to be based on a standard, but if context allows and privacy and views are preserved, then could go a bit higher
- San Bruno requirements - if go beyond standards, have to go through special design process
- Should have a specific height limit
- Do not like wording/language: "Require third story to be tucked under a pitched roof, to incorporate dormers for light and circulation, and be stepped back from the stories below." Should be suggestions, should not mandate design. For example, Mike McDonald's house (LEED) in Oakland has third story with a flat roof but the top of the structure is setback.
- There are ways that design can be explored instead of requiring or dictating how an architect should address certain issues; should not require design-specific regulations
- Should not use the word "require"
- Keep the word "require" and if the applicant proposes something different, then they should go through design review
- Issue of standards v. flexibility, what should the approach be?
- Should have standards but allow for flexibility if go further
- Should not establish a design review board
- Should have standard - if increase height, then can do it only if it is stepped back
- Height should not be completely tied to neighbors' preferences
- Write standard - highest point should be away from setbacks.
- Should look at height as something in relation to something else

LG: What do you see as an appropriate height limit?

- $30^{\prime}$ for 2 stories, $25^{\prime}$ on exterior and when you go inside, you can go higher
- $35^{\prime}$ for 3 stories
- How do you measure height? (the way that is defined could allow for pitched roof)
- Taller portions could be setback
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## DENSITY \& MASS

- Townhomes will have to make effort to reduce mass
- Is it wise to categorize building type by density?
- If there is a $25^{\prime}$ height limit on townhomes, the building will fill up too much of the lot in order to get density (resulting in a bigger footprint)
- Massing is more important than height
- Issue is to consider massing and context, should look at properties next door
- Higher densities are not as appropriate in the unincorporated areas as they are in central cities; could cause reduction in standards of living
- Density is not a problem, just poor design


## OPEN SPACE

- Issue of location versus amount of play area
- There should be a buffer between parking and play areas
- There should be more trees and landscaping in projects
- Does open space need to be landscaped (planted) or can it be decking / patio?
- Existing issue - children's area will count as open space while no other open space is pro-vided
- In townhomes, residents landscape their own rear yards. How do you mandate landscaping in that situation?
- How do you assure landscaping will be done and maintained by the residents?
- Should not allow any building on what is designated as private open space.

LG: Do you mandate a play area, even for fewer than 10 units?

- Yes, because the community is lacking in parks
- Don't know if children's area should be in the middle, near the units. Becomes an annoyance to adjacent residents
- Should specify that play areas should not be near trash, should be a decent size and usable shape, and safe from cars
- Location of children's play area not as important as size of play area
- If there are $5 / 6$ units or more, should require a play area
- 1,500 square feet as minimum size?
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- Set size of play area up in ranges of number of units: between $X$ and $Y$ units, has to be $Z$ sq. ft . big (easier to regulate)
- Community Space - not so much children's area, but want community space where people can interact. Should have amenities such as seating, barbeques, etc.
- Should have "Project Open Space" or "Common Open Space"
- Over certain size, should contain certain children's facilities
- There should be a buffer between play area and driveway


## SITE

- Integrate siting with public street
- Driveway should not be walkway
- Make driveways look more walkable
- If no sidewalk, then should have special paving materials
- Could the walkway be anything?
- Driveway width and materials requirements - would be different if it were an alley versus townhomes facing each other
- Should consider different spatial arrangements between buildings depending on relationship between building and driveway
- 5' separation between building and driveway should only apply if the rear of the units face the driveway side. 5' rule should only apply if driveway is in an alley and front door is on the other side of the building
- Single family homes have trees, fencing, etc as buffers
- Townhomes facing each other need to better address privacy with staggering of windows, greater separation between buildings, use of landscaping to screen, etc.
- Have to protect privacy
- Should not allow people to look into each other
- Minimum window to window distance on primary facades/rooms?
- Need minimum distance (building to building, window to window)
- Should offset windows
- Step back the third floor
- Liberty Pointe - like front street facade (where look like separate units), dislike treatment of the back façade it all looks the same. Same color, materials. Need variation in design, colors, and articulation. The uniformity makes the length of wall look like it goes on forever.
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- Liberty Pointe - windows should not face each other, semi-private spaces, such as stairways, should face each othter. Windows are not placed well.
- Density is an issue - if pack it in, will look a certain way. Bad proportions, density lends itself to bad design.
- Density is not an issue, it's an issue of bad design. Not everybody wants to live in a single family home. Design needs to improve.
- Issues of proportion of space when building is tall and also privacy issues.
- Will always be trade-offs with increased density
- Can do density but units can be small - as tradeoffs
- 5 ' between building units? - too small


## BUILDING LENGTH AND DESIGN

- Okay with 125 feet, don't want to give leeway, should just have max
- Get rid of exception, keep it at 125 feet
- Articulation requirement : put a minimum on the amount of articulation elements to include in a building design; i.e. instead of "some", use 3
- Shouldn't have articulation requirement. For example, modern design - looks good, not have any of those
- Not see anything wrong with having a semi-uniform look for Alameda County, should consider existing suburban setting
- Other parts of the area will become very dense, should allow for different designs
- Should have standards. If don't want to follow them, have to go through deeper design review process, with community input
- Exterior - do not allow stucco trim
- Materials of exterior sometimes may not meet "articulation standards"
- Guidelines will be used by planner at counter, need standards
- Front units detached in R-S and R-2? How will that work in townhomes?
- New construction should maximize street interaction
- There should be design consistency
- Building facing busy street - nobody wants to live there (hardest to rent)
- If busy street - do we have an alternative to street facing façade?
- Walkway to sidewalk to front door, doesn't have to be straight
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- Types of landscaping (what about Bay Friendly Landscaping), design of landscaping? How about porches?
- Need best use of scenario for the lots we do have, maximize use
- Storage space requirement - too expensive
- Take out storage space requirement, too costly
- Like it, but also issue of illegal conversions to living space


## PARKING

- Parking in front versus back. Where should it be?
- Parking should be hidden. Development should be more walkable
- Parking should be consolidated in a multi-level parking structure with a green roof on top. Then the rest of the development can be accessed by walking
- Suburban feel vs. city feel
- Special paving in driveway? (huge expense - $\$ 150,000$ or more ( $\$ 16 / \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft} . \mathrm{vs} \$ 4 / \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$., maintenance, etc.)
- Walkability should be enhanced - separate vehicles from pedestrians
- Parking (should be located in front, designed well, hidden, so interior is walkable)
- Guest parking has to be special paving
- First 20 ' should be special paving to indicate entering into homes
- Reduced Parking? Define transit station, should be BART or frequent bus lines, maybe "transit corridor" is a better phrase.
- Is there dimension? Within $1 / 4$ mile to transit?
- Should it be limited to the "Main Boulevards"?
- Define "transit station"


## NEXT MEETING

- Monday, March 30-6:30pm



## SMALL-LOT SINGLE FAMILY HOMES LOTS LESS THAN 75 FEET WIDE: ANALYSIS OF TYPICAL PROJECTS

This section presents the analysis of four typical small-lot single family home projects constructed on lots less than 75 feet wide in the unincorporated areas of Alameda County.

- 2187, 21813 Meekland Avenue
- 158 Poplar Avenue
- 280 Blossom Way
- 334 Cherry Way

The lots are small infill lots typical of those that exist throughout the County. The analysis for each project includes:

- A site plan of each project, showing density, setbacks, open space, and other key development standards;
- A three-dimensional drawing of the project and the surrounding context of homes and apartments; and
- Photographs of the project
- Aerial Photos of the Project Site

| STANDARD | LOCATION | REQUIREMENT | 2187, 21813 MEEKLAND AVE, CHERRYLAND | 158 POPLAR AVENUE, CHERRYLAND | 280 BLOSSOM WAY, CHERRYLAND | 334 CHERRY WAY, CHERRYLAND |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Dimensions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site area | 17.12 | Min 5,000 sf | 13,550 sf | 10,950 sf | 19, 825 sf | 19825 sf |
| Lot width | 17.12 | Min. 50' | $50 '$ | $50 '$ | $65^{\prime}$ | $65^{\prime}$ |
| Lot width, corner | 17.12 | Min. 60' | - | - | - | - |
| Height | 17.12 | Max. 25' | $12^{\prime}$ | $25^{\prime}$ | 25' | $25^{\prime}$ |
| Stories | 17.12 | Max. 2 stories | 1 stories | 2 stories | 2 stories | 2 stories |
| Density |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RS | 17.12 | 5,000 sf of building site per dwelling unit (8 du/ac) | - | - | - | 9.1 DU/ac |
| RS-D35 | 17.12 | 3,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit (12 du/ac) | - | - | 9.1 DU/ac | - |
| RS-D25 | 17.12, 17.24 | 2,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit (17.5 du/ac) | - | - | - | - |
| RS-D20 | 17.12, 17.24 | 2,000 sf of building site per dwelling unit (22 du/ac) | - | 11.1 DU/ac | - | - |
| RS-D15 | 17.12, 17.24 | 1,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit (29 du/ac) | - | - | - | - |
| D-3 | 17.12, 17.24 | As specified in amendment creating district; in no case less than 1,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $29 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) | 9.8 DU/ac | - | - | - |
| FAR | Condo Guideline 1 | Max. 1:3 (0.33) | 1:5.31 (0.19) | 1:2.98 (0.34) | 1:3.06 (0.33) | 1:3.38 (0.30) |
| Setbacks |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Front | 17.12 | Min. 20' | 9' | $20^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $23^{\prime}$ |
| Side (for three or more units) | 17.12 | Min. 10' | - | - | - | - |
| Side (for fewer than three units) | 17.12, 17.08 | Not less than five feet plus one foot for each full ten feet by which the median lot width exceeds fifty (50) feet up to a maximum requirement of ten feet, except that in every case the side yard on the street side of a corner lot shall have a width not less than ten feet. | 5' | 5' | 5' | 5.5' |
| Rear | 17.12 | Min. 20' | $20^{\prime}$ | 29'; 38 ' | 29.5'; 20' | $15^{\prime}$ |
| Setback from access driveway | 17.12 | Min. 10' | $0^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}$ | 5' | 5' |
| Distance between main buildings | 17.12 | Min. 20' | 95' | 58' | $56^{\prime}$ | 91' |
| Distance between walls at entry areas and parking/driveways | Condo Guideline 4 | $12^{\prime}$ | $0^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}$ | 5' | 5' |


| STANDARD | LOCATION | REQUIREMENT | 2187, 21813 MEEKLAND AVE, CHERRYLAND | 158 POPLAR AVENUE, CHERRYLAND | 280 BLOSSOM WAY, CHERRYLAND | 334 CHERRY WAY, CHERRYLAND |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit orientation | Condo Guideline 5 | Units to be sited and screened to provide privacy from adjacent units and uses | Units face front | Units face access drive | Front unit faces street, other units face access drive | Front unit faces street, other units face access drive |
| Open Space |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Useable open space | 17.12 | 600 sf per dwelling unit | ~610 sf/unit | ~545 sf/unit | ~930 sf/unit | ~774 sf/unit |
| Private open space for units on ground floor | Condo Guideline 3 | 300 sf | ~1,600 sf/unit | ~1,700 sf/unit | ~1,400 sf/unit | ~1,700 sf/unit |
| Minimum dimension for private open space for units on the ground floor |  | 15' | $20^{\prime}$ | $18^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $15 '$ |
| Private open space - units not on ground floor | Condo Guideline 3 | Adequate balconies; min. dimension $8^{\prime}$ | - | - | - | - |
| Play areas | Condo Guideline 13 | Play areas should be provided on a basis of 40 sq ft/child. | None indicated | None indicated | None indicated | None indicated |
| Parking |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit parking | Condo Guideline 2 | 2 per unit; one must be covered | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| Guest parking | Condo Guideline 2 | 0.5 per unit for units $<1,000 \mathrm{sf} ; 1.0$ per unit for units $>1,000$ sf | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Apron | Condo Guideline 2 | Where practical, enclosed parking spaces should have an apron in front capable of providing a tandem space for alternate or additional use. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Width of access driveway, 4 or fewer spaces served | 17.12, 17.52 | Min 12' | - | - | - | - |
| Width of access driveway, 5 or more spaces served | 17.12, 17.52 | Min. $20^{\prime}$ | $15{ }^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ | $13^{\prime}$ | 15.5' |

$\underline{21807,21813 \text { Meekland Avenue, Cherryland (RS-D3) }}$
Site Area: ~ 13,550 sf
Units: I existing, I new
Density: 9.8 DU/ac (6.5 DU/ac gross)
Max.Allowed I4.5 DU/ac
FAR: I:5.3I (0.19)
Max.Allowed I:3 (0.33)
Height: I2’
Stories: I

Unit Parking: 4 (2 per unit > I,000 sf; I per unit < I,000 sf) Guest Parking: 2 Apron

Usable Open Space: ~ 610 sf/unit
Private Open Space: ~ I,600 sf/unit


Driveway: 15’
Required min. 20'
FIGURE 3-2: 21807, 21813 MEEKLAND AVENUE AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT
Height: I2'
Stories: I
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158 Poplar Avenue, Cherryland (RS-D20)
Site Area: 10,950 sf
Units: 2 new
Density: I I.I DU/ac (7.9 DU/ac gross)
Max.Allowed 22 DU/ac
FAR: I:2.98 (0.34)
Max.Allowed I:3 (0.33)
Height: 25'
Stories: 2 (Garages: I Story)
Unit Parking: 4 (2 per unit > I,000 sf; I per unit < I,000 sf) Guest Parking: I on site + Apron

Usable Open Space: ~ 545 sf/unit
Private Open Space: ~ I,700 sf/unit

FIGURE 3-4: 158 POPLAR AVENUE AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT
Stories: 2, Garages: I Story

158 POPLAR AVENUE
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## 280 Blossom Way, Cherryland (RS-D35)

Site Area: 19,825 sf
Units: I existing, 2 new
Density: 9.I DU/ac (6.6 DU/ac gross)
Max. Alllowed 12 DU/ac
FAR: I:3.06 (0.33)
Max. Allowed I:3 (0.33)
Height: 25’
Stories: 2 (Existing House: I Story)
Unit Parking: 6 (2 per unit > I,000 sf; I per unit < I,000 sf)
Guest Parking: 2 + Apron
Usable Open Space: ~ 930 sf/unit
Private Open Space: $\sim 1,400$ sf/unit

FIGURE 3-6: 280 BLOSSOM WAY AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT

Stories: 2, Existing House: I Story
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334 Cherry Way, Cherryland (RS)
Site Area: 19,825 sf
Units: I existing, 2 new
Density: 9.I DU/ac (6.6 DU/ac gross)
Max. Alllowed 8 DU/ac
FAR: I:3.38 (0.30)
Max. Allowed I:3 (0.33)
Height: 25’
Stories: 2 (Garages: I Story, Existing House: I Story)
Unit Parking: 6 (2 per unit > I,000 sf; I per unit < I,000 sf)
Guest Parking: 2 + Apron
Usable Open Space: ~ 774 sf/unit
Private Open Space: ~ I,700 sf/unit

FIGURE 3-8: 334 CHERRY WAY AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT
Stories: 2, Garages: I Story, Existing House: I Story



## 334 CHERRY WAY
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This section presents the analysis of two typical townhome projects constructed on lots less than 75 feet wide in the unincorporated areas of Alameda County.

- 1168 Elgin Street
- 19505 Meekland Avenue

The lots are small infill lots typical of those that exist throughout the County. The analysis for each project includes:

- A site plan of each project, showing density, setbacks, open space, and other key development standards;
- A three-dimensional drawing of the project and the surrounding context of homes and apartments; and
- Photographs of the project
- Aerial Photos of the Project Site

| STANDARD | REQUIREMENT | 1168 ELGIN STREET, SAN LORENZO | 19505 MEEKLAND AVE, CHERRYLAND |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Dimensions |  |  |  |
| Site area | Min 5,000 sf | 17040 sf | 23,340 sf |
| Lot width | Min. 50' | $60^{\prime}$ | $70^{\prime}$ |
| Lot width, corner | Min. 60' | - | - |
| Height | Max. 25' | 25' | 30' |
| Stories | Max. 2 stories | 2 stories | 2 stories |
| Density |  |  |  |
| RS | 5,000 sf of building site per dwelling unit (8 du/ac) | - | - |
| RS-D35 | 3,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $12 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) | - | - |
| RS-D25 | 2,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $17.5 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) | - | - |
| RS-D20 | 2,000 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $22 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) | 3,408 sf/unit (13 DU/ac) | - |
| RS-D15 | 1,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit (29 du/ac) | - | - |
| D-3 | As specified in amendment creating district; in no case less than 1,500 sf of building site per dwelling unit ( $29 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) | - | 2,593 sf/unit (16 DU/ac) |
| FAR | Max. 1:3 (0.33) | 1:2.5 (0.4) | 1:212 (0.47) |
| Setbacks |  |  |  |
| Front | Min. 20' | $20^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ |
| Side (for three or more units) | Min. 10' | $10^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ |
| Side (for fewer than three units) | Not less than five feet plus one foot for each full ten feet by which the median lot width exceeds fifty (50) feet up to a maximum requirement of ten feet, except that in every case the side yard on the street side of a corner lot shall have a width not less than ten feet. | - | - |
| Rear | Min. 20' | 48' | 45' |
| Setback from access driveway | Min. 10' | 5' | 5' |
| Distance between main buildings | Min. 20' | $16^{\prime}$ | $26^{\prime}$ |


| STANDARD | REQUIREMENT | 1168 ELGIN STREET, SAN LORENZO | 19505 MEEKLAND AVE, CHERRYLAND |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distance between walls at entry areas and parking/driveways | 12' | 6' | 8' |
| Unit orientation | Units to be sited and screened to provide privacy from adjacent units and uses | Units face access drive | Units face access drive |
| Open Space |  |  |  |
| Useable open space | 600 sf per dwelling unit | ~662 sf/unit | ~650 sf/unit |
| Private open space for units on ground floor | 300 sf | 400 sf/unit | 190 sf/unit (at minimum) |
| Minimum dimension for private open space for units on the ground floor | 15' | 10' | 10' |
| Private open space units not on ground floor | Adequate balconies; min. dimension $8^{\prime}$ | - | - |
| Play areas | Play areas should be provided on a basis of 40 sq ft /child. | None indicated | None indicated |
| Parking |  |  |  |
| Unit parking | 2 per unit; one must be covered | 10 | 16 |
| Guest parking | 0.5 per unit for units $<1,000 \mathrm{sf} ; 1.0$ per unit for units $>1,000$ sf | 6 | 9 |
| Apron | Where practical, enclosed parking spaces should have an apron in front capable of providing a tandem space for alternate or additional use. | Not provided | Not provided |
| Width of access driveway, 4 or fewer spaces served | Min 12' | - | - |
| Width of access driveway, 5 or more spaces served | Min. 20' | $20^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ |

FIGURE 4-I: II68 ELGIN STREET PLAN

1168 Elgin Street, San Lorenzo (RS-D20)
Site Area: 17,040 sf ( $60^{\prime} \times 285^{\prime}$ )
Units: 5
Density: 3,408 sf/unit = 13 DU/ac (Max. allowed 22 DU/ac)
FAR: I:2.5 (0.4), Max. allowed I:3 (0.33)
Height: 25'
Stories: 2

Unit Parking: 10 (2 per unit)
Guest Parking: 6
Play Area: No play area indicated


1168 ELGIN STREET
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19505 Meekland Avenue, Cherryland (RS-D3)
Site Area: 23,340 sf (70’ x 343')
Units: 9
Density: 2,593 sf/unit $=16$ DU/ac (Max. allowed 29 DU/ac)
FAR: I:2.I2 (0.47), Max. allowed I:3 (0.33)

Height: 30', Max. allowed 25'
Stories: 2

Unit Parking: I6 (2 per unit > I,000 sf; I per unit < I,000 sf)
Guest Parking: 9
Play Area: No play area indicated

Private open space per dwelling unit: min. 190 sf

Required 300 sf
Min. dimension for private open space: 10'

FIGURE 3-4: 19505 MEEKLAND AVENUE AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT
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