

ERRATA SHEET			
No.	Section/Chapter	Comment/Issue	Revision
Underlined text is new text while strikethrough text is deleted text.			
GENERAL			
	Photos	Feedback from Taskforce	Photos throughout the document were updated based on feedback from the Taskforce. In addition, “decorative” photos on the beginning of each chapter were removed to limit the number of these photos. Text was added to Section 1.2 to explain the intention of photos in the document.
	Captions	Feedback from Taskforce	Captions were updated to speak more specifically about what the photo is showing. In addition, headers were also added stating which projects were “desirable” and which projects were “undesirable.”
	Guidelines	Standards in Guidelines	The Guidelines have been updated to remove all standards.
	Setbacks	Clarification	<p>Instead of “project” setbacks, it’s been updated to “building site” setbacks. Now the setback categories are:</p> <p>Building Site setbacks Lot Setbacks</p> <p>Added text to also say:</p> <p><u>Building site setbacks apply along the perimeter of a building site and lot setbacks apply to individual lots within a building site. In the event of conflict between building site setback requirements and lot setback requirements, the project must comply with whichever standard results in the greater setback.</u></p>
CHAPTER 1: Introduction			
1.	1.1	Taskforce comment regarding providing a stronger introduction to the document.	Expanded background text to include specific problems identified by the community regarding development.
2.	1.2	Policy regarding conflict between existing standards and specific plan standards were in another place.	<p>Updated Police 1-1 to consolidate into one place.</p> <p>Policy 1-1: Design residential development projects to comply with all of the standards and guidelines. In the event of a conflict between the existing development standards in the Zoning Code, and these standards and guidelines, the more restrictive requirements shall apply. <u>In the event of a conflict between the existing development standards in the Specific Plans and these standards and guidelines, the Planning Director shall determine which standards apply.</u></p>

ERRATA SHEET			
No.	Section/Chapter	Comment/Issue	Revision
<i>Underlined text is new text while strikethrough text is deleted text.</i>			
3.	1.2	Taskforce comment regarding providing a stronger introduction to the document.	Added text explaining standards versus guidelines.
4.	1.2	Taskforce comment regarding providing text about the photographs contained in the document.	Added text explaining intention of photographs.
5.	1.3	Repetition throughout the section.	Consolidated the text regarding Specific Plans to avoid repetition
CHAPTER 2: Development Standards for Residential Projects			
6.	2.1	Repetitive discussion regarding where zoning districts can be found in the County.	Deleted discussion about where zoning districts can be found in the County in section 2.1 as the same discussion can be found in the beginning of each building type section.
7.	2.1, 4.1	Outdated Density Bonus language.	Updated language to reflect most current State policy.
8.	2.2	Taskforce comment regarding clarifying height exception and second story rear setback labels on Figure 2.2-1.	Updated Figure 2.2-1 and Table 2.2-1 and Table 2.2-2. Height: max. 25'; up to 30' on large wide lots over 70' x 100' . Up to 30' provided that the roof is pitched and portion of roof > 25' is min. 15' from bldg site property line. Second Story Rear Setback: Min. 25' <u>if second story floor area > 80% of the first story bldg footprint</u>
9.	2.2	Taskforce comment that minimum front porch/recess requirement too restrictive.	Updated Figure 2.2-4 and Table 2.2-1. <u>5 percent of ground floor building footprint area; up to a maximum of 100 square feet; minimum 5 foot dimension</u>
10.	2.2	Taskforce comment that three car garages should be allowed, garage aprons should be wider than the garage door, and curb cut should not be limited to 20 feet.	New Figure 2.2-5. Updated Table 2.2-1. <u>Maximum Garage Width (ft)</u> <u>Facing Public Street:</u> <u>Where garage doors face a public street, garage width shall not exceed 50 percent of the width of the front facade of the building.</u>

ERRATA SHEET			
No.	Section/Chapter	Comment/Issue	Revision
<i>Underlined text is new text while strikethrough text is deleted text.</i>			
			<p><u>Facing Access Driveway/Private Street:</u> Where garage doors face a private street or access driveway, garage width shall not exceed 60 percent of the width of the front facade of the building.</p> <p><u>Three-Car Garages:</u> Garages with three or more doors, or designed to accommodate three or more non-tandem parked cars, are permitted only on lots 85 feet wide or greater, and at least one garage front must be separated from the remaining garage fronts by at least two feet.</p> <p><u>Maximum Driveway Apron Width (ft):</u> Driveway apron width shall not exceed the garage door width by more than one foot in either direction. Garage aprons leading to three-car garages shall be treated with decorative or permeable paving for a minimum of 35 percent of the driveway apron area.</p>
11.	2.2	Taskforce comment that minimum landscaping for access driveway/Private Street/Parking area is too restrictive.	<p>Updated Table 2.2-1.</p> <p>The minimum side landscaping shall be 3 feet when the building site width is less than 80 feet. <u>Staff may approve a minimum side landscaping of 3 feet for building sites that are 80 feet or wider if vertical landscaping (e.g. trees, shrubs, bushes) is planted along this side landscaping area.</u></p>
12.	2.2	Text regarding private, usable open space area for Fairview should be added to Table 2.2 and not be in Chapter 7.	Updated Table 2.2-1.
13.	2.3	Taskforce comment that masses in Figure 2.3-2 and 2.3-3 are too bulky	Updated Figures.
14.	2.3, 2.4	Taskforce comment that minimum front porch/recess requirement too restrictive.	<p>Updated Figure 2.3-6 and Table 2.3-1. Updated Figure 2.4-11 (used to be Figure 2.4-11) and Table 2.4.1.</p> <p><u>5 percent of ground floor building footprint area; up to a maximum of 75 square feet; minimum 5 foot dimension</u></p>
15.	2.3, 2.4	Taskforce comment garage aprons should	New Figure 2.3-8 and Updated Table 2.3-1. New Figure 2.4-12 and Updated

ERRATA SHEET			
No.	Section/Chapter	Comment/Issue	Revision
<i>Underlined text is new text while strikethrough text is deleted text.</i>			
		be wider than the garage door.	Table 2.4-1. <u>Maximum Driveway Apron Width (ft):</u> <u>Driveway apron width shall not exceed the garage door width by more than one foot in either direction.</u>
16.	2.3, 2.4	Taskforce comment about being more specific about when garage width exceptions apply.	Updated Figure 2.3-9 (used to be 2.3-8) and Table 2.3-1. Updated Figure 2.4-6 2.4-7 (used to be 2.4-8) and Table 2.4-1. Specify that exception is for when second story is on top of garage and projects a <u>minimum of two feet</u> forward.
17.	2.3, 2.4	Bulk reduction along the building site side property line should be quantified.	Updated Figure 2.3-10 and Table 2.3-1. Updated Figure 2.4-8 (used to be Figure 2.4-9) and Table 2.4-1. <u>50% of the required bulk reduction shall occur along the building site side property line.</u>
18.	2.3, 2.4	Taskforce comment that standard requiring minimum distance between buildings based on windows may discourage projects to incorporate adequate windows in order to get a lower separation distance.	Updated Figure 2.3-11 (used to be Figure 2.3-9) and Table 2.3-1. Updated Table 2.4-1. Standard is now based on walls, not windows.
19.	2.3	Taskforce comment that there should be more space between new project and adjacent neighboring properties when the building site is narrow and side setback is 5 feet.	Updated Table 2.3-1. <u>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.</u>
20.	2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Taskforce comment that decorative paving should not be required in fire turnarounds.	Updated Table 2.3-1 and Table 2.4-1 and Table 2.5-1. Locate at driveway entrances, driveway aprons and in areas that can be used as open space. such as fire turnarounds.
21.	2.3, 2.4	Taskforce comment that minimum landscaping for access driveway/Private	Updated Table 2.3-1 and Table 2.4-1. <u>Staff may approve a minimum side landscaping of 3 feet for building sites that</u>

ERRATA SHEET			
No.	Section/Chapter	Comment/Issue	Revision
<i>Underlined text is new text while strikethrough text is deleted text.</i>			
		Street/Parking area is too restrictive.	<u>are 75 feet or wider if vertical landscaping (e.g. trees, shrubs, bushes) is planted along this side landscaping area.</u>
22.	2.5	Added Exception for Entry	Updated Table 2.5-1. <u>Exception: If entries consist of individual entrances, each individual entrance shall incorporate a projection (e.g. porch) or recess, or combination of projection and recess at least 40 square feet in area, with a minimum depth of five feet.</u>
23.	2.5, 4.2	Need to increase minimum distance between buildings.	Updated Table 2.5-1 and Table 4.2-1. <u>The minimum distance between buildings shall be 10 feet. The minimum distance shall be increased by 10 feet for each additional story.</u>
CHAPTER 3: Design Guidelines for Residential Projects			
24.	3	Taskforce comment that there should be short intro before Guidelines.	Updated.
25.	3, A	Taskforce debate regarding the word "compatible"	Added word "compatible" to Definitions. <u>Compatible. That which is harmonious with and will not adversely affect surrounding buildings and/or uses.</u> Deleted A-3 as more applicable to Section C.
26.	3, B	Taskforce comment regarding having new projects keep single-story character of area if that is prevailing character.	Added new Guideline. See B-4.
27.	3, C	Taskforce comment regarding having single-family detached development along the street frontage if the prevailing character of the area is such.	Added new Guideline. See C-5.
28.	3, D	Taskforce comment regarding having projects exhibit architectural integrity.	Updated D-1, Added new Guideline. See D-2.
29.	3, D	Taskforce comment regarding clarifying language regarding "unified materials on all four sides."	Updated. See Guideline D-6.

ERRATA SHEET			
No.	Section/Chapter	Comment/Issue	Revision
<i>Underlined text is new text while strikethrough text is deleted text.</i>			
30.	3, D	Taskforce comment regarding stronger language about colors.	Updated. See Guideline D-9 and D-10.
31.	3, D	Taskforce comment regarding have better guidelines for windows.	Updated. Removed window options from D-11. Created new guideline specifically for windows. See D-16 and D-17.
32.	3, D	Taskforce comment regarding having stronger guidelines for remodeling and additions.	Updated. See D-20 to D-25.
33	3, E	Building Separation more of standard than guideline.	Deleted E-4 and E-5.
34.	3, F	Taskforce comment regarding the infeasibility of requiring shared driveways.	Deleted F-4. Updated F-3 to require landscaping strip if driveways are next to each other.
35.	3, F	Guidelines F-5 to F-8 not really guidelines.	Deleted. New F-5 Guideline references Engineering Design Guidelines.
36.	3, I	Taskforce comment that bay friendly, drought-tolerant landscaping is not attractive	Updated I-2, added word attractive.
37.	3, I	Taskforce comment that play areas should have grass.	See new Guideline I-7. Allows landscaping requiring higher water usage for intensively used areas.
Chapter 4: Development Standards for Residential Mixed-Use Projects			
38.	4.2	Street front setback adjacent to residential updated to be a minimum of 10' to be consistent with other districts. Added note regarding areas that may potentially need to be greater.	Updated Figure 4.2-7 and Table 4.2-1. <u>Street Front (Commercial Uses, Adjacent to Residential District):</u> <u>Minimum 10 feet. As part of a future study, the County may identify certain areas that may require a greater setback for the purpose of creating gateways at select intersections.</u>
39.	4.2	Figure 4.2-10. Error in drawing showing setback adjacent to low density residential	Updated Figure.
40.	4.2	Taskforce comment regarding clarification for Minimum Ground Floor Commercial Space	Updated Table 4.2-1. The Specific Plan says that the percentage is of the ground floor space. Exception currently written in.

Alameda County Design Standards and Guidelines
 Taskforce Review Draft Errata Sheet, July 2010

ERRATA SHEET			
No.	Section/Chapter	Comment/Issue	Revision
<i>Underlined text is new text while strikethrough text is deleted text.</i>			
.CHAPTER 5: Design Guidelines for Residential Mixed-Use Projects			
41.	4	Taskforce comment that there should be short intro before Guidelines.	Updated.
42.	4, B	Taskforce comment about desire to see guidelines encourage open air frontages as well.	See Guideline B-2.
43.	4, E	Taskforce comment regarding having projects exhibit design integrity.	See Guidelines E-1 and E-2.
44.	4, E	Taskforce comment to reword E-40.	See Guideline E-32.
45.	4, F	Building separation is standard	Removed F-2.
CHAPTER 6: Standards that Apply to All or Some Projects			
46.	6, Parking	Updated aisle widths, were too small.	See Table 6.1.
47.	6, Projections	Removed building additions language.	County should incorporate this into provisions for nonconforming uses and structures.
48.	6, Fences	Add limit for fences outside of required yards.	Updated.
49.	6, Trees	Tree list is outdated.	Deleted.
CHAPTER 7: Definitions and Rules of Measurement			
50.	7, Definitions	Added more Definitions.	
51.	7, Rules of Measurement	Updated Determining Average Slope to reflect new methodology.	
52.	7, Rules of Measurement	Added Determining Lot Frontage to clarify where the front of the lot is in situations such as flag lots.	
53.	7, Rules of Measurement	Added Determining Setbacks.	
STAFF COMMENTS SUBMITTED JULY 2, 2010			

ERRATA SHEET			
No.	Section/Chapter	Comment/Issue	Revision
<i>Underlined text is new text while strikethrough text is deleted text.</i>			
54.	Chapters 3 and 5	C.3 Responsibilities	<p>For the following topics: Building Relationship to the Street (page 3-7/5-7) Auto Circulation (page 3-17) Parking Location and Design (page 3-18/5-18) Facilities for Walking, Bicycle, Transit (page 3-20/5-19) Site Landscaping (page 3-22/5-21) Usable Open Space (page 3-25/5-24)</p> <p>Added Reference to following Endnote: <u>When meeting the design guideline or the design guidelines within this topic, the project must exhibit an overarching intent to reduce water quality impacts of development. Site Design Measures in combination with Low Impact Development and Bay-Friendly Landscaping principles must be integrated into development projects wherever feasible and practicable. Infeasibility must be demonstrated in projects where treatment measures cannot be practiced or included in site and building designs. Cost is not an acceptable defense for infeasibility.</u> (page 3-30/5-28)</p>
55.	Chapters 3 and 5	C.3 Responsibilities	<p>Update Guideline G-1 (Chapt.3) and H-1 (Chapt. 5) Locate parking to the side or rear of buildings or underneath buildings <u>and avoid land intensive surface parking lots...</u></p>
56	Chapters 3 and 5	C.3 Responsibilities	<p>Update Guideline G-6 (Chapt.3) Disperse <u>contiguously paved parking areas</u> throughout the project in smaller <u>segmented parking areas</u>, rather than creating <u>land intensive surface large</u> parking lots.</p> <p>Add new Guideline H-2 (Chapt. 5) <u>Disperse contiguously paved parking areas throughout the project in smaller segmented parking areas, rather than creating land intensive surface parking lots.</u></p>
57.	Chapters 3 and 5	C.3Responsibilities	Update Guideline H-4 (Chapt. 3) and I-7(Chapt 5):

Alameda County Design Standards and Guidelines
 Taskforce Review Draft Errata Sheet, July 2010

ERRATA SHEET			
No.	Section/Chapter	Comment/Issue	Revision
<i>Underlined text is new text while strikethrough text is deleted text.</i>			
			Incorporate decorative, <u>pervious</u> paving into paved and landscaped areas...
58.	Chapters 3 and 5	C.3 Responsibilities	Add new Guideline I-5 (Chapt. 3) and J-4 (Chapt. 5): <u>Do not reduce the amount of existing landscaping on site.</u>
59.	Chapter 3 (pg. 3-24)	Update stormwater photo	New photo of green roof on bottom left.
60.	Chapters 3 and 5	C.3 Responsibilities	Add new Guideline J-2 (Chapt. 3) and K-2 (Chapt. 5) <u>Provide usable open space that may have a dual function for stormwater treatment and incorporates strategies such as grassy swales, vegetated swales, flow through planters, rain gardens, etc.</u>
51.	Chapter 7	C.3Responsibilities	Added new definitions for: Low Impact Development Bay-Friendly Landscaping Site Design Measures Added new policy for: Stormwater