

Taskforce Meeting Notes – July 27, 2010

- Should give Planning Commission a copy of the Design Standards and Guidelines that will be handed out tomorrow
- What is the focus? How design review fits in rather than process in general?
- Under Role of Respective authorities – add public
- Who decides? Community ought to be involved
- Site Development Review (SDR) is a non-public process except in Castro Valley
 - RO: “Roundtable” exists for interested parties who want more information or want to offer comments
- The current issue is that there are high thresholds for SDR
- Does Planning maintain a list of current SDR applications?
 - RO: Can get a list
- Should have these projects listed on the website or posted on a bulletin board in the Planning office.
 - SR: need to address internally clean up between Advantage list and what can go on web
- When someone sees a sign posted about a project on the project site and calls planning, will the person who answers the phone be able to provide info about project?
 - RO: receptionist will refer you to project planner
- What triggers need for EIR?
- When do you go from initial study to EIR? Is it clear?
- Within 60-day period - referrals to public to elicit written response. No time for community meetings?
- Categorical exempt: Single-family Residential
- Go to MAC, then PC. Is there a 30-day notice for MAC?
 - VK: MAC not a decision-body so 72 hr noticing
- MND/ND: have 20/30-day review period
- MAC: While this is happening, should be going through other reviews
- Is PC 30-day?
 - RO: No: 10 day notice for meeting
 - VK: local agency can require more days but max usually 15
 - 72 hour Notice related Brown Act (Public Meetings)
- Some CUPS go to BZA
- Public should realize that re-zoning is concurrent with project
- Why would lots that were subdivided a long time ago be subject to Design Review?

- Now, if you submit tent/tract map, would you need to submit building plans? But you would know where building envelope is. If someone wants to come in and build, then need to do design review. Why require it at time of map process?
 - VK: It would be up to applicant. If project already went through design review and is approved, could be more attractive to buyer.
 - VK: Other jurisdictions ask for elevations.
 - VK: County have little may not know what is imposed 20 years ago. In addition, there are changes in standards/law.
 - RO: Madison Area, can't build on anything over 30% slope. But when application for subdivision approved, little idea of where buildings go and end up with buildings that are too tall and slope too high.
- But that is different since rules changed. What about 2 -3 lot subdivision? Should set a threshold.
- If simple subdivision with building envelope and setbacks shown, shouldn't need design review. (Difference between involving an engineer and an architect.)
 - VK: One issue would be what info should be required for parcel/ tent maps in future?
- Building envelopes solve the problem so should show on map
 - VK: So should show Parking, driveways, setbacks, trees?
- All that mapping can be accomplished with engineer. Cost increases when involve architect. Should have threshold: parcel versus tract map
- Approve map if design standards and guidelines adopted.
- Whoever buys subdivided lots should have to go through design review
- There's a difference between someone who just subdivides and sells versus subdivide and build
 - RO: Should have some kind of review (5 or more) more lots, may be more stringent
- Does the 2,500 sf of landscaping have to be contiguous?
- Doesn't talk about large landscaping, why is it? What is the authority for reviewing landscaping?
 - RO: Currently, landscaping review not that stringent
- Storm water requirements have changed. C.3, EBMUD, etc multi-jurisdictional process now
- Don't see in design approval where someone says need 2,000 sq. ft. of landscaping in the standards and guidelines
- All exempt projects should not be appealable.
 - VK: Appealable on interpretation of standards
- Ministerial: not lot of wiggle room, flexibility someone just rubberstamps project.
- If appealable, makes it discretionary (not ministerial)
- Go to senior planner, not have a formal appeal process with public hearing
- Not use "ministerial"?

Track 1

- 2,500 square feet of landscaping? Where did you get that number?

- Typo in chart “of” versus “or”
- 5,000 sq. ft. is a lot of structure
- Ministerial design review?
 - VK: If you comply, get points. If not comply, don’t get points
- “Ministerial” should say checklist review, make it abundantly clear that checklist is to ensure compliance with standards and guidelines
- So need to go above standards? Get penalized for meeting standards?
- If go over lot coverage, then go through a more stringent process?
 - VK: Don’t achieve the minimum from 3 out of 6?
- Agree by section by not like lot coverage as a category
- Abutting? Just next to?
- If 2 stories, go to Tack 2 automatically?
 - VK: Only if those around you are single-story
- Average height? Of all abutting? (VK: Yes)
- Doing this to stay on Track 1
- Planning Director: pioneer to increase affordable housing, will this replace that?
- Building height: Should have stricter minimum points
- Okay with concept of checklist
- Should have weighted design category
- When would you have the checklist? Don’t want to adopt standards/guidelines and then not have checklist
 - RO: If there is no checklist, would have a more complicated process
- What needs to be submitted for the different tracks?
- Track 1? No appeal. Do neighbors get notified?
 - VK: Can be an issue for discussion
- If meet checklist, can build 5,000 sq. ft. duplex
- VK: Have to meet standards and use
- What if we re-zone? (Get kicked up)
- Track 2 and 3 should not appealable to BOS
- Is there currently a pre-application fee?
 - SR: \$150 per department
- Does applicant continue to pay to meet again?
- Can it be an iterative process? (Pre-application)
- Need to submit application at this point
 - VK: Pre-application should be one shot deal
 - SR: Applicants come and meet with different planners, think they have a project
- Concerned about in-house architect option
 - VK: In pre-application, design would become part of the process
- Planners at desk not always give best advice. More authority in pre-application
- Often get different answers from different planners so pre-application is a good idea
- How incorporate design review?
 - VK: Planners would provide advice regarding topics
 - RO: Planners would point the applicant to the right section, what guidelines apply

- Prob. With staff consultant is cost, outside consultants will cost too much. Rather see expertise with staff
- Makes more sense with having a staff with own viewpoints. Having expertise on staff makes it more dynamic, informative to other staff members.
- If you ask applicant to follow the Design Standards and Guidelines, should be some burden on staff to have in-house expertise
- Applicant has to pay for outside consultant
- If can't afford review process, can't afford to play the game
- If do this, need commitment from Planning Director to back it up with staff's knowledge. If can't do that, need Design Review Board
- Minimum number of Planning Commission need to live in area, not all
- Opposed to picking specialties for Planning Commission. Would like to see someone with more economic knowledge or get people who are open minded, willing to learn, etc. Less important to be architect, lawyer.
- Responsibility for enforcement lies with County
- Planning staff has to go out and check, architect working for applicant, so will help applicant
- Having an architect certify only works well if developer, contractor actually does what the architect specifies
- Enforcement should be planning staff
- Planner carry out with site plan and checked, so on some level it is done, needs to be better
- Email out PowerPoint and handouts