

Summary of Revisions Made and Responses to Comments Received at the Planning Commission Hearing of June 22, 2022				
Line #	OLD #	NEW #	Comments Received	Staff Response
PUBLIC TESTIMONY				
1	--	--	In previous meetings, it was stated that there would be one unifying document of all objective standards. If we don't do this, it will be confusing for the public to understand. Document should be integrated.	Other applicable development requirements in the Town are now listed in the "Purpose and Applicability" section.
2	--	--	Define qualifying project.	"Qualifying Project" are now outlined in the "Purpose and Applicability" section.
3	--	--	Photos or graphics would be helpful for the public to understand the concepts.	Diagrams have been updated throughout the document.
4	--	--	The document covers many building types and the concepts should be broken up for each building type.	The document has not be modified to cover different building types. Staff does not recommend this approach as it will over-complicate the document.
COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION				
5	--	--	How will the objective standards document be viewed from a developer perspective?	The final formatting and application process for qualifying projects will be developed by staff after adoption of the final document. Staff will determine the best approach based on the final adopted document. All documents and applications will be made available on the Town's website.
6	--	--	Is this applicable to single-family?	No. "Qualifying Projects" is now outlined in the "Purpose and Applicability" section.
7	--	--	Will there still be discretionary review if an applicant does not want to follow these standards?	Yes.
8	--	--	What does "qualifying" mean in this sense?	"Qualifying Projects" are now outlined in the "Purpose and Applicability" section.
9	--	--	Discussion on amending Town Code and guideline documents.	The intent is that the document would be a stand-alone policy document without requiring any other amendments to existing Town documents. A stand-alone document, similar to the Hillside Development Standards and Guidelines, allows for increased flexibility through periodic updates that are more difficult to accomplish within the structure of the Town Code.
10	--	--	What happens if an element was not included in the objective standards?	The goal of the document is to include all relevant standards. Being a stand-alone policy document, staff can return with updates periodically as needed.
11	--	--	Likes the idea of real-world examples instead of simplistic diagrams.	Photographic examples of the concepts have the potential to communicate unintended values or design guidance. Diagrams have been updated throughout the document to better illustrate the concepts in a more realistic style. Staff does not recommend the use of photos in the document.
12	--	--	Is protection of views covered and considered? Do any other jurisdictions have objective standards for view protection?	Protection of views is not covered in the document. The concept was discussed in previous meetings and researched by the consultant. Staff is not aware of other jurisdictions having objective view standards. The Town would first need to adopt a view shed protection ordinance in order to include standards in the document to protect views. This would be a Council-level priority decision and is not appropriate for this policy document.
13	--	--	Since Palo Alto's standards are much more comprehensive, how should we move forward?	Palo Alto's ordinance includes both objective standards and context based design criteria formatted in line with one another. The context based criteria lines up with the Town's discretionary review application process. If there are specific pieces of objective standards from other jurisdictions that the Planning Commission thinks should be included in the Town's document, please let staff know.
14	--	--	There would be merit to having a more comprehensive document even if we are duplicating code.	From the onset, the goal was to avoid duplication of the Town Code. Staff has revised the document to eliminate unnecessary duplication of the Town Code.
15	--	--	Clearly describe that there are objective standards in other areas - we should list them in this document.	Other applicable development requirements in the Town are now listed in the "Purpose and Applicability" section.
16	--	--	We should be consistent about when we duplicate existing Town Code requirements.	From the onset, the goal was to avoid duplication of the Town Code. Staff has revised the document to eliminate unnecessary duplication of the Town Code.

Summary of Revisions Made and Responses to Comments Received at the Planning Commission Hearing of June 22, 2022				
Line #	OLD #	NEW #	Comments Received	Staff Response
17	--	--	Staff addition/revision.	"Purpose and Applicability" section now includes an outline of Qualifying Projects and lists other applicable development requirements in the Town. Other revisions made for document consistency.
18	--	--	Staff addition/revision.	A "Key Terms" section has been added to clarify several terms used throughout the document.
19	A.1	A.1	Regarding Pedestrian Access, Palo Alto has a hierarchy prioritizing different modes of transportation.	Palo Alto's modal hierarchy is included in their contextual design criteria, which is not objective. Through research, staff determined that a modal hierarchy would be very difficult to objectify. Such a hierarchy should be determined at the Council level and included in a more appropriate policy document.
20	A.1	A.1	Why don't we have bicycle standards? We should prioritize bicycles.	Bicycle standards have been added (new A.2). The standards included are those that can be required on-site. Off-site improvements (such as the addition of bike lanes) are not appropriate in this document and may be required on a case-by-case basis through the Parks and Public Works Department.
21	A.1	A.1	This document should cover all modes of transportation in some way.	In addition to the pedestrian access and vehicular access/parking standards, bicycle standards have been added (new A.2).
22	A.1.2	A.1.2	Why don't we mention depth? We only specify height.	A width dimension of six feet has been added.
23	A.3.4	A.4.4	Staff addition/revision.	Clarified that the standard is applicable to the "primary" building.
24	A.5.1	A.6.1	Is this related to height or location? 15' is very tall. There should be location standards.	The original standard was related to height. The maximum height allowed has been revised from 15 feet to 12 feet. A maximum spacing between lighting has been added (30 feet).
25	A.5.1	A.6.1	Staff addition/revision.	"in community recreation spaces" added to align with new A.10.
26	A.5.2	A.6.2	Staff addition/revision.	Added language requiring exterior lighting be directed to not shine on neighboring residential properties to be consistent with Town Code.
27	A.6 A.9	A.7 A.10	Landscaping should be required to be native and drought tolerant	The terms "native" and "Drought tolerant" are not objective without very specific definitions and/or lists of allowed species. This level of specificity may limit the variety of landscaping in the Town. Additionally, the Town and the State already have rules addressing water use. Chapter 26 of the Town Code and the State's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO) promote efficient water use in landscape areas. These ordinances recognize that large water savings can be gained by efficient landscape design, installation, management, and maintenance. This is accomplished by choosing climate adapted plants, improving soil conditions, using and maintaining high efficiency irrigation equipment, and managing the irrigation schedule to fit the plants water needs as they are influenced by local climates.
28	A.6	A.7	Do we define "landscape"?	"Landscaping" has been added to the Key Terms.
29	A.6.2	A.7.2	Staff addition/revision.	Clarified that the landscape buffer must stretch the full length of the shared property line.
30	A.6.2.a	A.7.2.a	Why is a masonry wall is required over regular fencing?	The requirement in the document for a masonry wall reflects the Town Code, which requires a masonry wall between residential zoned properties and commercial/office/manufacturing zoned properties. The intent of the wall is to provide robust separation between more intense uses (commercial, mixed-use, multiple-family) and less intense single- and two-family uses. As written, the standard would not require a masonry wall separating single- and two-family residential uses from neighboring single- and two-family residential uses.
			Is there a way to be clear that this doesn't apply to residential facing residential?	
			Would a duplex need a multi-family wall? We should be clear when this is required.	
31	A.6.2.a	A.7.2.a	Staff addition/revision.	Added clarification that a six-foot tall masonry wall is not allowed within a street-facing setback, consistent with Town Code Section 29.50.035
32	A.6.3	A.7.3	Should we create a maximum height as well for parking lot buffers?	Added a maximum height allowance for screening located within a street-facing setback.

Summary of Revisions Made and Responses to Comments Received at the Planning Commission Hearing of June 22, 2022				
Line #	OLD #	NEW #	Comments Received	Staff Response
33	A.7	A.8	Consider deleting this sections as it duplicates Town Code.	This standard duplicates elements of the fence regulations application to residential properties. The residential fence regulations contained in Sections 29.40.030 through 29.40.0330 would not apply to qualifying projects outside of residential zones. Therefore, this standards was not deleted as it does not duplicate Town Code regulations.
34	A.9	A.10	Are these two standards combined to burdensome? Do these two standards overlap? Can we clarify that these do overlap?	The entire A.9 section has been replaced with new A.10 to align with the Town Code, eliminate overlap, specify the types of "open areas", and clarify applicability between multi-family and mixed use projects.
35	A.9	A.10	Use of the word "may" - is this objective?	Conflict eliminated. The entire A.9 section has been replaced with new A.10.
36	A.9	A.10	Perhaps we remove the allowance of grass due to the drought.	Landscaping is now defined in the "Key Terms" section. The definition includes lawns allowing developers flexibility to meet their project goals while recognizing the Town regulates water use through Chapter 26 of the Town Code and the MWELO.
37	A.9	A.10	Palo Alto has an "open to sky" requirement. Recommends we look into this.	"Community recreation space" includes a requirement that 60 percent of the space remain open to the sky (A.10.1.c).
38	A.9	A.10	Look at private open space that is used in Palo Alto's code.	Revised A.10 addresses this comment.
39	A.9	A.10	Requirement for multi-story to have a balcony as discussed during the General Plan update.	"Private recreation space" added as a "Key Term" that includes balconies. Private recreation space above the ground floor is required in multi-story qualifying projects.
40	A.10.1	A.11.1	Staff addition/revision.	Changed "Community Place District" to "Community <u>Growth</u> District".
41	A.10.1	A.11.1	Why does this only include Community Growth Districts (CGDs)?	The following polices discussing setbacks are included in the Community Design Element of the 2040 General Plan: CD-2.10 (Town-wide): Well-Defined Street Fronts - Require new buildings to maintain a consistent setback from the public right-of-way in order to create a well-defined streetscape. Require new buildings throughout Town to use consistent setbacks. CD-7.1 (All CGDs): Neighborhood-Friendly Design - Encourage buildings and sites within all Community Growth Districts regardless of designation, including shopping centers undergoing redevelopment, to integrate design features that create a pedestrian- and neighborhood-friendly environment, such as by siting buildings close to the sidewalks, providing space for small plazas, and including public art. CD-9.1: (LGB CGD): Setbacks and Step Backs of Massing - Require medium density, high density, and mixed-use parcels in the Los Gatos Boulevard District adjacent to single-family parcels to include increased site setbacks and multi-story step backs to minimize the impact and increase compatibility with smaller adjacent structures. CDP-11.7: (Lark CGD): Reduced Setbacks - Allow reduced setbacks to foster a more urban environment focused on corporate centers, commercial shopping areas, medical services, and hospitality uses. Consistent setbacks are encouraged by CD-2.10, while reduced setbacks are encouraged in CGDs. For this reason, Standard A.11.1 was written specific to CGDs. Given the above polices and the comments made by the Commission during discussion of this item, staff requests direction on whether this standard should apply Town-wide or only within CGDs. The corresponding figure/diagram will be updated accordingly.
			Likes that it only applies to Community Growth Districts otherwise it could make them look out of place. It might also limit design related to arcade setback standards in Section B.	
			Can we apply this just to mixed-use? It should apply to ground-floor commercial.	
			Big focus during GP discussions was street-activation and should be kept in mind during revisions.	
			Perhaps replace "Community Growth District" with "Mixed-Use".	
42	B.1.1	B.1.1	There is chance that using three of these approaches may result in poor design. Maybe two would be better. Perhaps anchor it to the amount of street facing façade that exists. If under 50 feet, only require two.	This Standards continues to require implementation of at least three solutions. Staff evaluated several projects in the Town to see if they would meet this Standards (Exhibit X). A quality design should not have a problem implementing at least three solutions.
	B.1.1	B.1.1	Palo Alto requires three or more. Good architects should be able to make it work.	
	B.1.1	B.1.1	Would the mixed use building at N40 meet this standard?	

Summary of Revisions Made and Responses to Comments Received at the Planning Commission Hearing of June 22, 2022				
Line #	OLD #	NEW #	Comments Received	Staff Response
43	B.1.1	B.1.1	Detailed images or renderings would be helpful for this section.	Photographic examples of the concepts have the potential to communicate unintended values or design guidance. Diagrams have been updated throughout the document to better illustrate the concepts in a more realistic style. Staff does not recommend the use of photos in the document.
44	B.1.1.a	B.1.1.a	Staff addition/revision.	Revised required step back from six feet to five feet for consistency within the document.
45	B.1.1.e	B.1.1.e	Staff addition/revision.	Changed 48 to 60 square feet to align with new A.10.
46	B.2.3	B.2.3	Staff addition/revision.	Added "façade" to align with key term "façade articulation".
47	B.2.3.b	B.2.3.b	Where did the 25% number come from?	This metric is included in B.2.3 above. Staff simplified language by removing "25 percent of the façade length" since this minimum is required in B.2.3 above. Also added "façade" to align with key term "façade articulation".
48	B.3.1.c	B.3.1.c	Staff addition/revision.	Revised the change in façade or roof height from four feet to two feet to align with the height limitations of the Town Code.
49	B.3.4	B.3.4	Staff addition/revision.	Deleted to eliminate potential conflict with architectural styles.
50	B.4.1	B.4.1	Example pictures would be helpful.	Photographic examples of the concepts have the potential to communicate unintended values or design guidance. Diagrams have been updated throughout the document to better illustrate the concepts in a more realistic style. Staff does not recommend the use of photos in the document.
51	B.4.1.a	B.4.1.a	Staff addition/revision.	Revised the minimum percent from 70 to 60 percent following case study of buildings with similar heights to those allowed in the Town.
52	B.4.1	B.4.1	Why not include varied plate heights in this section? It would make for dynamic architecture.	Added B.4.1.f, offering a solution that the upper floor utilize a higher floor-to-ceiling height that is a minimum of two feet greater than the floor-to-ceiling height of the floor immediately below. New figure B.2.1.f added.
53	B.4.2	B.4.2	Inconsistency with 4.1.e regarding the use of different building materials. What is 4.2 trying to say?	Revised to clarify that the building elements that need to be repeated on all elevations are the façade materials (such as siding, window types, trim) and not forms (such as chimneys, arcades, etc.). Revised standard does not conflict with B.4.1.e and does not require that materials be distributed consistently between elevations; (i.e.; if a second material is used on 30 percent of the front elevation, it does not need to be included at 30 percent of each of the other elevations).
54	B.4.2	B.4.2	The 360 degree architecture might limit design.	This requirement has been applied for designs of residences and structures throughout the Town for some time without any significant impacts to quality architecture.
55	B.4.2	B.4.2	360 degree architecture is in the draft General Plan. Perhaps there is a better way to say this. Please look into this further.	B.4.2 revised as discussed above.
56	B.4.3	B.4.3	Staff addition/revision.	Increased the point requirement from 12 to 16 points to require incorporation of more than two architectural solutions.
57	B.4.3	B.4.3	Has this menu been used successfully in other places? Likes the idea.	Yes. This leaves flexibility for the architect/designer.
58	B.4.3	B.4.3	This only addresses street-façade planes. Should consideration be given to other sides of the building?	B.4.2 addresses carrying architectural detailing around all sides of a building. The purpose of B.4.3 is to require more articulation on the most visible facades.
59	B.4.3	B.4.3	Staff addition/revision.	Removed upper floor step back as it is required elsewhere for buildings greater than two floors and could result in an awkward design if used on a two-story building
60	B.4.3	B.4.3	Staff addition/revision.	Reduce point value for materials and color changes from five points to three points
61	B.4.3	B.4.3	Staff addition/revision.	Removed "ornamentation" for specifics of decorative elements since it is a general term.
62	B.4.3	B.4.3	Staff addition/revision.	Revised "overhang" language to increase objectivity.
63	B.4.4	B.4.4	Staff addition/revision.	Deleted individual standard due to repetition in following new B.4.6.
64	B.4.7	B.4.6	Staff addition/revision.	Added elements of old B.4.9 to reduce repetition in new B.4.6.
65	B.4.6	B.4.5	How would you do this with a column? An illustration of the columns or projection would help	Revised illustration added.

Summary of Revisions Made and Responses to Comments Received at the Planning Commission Hearing of June 22, 2022				
Line #	OLD #	NEW #	Comments Received	Staff Response
66	B.4.7	B.4.7	Palo Alto document details entry (not just door width) dimensions. Perhaps we should consider.	New B.4.7 includes entry width requirements based on use.
67	B.4.9	--	Staff addition/revision.	Deleted and incorporated concept into ne B.4.6.
68	B.4.12	B.4.11	Staff addition/revision.	Revised standard to allow balconies on street-facing facades and on facades that face existing non-residential uses on abutting parcels. Additionally, balconies are allowed when facing residential uses when proven that it will not create a privacy issue with the neighboring residential use. The applicant would be required to submit additional drawings (site line study, section, screening, etc.) to prove compliance with this standard. This provides more opportunity for developments to achieve the private recreation space requirements while protecting existing residential uses at all scales. Even with this change, staff is concerned with the requirement for private recreation space while simultaneously restricting its location in an attempt to protect privacy. Staff looks forward to the discussion with the Planning Commission.

***This Page
Intentionally
Left Blank***