

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Los Gatos Planning Commissioners:	Kendra Burch, Chair Jeffrey Barnett, Vice Chair Susan Burnett Adam Mayer Joseph Sordi Rob Stump Emily Thomas
Community Development Director:	Joel Paulson
Town Attorney:	Gabrielle Whelan
Transcribed by:	Vicki L. Blandin (619) 541-3405

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S:

CHAIR BURCH: We are now going to move into other Business, Item 4, forwarding a recommendation to the Town Council on proposed changes and additions to the Town's Objective Design Standards for multi-family and mixed-use projects.

This is not subject to CEQA review pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15061(b)(3) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the changes and additions to the Town's Objective Design Standards for Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Projects would have a significant effect on the environment. All projects for which the Objective Design Standards for Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Projects will undergo separate CEQA review and approval.

The location is Town Wide, and our project planner is Mr. Mullin.

SEAN MULLIN: Thank you, once again, and I will start, and then we have our consultant team on board to provide a visual presentation.

For your consideration tonight, Staff presents the changes and additions to the Town's Objective Design Standards for Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Projects, or ODS.

1 The existing ODS were adopted by the Town Council
2 in November 2022 and have been used in the review of
3 numerous applications. In August 2024 the Council directed
4 Staff to issue an RFP for the development of additional
5 standards addressing high-quality building design,
6 architectural style, height transitions, and consideration
7 of small, multi-family housing.

8 The Town selected Lisa Wise for service and has
9 worked with their team through the project. We went through
10 project initiation, six consultant-led focus groups, a
11 community open house, a Town Council/Planning Commission
12 joint study session, and an administrative draft review.
13 These efforts culminated in the Draft ODS before you
14 tonight.

15 The draft continues to be organized into two
16 sections: Site Standards as Section A, and Building
17 Standards as Section B. Updates and additions have been
18 made throughout the document in response to Council
19 direction and community feedback. The document is used in
20 the review of qualifying Multi-Family Residential and
21 Mixed-Use Residential projects throughout the Town.

22 Staff recommends that the Commission review the
23 Draft ODS, consider public feedback, and forward a
24 recommendation to the Town Council with any modifications.
25

1 With that, I'd like to turn it over to our
2 consultant, who will walk you through the changes in more
3 detail.

4 MONICA SZYDLIK: Thank you, Sean. Good evening,
5 Planning Commissioners. I'm Monica Szydlik, Project
6 Manager, and I'm joined by my colleagues here who I'll
7 introduce in a moment. We'll be presenting the hearing
8 Draft Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Objective Design Standards
9 Update.

10 CHAIR BURCH: I'm sorry, I'm actually going to
11 have to step in here. Ma'am, are you able to turn up the
12 volume of your microphone?

13 SEAN MULLIN: And/or KCAT may be able to boost
14 her mic.

15 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, whichever one. We're having a
16 bit of difficulty hearing you.

17 MONICA SZYDLIK: I think I can do this. How does
18 that sound? Does that sound better?

19 SEAN MULLIN: Yes.

20 MONICA SZYDLIK: Great, okay. Thank you for that
21 reminder. Thank you, Sean. I'm Monica Szydlik. I'm here to
22 present to you the hearing Draft Multi-Family and Mixed-Use
23 Objective Design Standards Update for your review and
24 recommendation to the Town Council.
25

1 A brief introduction about the project team. I am
2 the project manager from the lead consultant LWC. I'm
3 joined by my colleagues Cal Kurtz and Po Johnson. Also, on
4 the team as consultants, but not here tonight, are Urban
5 Planning Partners, and throughout the process we worked
6 very closely with Sean Mullin and Joel Paulson.

7 As you know, this project is an update to the
8 2023 Objective Design Standards for Multi-Family and Mixed-
9 Use Residential Development. The project implements all
10 established policy and makes sure that the standards are
11 compliant with State law, most notably SB 330, which was
12 effective January 2020.

13 That's true of all ODS across the State to
14 implement established policy and ensure compliance with
15 State law, but locally the focus of this particular project
16 is to ensure that projects reflect high-quality building
17 design, address height transitions between projects of
18 different scale, acknowledge architecture character and
19 details, ensure that projects express the character and the
20 details desired by the community, and that they apply
21 equality to small scale as well as large scale multi-family
22 buildings.

23 Of course, we know that you all in the Los Gatos
24 community are aware of what Objective Design Standards are
25

1 and the difference between objective and subjective. In
2 short, they are measurable and they support the ministerial
3 process that is required by State law.

4 I'll go through very quickly our process so far.
5 We kicked off the project in April of last year. We
6 conducted a Site Analysis and Evaluation Memo which looked
7 at everything on the books that would impact the design
8 standards and that we should be cognizant of going forward,
9 in addition to proposals and recent projects that would
10 inform the standards.

11 We initiated our community outreach. We held a
12 number of focus groups where we discussed everything at
13 hand.

14 We then developed a set of recommendations based
15 on all of the input that we received.

16 Then in December we held a community open house
17 where we focused on some key design elements, and we had a
18 series of boards that described some options for the
19 community to consider, and we got a whole lot of great
20 feedback.

21 We came before you and the Town Council in March
22 of this year to review some working design ideas and get
23 some key input that we needed to develop the Admin Draft
24 Standards, which we submitted in April and Staff reviewed.

1 Staff reviewed those. The consulting team worked on the
2 draft standards with Staff, and then we just now released
3 the public draft, and we are here tonight to discuss them
4 with you.

5 Let's talk just for a moment about we want to
6 point out the sources of the recommendations before you,
7 meaning specific direction that we gathered from the
8 community about this particular effort.

9 We looked closely at the takeaways from a
10 workshop about community design back during the GP update.
11 We looked closely at the takeaways from a community meeting
12 for the initial ODS project, and from the Council meeting
13 where it was determined that an update to the ODS was
14 warranted.

15 We looked at the list of changes that the
16 Planning Staff suggested, and then from the outreach that
17 we conducted, which included the focus groups, the open
18 house, and the joint session in March. All of this together
19 was essentially our marching orders.

20 So, what changed, really? This is the existing
21 Table of Contents of the current ODS that was adopted in
22 January 2023. This slide shows in a nutshell what we have
23 suggested that we do to it. The next handful of slides will
24 talk about the recommendations themselves that are in your
25

1 packet. The slides summarize major additions and changes,
2 but there is a lot that went into it, and as you know, you
3 have the clean version of the ODS, and then there is also a
4 version that shows in track changes, so everything we did.

5 One topic that really warranted a fresh look, and
6 also graphics that more closely reflect the forms and kinds
7 of sites that we see in Los Gatos and the sites that
8 support multi-family and mixed-use, is options for building
9 massing. It was important to us that the options we present
10 would work for the range of densities that the multi-
11 family, mixed-use zones support. You may recall we
12 discussed this at the joint session in March, and we
13 arrived at the three options you see on the right side of
14 the slide. We also included a requirement that attached
15 townhomes must appear as separate volumes through a change
16 in plane. We found that these options would work for the
17 range of scales and densities that we expect.

18
19 We looked closely at sensitive interior and side
20 and rear adjacencies, and after some discussion at the open
21 house and at the joint session we recommended a reduced
22 height within 40' of a single-family district, and a 5'
23 separation step-back for elevated outdoor open space at
24 that adjacency, and then we added some graphics to describe
25 that.

1 Then we explored with Staff and the community
2 some ways of ensuring that architectural articulation
3 reflects Los Gatos character, the character of Los Gatos
4 neighborhoods. It was important to us that when applicants
5 are presented with options, the options are commensurate in
6 terms of contribution to the neighborhood, and also burden
7 on the applicants, so that they truly are options.

8 We started with the concepts that are presented
9 in the current draft, and then we worked from there to
10 refine and enhance that section to ensure that they would
11 apply to small multi-family housing as well as larger scale
12 developments, and add to the character as we understood was
13 desired by the community.

14 We added standards for what we called "360-degree
15 design," so that all building elevations are treated the
16 same and changes in materials reflect high-quality design.
17 You can see what we mean on the upper-right here. And we
18 introduced limits on blank walls, also an effort to require
19 high-quality design and to enhance walkability and
20 pedestrian comfort.

21 We enhanced and refined the standards for
22 residential entries and also for non-residential entries,
23 essentially assuring that building access is visible and
24 comfortable and enhances the streetscape.
25

1 A little bit more on high-quality design. Some
2 specific standards for windows, window design, materials,
3 palettes, and durability and fire resistance. And options
4 for roof design, all which ensure depth, variation, and
5 visual interest of the top of the building.

6 Looking at site design, we updated the existing
7 design standards to address specific concerns about the
8 amount and design and usability of required open space. We
9 introduced a requirement for community open space, and it's
10 designed for all multi-family and mixed-use projects, and
11 we introduced requirements that upper-story step-backs be
12 improved as usable open space.

13 Looking at the building placement and the design
14 of the front setback area, this really is the streetscape
15 area. Again, we started with the standards in the current
16 draft, and then we created models that reflect actual site
17 conditions, dimensions, and development standards. Then we
18 refined the design standards based on what we found in the
19 model, what we heard from the community, and what worked
20 with the standards for the building design, the development
21 standards and design standards both.

22 Then parking, of course, drives the form of any
23 residential building and all the residential building
24 types, so we looked at the parking configurations that we
25

1 see and those that we anticipate in multi-family and mixed-
2 use in the future in Los Gatos, and we updated the
3 standards to address bicycle parking, access to vehicular
4 parking, visibility, and the design of visible structured
5 parking areas.

6 That's our quick summary of the standards before
7 you and how they have been updated from the January 2023
8 draft. Thank you, and we welcome questions.

9 CHAIR BURCH: Thank you. Are there any questions
10 of the consultant about the presentation? I would like to
11 say as we go into this and discuss the revisions, I'd like
12 to go through the sections. That ways it's orderly and good
13 notes can be taken. I think right now would be if you've
14 got questions of Staff about the process or about the
15 presentation we just saw.

16 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Just a quick one. What we're
17 looking at, the red lines that we're looking at, I'm
18 presuming are the changes made since the January 2023
19 version, which I think was a different consultant; I think
20 that was M-Group. It's not reflective of the changes made
21 since the last time we saw this when we were in the joint
22 study session.

1 SEAN MULLIN: That correct. It's reflective of
2 changes to the existing document. This is the first time a
3 draft has been put out there of the revised..

4 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Okay, thank you.

5 CHAIR BURCH: And I assume that while there were
6 revisions that we're talking about, really can
7 conversations be made about any of the standards that are
8 in here, or do you want us just to focus on the revisions?
9

10 SEAN MULLIN: I think feedback across the board
11 is welcomed.

12 CHAIR BURCH: All right, so then I'm going to say
13 Section 1 is Purpose and Applicability, which I am going to
14 say is also going to include Organization and Key Terms.
15 Are there any notes that anyone (inaudible)? Yes, please.

16 I didn't have a card, so I didn't think anybody
17 was. Do we have anybody on Zoom that wants to speak? There
18 is no public testimony so far tonight, so I'm going to go
19 ahead and jump on into it.

20 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I just have a question. Are
21 we all going to be looking at Exhibit 1 or Exhibit 2? I
22 know they're the same, but one has the tracked changes
23 highlighted and one doesn't.
24
25

1 CHAIR BURCH: I would prefer we look at Exhibit
2 2, so everybody is very clear on what changes have been
3 made since January 2023.

4 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Just wanted to make sure
5 that we were all looking at the same document.

6 CHAIR BURCH: Good clarification. All right, so
7 Purpose and Applicability, Organization, and Key Terms.
8 Vice Chair Barnett.

9 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Before that, I recommend
10 that we change Objective Design Standards in the title to
11 Objective Design and Building Standards, since there are
12 two parts to the document.

13 CHAIR BURCH: Any discussion among Commissioners?
14 Is there anybody that has anything, comments, like I said,
15 on Purpose and Applicability, Organization, or Key Terms?

16 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Sorry, Vice Chair, can you
17 explain your thinking behind the title, because it looks
18 like if there are site standards and then there is building
19 standards, so Objective Design Standards.

20 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I'm looking at Exhibit 2.

21 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Town of Los Gatos Objective
23 Design Standards. It doesn't say Objective Design in... I
24
25

1 know it's in the document; I just wanted to change the
2 title.

3 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, the document (inaudible), so
4 do you actually want this to say, "Objective Design Site
5 and Building Standards"?

6 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Okay.

8 CHAIR BURCH: All right. Commissioner Sordi.

9 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Most of the document is
10 really detailed, but yes, starting on page 1, at the bottom
11 where it says, "Preparation of Development Plans," I don't
12 understand that sentence. It says, "Development plans will
13 require additional dimensions to demonstrate compliance..."
14 blah, blah, blah. I mean, dimensions are just like a note
15 that identifies a distance from this to this, so I don't
16 know where that comes from. It doesn't really make sense to
17 me.
18

19 CHAIR BURCH: Mr. Mullin.

20 SEAN MULLIN: I can respond. This is born of
21 direct experience in working with developers and their
22 resistance to providing additional dimensions to show..
23 Let's just take dormers, for example. Dormers are limited
24 to a maximum width of 50% of the primary roofline.
25 Oftentimes they don't provide enough dimensions to

1 demonstrate that, so we're disclaiming it, essentially
2 saying it's your responsibility to prove that you comply,
3 and sometimes that means more dimensions than you're used
4 to adding to plans, or even specialized exhibits showing
5 that the community recreation space is in fact meeting the
6 design requirements. So, we wanted to put that up front and
7 say it's the developer's responsibility and there is going
8 to be more required of you.

9
10 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Okay. What if we added the
11 words "additional plan dimensions in specialized exhibits,"
12 those two words? I don't want to make things too
13 complicated; it reads better to me that way.

14 CHAIR BURCH: Commissioner Mayer.

15 COMMISSIONER MAYER: I don't know how real estate
16 developers might respond to the language here, but from the
17 architectural profession, we prefer the word "diagram" when
18 describing this kind of drawing. If I saw this and it said,
19 "diagrams and exhibits with dimensions," that would make
20 the most sense to me professionally as an architect.

21 SEAN MULLIN: Thank you.

22 CHAIR BURCH: Anything else in these sections?
23 Key Terms? Vice Chair.
24
25

1 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: The term "townhouses" is
2 used in the document, and I would recommend that there be
3 an addition of a definition for that term.

4 CHAIR BURCH: Okay.

5 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: In the Civil Code they
6 differentiate condominiums and townhomes, for example.

7 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, correct. Is there anything
8 else?

9 COMMISSIONER STUMP: But is condominium in there?
10 Are you suggesting adding both?

11 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: No, I'm just suggesting a
12 definition be provided so that we know what townhomes
13 means. How inclusive?

14 CHAIR BURCH: He's asking do you think there
15 should be a definition of condominiums and townhomes to
16 differentiate them?

17 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: There are other types too,
18 so I just think I would leave it to the Council to provide
19 some expansion of what that term means.

20 CHAIR BURCH: My thought would be if that housing
21 type is mentioned in this document, there should be a
22 definition. Commissioner Mayer.

23 COMMISSIONER MAYER: My understanding is that
24 "condominium" is more of a legal term referring to the type
25

1 of legal framework around a housing unit, whereas
2 "townhome" is a building type. Yes, I think that probably
3 makes sense maybe to clarify.

4 CHAIR BURCH: All right, I'm going to move into
5 Site Standards and talk about Pedestrian Access, and Short-
6 and Long-Term Bicycle Parking. Does anyone have any
7 comments on these? Commissioner Thomas.

8 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I have a couple of
9 questions about pedestrian access. One, just the change
10 from the "shall" to the "must," can we quickly go over the
11 shall, should, the legal... What is our preferred, and why
12 are we trying to be consistent with...

13 SEAN MULLIN: I can start, and maybe Monica can
14 jump in, but they both carry the same weight. You have to
15 do it. It's not a should. Shall, you must. I don't recall
16 exactly why we would change this one in particular from
17 shall to must.

18 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I mean, I know that legally
19 shall... I think that must is clearer to the general public
20 that is reading this, so I am happy to change other shalls
21 to must in the document if it holds the same weight
22 legally, because I do think that that is clearer. Must does
23 definitely seem to the public that that must happen, and
24 has to happen, versus shall.
25

1 DIRECTOR PAULSON: Through the Chair, I think
2 either way, whichever way the Planning Commission decides
3 on the recommendation, we'll just make sure that it's
4 consistent throughout the document.

5 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes. Do we want to talk
6 about that now, or no?

7 CHAIR BURCH: Well, I think if we're going to say
8 for what purpose and organization, yes.

9 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Just try to be consistent.
10 We want it to be consistent throughout the document,
11 obviously, but if people have a strong preference for must
12 versus shall.

13 COMMISSIONER MAYER: The Town Attorney is not
14 here tonight, but I would defer to them for the
15 recommendation.

16 CHAIR BURCH: I, personally, hear a lot of people
17 say that when they come to some of these meetings and they
18 read these that people can interpret these differently. If
19 I had a preference, I would actually prefer must.
20 Obviously, I'll defer to the Town Attorney, but having
21 listened to this for like, I don't know, 14 years, I do
22 know that to a resident reading these, or even somebody
23 that doesn't do this all the time, it gets brought up a
24
25

1 lot, so I don't think that's bad. Obviously, the Town
2 Attorney can weigh in, but I would prefer that.

3 SEAN MULLIN: We can take a look at it, and we'll
4 check in with the Town Attorney, and then if this is
5 included as part of the recommendation, then we'll respond
6 when we get to Council.

7 CHAIR BURCH: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Then I had a question. When
9 it says, "A pedestrian pathway network shall connect to..."
10 Hold on, it says must. It should say must, maybe, but "...the
11 public sidewalk along all abutting streets." Will there
12 always be sidewalks on abutting streets I guess is my
13 question?
14

15 SEAN MULLIN: Not necessarily. That's based on
16 the built environment.

17 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Right, so is there
18 something in here that we need to include that developers
19 make sure to add, provide sidewalks? How does that all
20 connect? Thank you.

21 DIRECTOR PAULSON: I'll just jump in. In thinking
22 of some of the projects that we have, if they don't already
23 have sidewalks on a public street, then Parks and Public
24 Works is going to require them to add sidewalks, so I think
25 we get there either way. But, again, feel free to have the

1 conversation. You guys can make whatever recommendations
2 you like, and we'll take those forward and vet them with
3 the Council.

4 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Okay, thank you. Yes, I
5 knew that that was what we tried to do, but didn't know how
6 that was incorporated in here.

7 I do have a recommendation about the bicycle
8 parking, and it is that the... I took my notes on the other
9 document, so let me just go back just confirm that I'm... The
10 first is that for 2.1, what happens if there are multiple
11 entrances? I don't know if that's a question for Staff.

12 SEAN MULLIN: Most of these buildings, when you
13 get above a certain number of units and you get out of the
14 townhome product, you're going to have multiple entrances.
15 I would say they all have a primary entrance, and whether
16 that's defined architecturally, it's defined, it's more
17 announced. I have not seen of our projects so far something
18 that would be questionable as to whether it's a primary or
19 a secondary entrance. This is just noting that they should
20 be within X feet of that primary entrance.

21 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Okay. The goal of it is to
22 require bicycle parking close to the entrance to the
23 buildings, and maybe I'm interpreting it incorrectly, but I
24 feel like this restricts, like on larger developments it
25

1 will force bicycles in one location that might not actually
2 make it convenient for most residents or all residents.

3 SEAN MULLIN: As some feedback I can provide,
4 this is short-term bike parking. This is not for residents
5 per se. There is a separate category of long-term, and
6 that's where I live in the building and I'm storing my
7 bicycle either in the townhome, in the garage, or in a bike
8 room. This is for someone who is coming to visit me, and
9 they're going to be accessing the building through the
10 primary entrance and want to park near the primary
11 entrance, so that they're not out in the rain for a long
12 period of time or out in the weather.

14 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Okay, thank you for
15 clarifying. That makes more sense. I didn't want it to be
16 restrictive.

17 I do think that for 2.2 though that we should
18 eliminate any requirements related to car parking spaces,
19 because one, often that is going to be asked to get waived,
20 and so I think that it is going to be a moot point, and I
21 think that in the future coming down the pipeline from
22 Sacramento it's likely that parking minimums are going to
23 go away, and then we're going to have to back through or
24 this is not going to be relevant, so I recommend that we
25

1 base it on something else, or that we remove any bicycle
2 parking that's connected to any number of car spaces.

3 SEAN MULLIN: To be clear on that one, the
4 requirement that is related to car parking here is for non-
5 residential space, and I'm not too aware of the State going
6 after reductions in commercial space parking requirements
7 as aggressively as they are for residential. So, we have
8 two categories here saying per number of units you should
9 provide this number of short-term bike parking spaces, and
10 per commercial. I'll make sure to note that, because maybe
11 we go back to basing it on square footage of non-
12 residential space rather than the parking requirement of
13 the non-residential space.
14

15 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Okay, thank you. I don't
16 want to overdo that, but I do think that you've heard my
17 concern that the parking is always contentious. Okay, thank
18 you.

19 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I have a question about
20 protocol. Since we're making Planning Commission
21 recommendations to the Council, should we be voting
22 separately on each proposed change, would Staff be willing
23 to just somehow take note of our concerns?
24

25 CHAIR BURCH: To clarify, I would prefer not to
do that.

1 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I have a suggestion that we
2 make our comments, and if someone else doesn't fully
3 support that, that we just speak up at that point, and then
4 have a discussion on it and decide to include it or not.

5 CHAIR BURCH: I think that would be my
6 preference. I think we would be here for days if we did
7 this otherwise. So, I will ask, if somebody mentions
8 something and you don't agree with it, not to be shy and
9 just talk about it now. Does anyone have anything else as
10 far as pedestrian short-term bike and long-term bike? Okay.

11
12 Now let's talk about Vehicular Access and Parking
13 Structure Access. Any comments on these? No, okay.
14 Utilities? Landscaping and Screening? I'm going to get
15 there. I thought that's going to be a bigger topic for most
16 people, so I saved it.

17 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Can I ask one question about
18 curb cut?

19 CHAIR BURCH: Of course.

20 COMMISSIONER SORDI: I don't want to go
21 backwards. I don't mean to go backwards.

22 CHAIR BURCH: Yeah, I know, I need you to keep up
23 with me, Commissioner Sordi.

24 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Just a very quick question.
25 The 4.2, "A maximum of one curb cut is allowed along every

1 100' of primary street frontage," is that something,
2 because it's in the public right-of-way, that a developer
3 could waive out of using like a density bonus concession?
4 I'm just curious.

5 SEAN MULLIN: I'm sorry, I just want to clarify
6 the question. As it's written here, are you asking if the
7 developer could waive out of that?

8 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Yes.

9 SEAN MULLIN: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Okay.

11 SEAN MULLIN: All of these the developers can
12 waive out of. In fact, some of these are being eliminated
13 because they're constantly waived out of because they're
14 hard to achieve.

15 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Okay, thanks.

16 CHAIR BURCH: On Utilities? Landscaping and
17 Screening? Actually, I'm going to go back up. Well, 7.4,
18 "Rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened from view
19 from the street." Do we want to put anything in this about
20 materials? I think we've all seen people put in materials
21 that get shredded in a year, and they look worse than the
22 mechanical equipment. Then, I'm also going to ask why Whole
23 Foods doesn't have mechanical screening?
24
25

1 SEAN MULLIN: I'll jump in on Whole Foods. We're
2 still working with them on that, so we're not done there.

3 CHAIR BURCH: Thank you.

4 SEAN MULLIN: And you could certainly specify
5 durable materials that are consistent with the materials
6 used on the building.

7 CHAIR BURCH: I think we should do something like
8 that. I can't tell you how many times I've honestly been on
9 projects where we put material that you know is going to
10 look horrible on a relatively new building within a year,
11 so if we could put some form of language about the
12 durability.
13

14 DIRECTOR PAULSON: Well, you can definitely
15 recommend...

16 CHAIR BURCH: I'm recommending.

17 DIRECTOR PAULSON: I mean, durable I would say is
18 not objective, but you can just make that statement that
19 you want...

20 CHAIR BURCH: Well, no, I think I was going to
21 say I'm not the expert on this. There is somebody who
22 should be probably better at this than me out there. I
23 think perhaps materials that match the building exterior is
24 a very good way to go.
25

1 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes, some sort of material
2 that's already existing on the building exterior I think
3 would be...

4 CHAIR BURCH: Yes.

5 DIRECTOR PAULSON: Yes, and I think that's a good
6 recommendation from a practical perspective. What we end up
7 running into is we require them to show mechanical
8 screening, then they get into the building drawings and
9 they haven't really thought it through, and then oh, we
10 forgot to put this up, and so now we've got all these
11 penetrations in the roof that we forgot about last minute.

12 CHAIR BURCH: That sounds like you need to hire a
13 better architect.

14 DIRECTOR PAULSON: Well, that's a different
15 conversation, but from an implementation perspective, I
16 think the notion is noted and we definitely can work on
17 some language around that.

18 CHAIR BURCH: Okay, but I honestly would say my
19 stance would be that is a you problem to them; figure it
20 out. I'm sorry it's costly, but it's required. Commissioner
21 Mayer.

22 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Yes, I agree with you.
23 Mechanical equipment on the roof is pretty unsightly
24 without screening, but there are often times when the
25

1 equipment is far enough away from the parapet or the
2 perimeter where you don't really see it at the street, so
3 in those cases you don't need it.

4 CHAIR BURCH: That's what it says. It "shall be
5 screened from view from the street."

6 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Gotcha.

7 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, I'm not making a blanket
8 statement. I agree, you can oftentimes place it in a way
9 that's fine, but then you do have the lengths that it
10 can't, so I think we should think of those.

11 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Right, when you're too close
12 to the edge.

13 CHAIR BURCH: Like Whole Foods?

14 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Yes. I just don't want to
15 get in a situation where, let's say, you have a big stucco
16 wall, right? And then the developer decides just to extend
17 that parapet up to screen it, because in that case then
18 you're stuck with a huge wall instead of...

19 CHAIR BURCH: I have a lot of faith that Town
20 Staff would not let that happen.

21 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Okay. I'm just bringing that
22 up.

23 CHAIR BURCH: No, we've all seen bad examples,
24 but I have faith.

1 SEAN MULLIN: And to that point, this is one of
2 the examples where we would ask for a diagram showing
3 whether you can see it or not, and we've enforced this as a
4 guideline for 100 years for rooftop equipment, and when
5 folks come in and show that it's not tall enough or it just
6 won't give us that sightline study, we don't require extra
7 screening.

8 CHAIR BURCH: Okay.

9
10 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I was going to make a
11 recommendation about 8.3. Are we there? Yes, we're in
12 Landscaping. 8.3 with regard to the "Surface parking lots
13 shall be screened from view...with landscaping or a wall..." I
14 think that a solid fence or something. I don't know what
15 the definition of a wall is, but I don't think it... I think
16 there is something between landscaping and a solid wall
17 that exists that maybe needs to be included in that.

18 CHAIR BURCH: I'm also going to ask why it's only
19 at 3', because 3' doesn't really screen much (inaudible).

20 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Because that's consistent
21 with our Fence Ordinance.

22 SEAN MULLIN: Yes, we run into sightline issues
23 and traffic safety issues.

24 CHAIR BURCH: Okay, thank you.
25

1 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: And it blocks it a little
2 bit.

3 CHAIR BURCH: No, no, I was just curious. It just
4 felt like a random number to me. All right, anything else
5 on those before we move to Fencing? All right, Fencing.
6 Vice Chair.

7 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Mr. Mullin and I had some
8 discussion about this before the meeting, and I understand
9 that—correct me if I’m wrong, and I’m probably wrong—this
10 relates to, or has its origin in, commercial rather than
11 multi-family, is that correct?
12

13 SEAN MULLIN: In reading it with a little bit
14 more detail, it also starts to conflict with the
15 aforementioned parking lot screening as well, so in one
16 standard we’re saying you’ve got to screen your parking
17 lots if they’re along the street, and then a standard-and-
18 a-half later we’re saying you can’t do that in a front
19 setback. That just clicked into my head. I can look a
20 little bit more into one of the documents about where we
21 got this.

22 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: The larger concern is
23 whether that should be removed or not.
24

25 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: 9.1, you mean?

VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: The original?

2 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: The original.

3 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Okay.

4 CHAIR BURCH: Is there anything else on Fencing?
5 Then I want to do—because these go together to me—Retaining
6 Walls and Landscape Spaces. Comments on these? I'm sorry,
7 Commissioner Stump.

8 COMMISSIONER STUMP: I'm sorry, are you down to
9 Landscaped, Private, and Community Recreation Spaces?
10

11 CHAIR BURCH: I'm at Retaining walls, and then
12 Landscaped, Private, and Community Recreation Spaces, yes.

13 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I just want to say that
14 there are specific numbers in here, which is great, because
15 that makes it objective, and I just trust that Staff and
16 the consultants were able to work through this, and these
17 numbers and stuff are what makes sense, so I'm happy with
18 this portion.

19 SEAN MULLIN: A lot of these numbers already came
20 out of Town Code.

21 CHAIR BURCH: Anything else on these sections?
22 All right, let's go all the way over to the Building
23 Placement, unless you have something.
24

25

1 COMMISSIONER STUMP: I'm sorry, did I miss my
2 famous Landscaped, Private, and Community Recreation
3 Spaces?

4 CHAIR BURCH: You did. I was there.

5 COMMISSIONER STUMP: I woke up.

6 CHAIR BURCH: We are so happy you could join us,
7 Commissioner Stump.

8 COMMISSIONER STUMP: Thank you. I guess I was
9 eating at the time. 11.1c, can I get clarification? It says
10 community recreation space, the minimum dimension is 10'.
11

12 SEAN MULLIN: That's a good question, and this is
13 often something we have to explain to folks.

14 COMMISSIONER STUMP: Thank you.

15 SEAN MULLIN: For community recreation space, the
16 regulation and the standard is that you have to provide a
17 certain area; so, let's call that 100 square feet for the
18 sake of argument. We don't want that area to be
19 accommodated as a 1' deep by 100 square-foot stretch. We
20 want it to be usable, so the minimum dimension is 10' in
21 any direction, so that at least if it's 10'x10', then
22 you've got 10'x10' and it's somewhat usable.

23 COMMISSIONER STUMP: Is there any way to clarify
24 that more? I don't know, I may not be the only person with
25 that question wondering.

1 SEAN MULLIN: I'll note that and see if we can
2 come up with some language that clarifies that it's a
3 linear dimension of width or length.

4 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes, at least one dimension
5 as minimum of 10', I guess.

6 COMMISSIONER STUMP: I'm ready to move on.

7 CHAIR BURCH: Is there anything else on that
8 section? No? Okay. I would like to move on to Building
9 Placement.

10 I found it a little odd that we were going at a
11 "minimum of 75% of all street-facing elevations...shall be
12 located on or within 5' of the setback..." When you are that
13 close to the setback, or to the sidewalk right where people
14 walk, 5' for like a large, large building is not a large
15 articulation. I don't want to make this too difficult. A
16 long time ago we had a project that came up, it was on the
17 Boulevard, and it had an extremely long expanse that was
18 right at the setback for the entire way, and it was just a
19 wall; and I think they did do these little articulations in
20 it, but it didn't change the impression just because of the
21 overall sheer size, so if there's a way to clarify like 75%
22 if the vertical space is this size or this size. I don't
23 want to make it too difficult, but having seen that one
24
25

1 application, that's exactly what I thought of when I saw
2 this.

3 SEAN MULLIN: I think there are some other
4 standards in the Building Design section that would push
5 back against someone just trying to do a 75% long blank
6 wall, so there is required articulation, required
7 fenestration that is going to activate that and make it
8 more human-scale friendly.

9
10 The concept of bringing the buildings to the
11 street is obviously a pretty basic urban design principle,
12 and rather than having a parking lot fronting the street
13 like old urban design thinking, the practice is to bring
14 buildings closer to the street. This is still allowing that
15 you're saying that you should meet your setback and that at
16 least the primary chunk of the building should be within
17 75% of the setback.

18 We've got site design standards that require
19 setbacks to be landscaped and activated. We've got other
20 standards that, like I said, would require articulation,
21 breaking up of that long, blank mass so that hopefully when
22 you put the whole document together and apply it, you don't
23 end up with that situation.

24 CHAIR BURCH: Okay, so I, as a developer, come in
25 with a property like that location of the old Whole Foods,

1 and it was running that length, and I argued that I was
2 meeting this and I wanted to keep it that way because it's
3 more expensive for me to create all these articulations
4 that you guys would be referring them back to, however, you
5 have to go back to these articulation standards.

6 SEAN MULLIN: So, we would apply the standards
7 and hopefully they work with us on that.

8 CHAIR BURCH: Okay. Then that's fine. That was
9 just my worry. Vice Chair.

10 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: On page 274(3)(iii) I wanted
11 to just have the word "however" inserted before "Rooftop,"
12 because it would make it smoother and clearer, I think.

13 CHAIR BURCH: To be clear for the consultant
14 that's listening, you went back up into the Landscaped,
15 Private, and Community Recreation Spaces to a section up
16 here? Where are you?

17 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Page 274, sub iii.

18 CHAIR BURCH: Okay, so it is in Section A.11c,
19 iii.

20 SEAN MULLIN: I have it, and to clarify, you
21 would want "However" before the second sentence, because
22 both sentences begin with "Rooftop."

23 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Correct.

1 CHAIR BURCH: Okay. I want to make sure we roll
2 on the same page. Anything else, everybody, on Building
3 Placement?

4 COMMISSIONER SORDI: I had a quick follow-up on
5 the extended frontage that the Chair was just talking
6 about. Are there exceptions if you've got a bus stop? For
7 example, if you're in a situation where you've got a bus
8 stop, and then it's an enclosure that encompasses a portion
9 of the sidewalk, and then all you have between the sidewalk
10 and the building is this tiny little setback, and then
11 you've got kind of like a tunnel. I think in the Design
12 Guidelines in San Jose we have places where if you have a
13 condition like that and VTA won't let you move your bus
14 stop, that you accept out of it.

16 SEAN MULLIN: When we receive these applications
17 we route them to VTA if there is a bus stop in close
18 proximity, so if VTA makes a comment about you're not going
19 to be allowed to move this, we try to work with the
20 developer to avoid that. We don't have a standard to that
21 point saying that if there is a bus shelter that constrains
22 the passage along the sidewalk to X feet, then you shall do
23 Y, but we do have setback requirements, and we're not
24 talking about building at a zero setback with this
25 standard, we're talking about that the building be within

1 5' of the required setback, so even if there is a required
2 setback of zero, it would be within 5'.

3 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Okay.

4 MONICA SZYDLIK: If I may?

5 SEAN MULLIN: Go ahead, Monica, please.

6 MONICA SZYDLIK: To add onto Sean's comment, in
7 the initial analysis memo that I mentioned, we documented
8 all the development standards for the zones that support
9 multi-family and mixed-use, and so just looking at that
10 table, and it's also really to the Commissioner's comment a
11 moment ago about if the building is at the back of
12 sidewalk. So, the required front setback in these zones is
13 between 15'-25', so there is an ample setback, it's not
14 right at the back of sidewalk, and then we have standards
15 for the landscaping design of that required front setback.
16 I hope that provides a little bit of background into that
17 building to street relationship for this placement
18 standard.
19

20 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Yes, that helps. So, we have
21 more breathing room, basically, to work with there.

22 CHAIR BURCH: Thank you for that. Are there any
23 other comments about Building Placement? I want to clarify
24 that that does take us to the end of the Site section, so
25

1 if anybody wants to fall back, thought of something in the
2 site... No. Joel says no, you've said your piece.

3 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I do have a question about
4 the bus stops in general, because I did notice this the
5 other day with actually Whole Foods. I don't think this is
6 a place that it can be really added, but it felt like there
7 was a missed opportunity, because there is a bus stop along
8 there and then the bench doesn't line up with it. I think
9 it's along the Whole Foods, because I was looking at it the
10 other day and I was like, "Huh, this is weird." Anyway,
11 there was no original bench of sheltered bus stop, so is it
12 appropriate to add in... I mean, it's an improvement along
13 the sidewalk, so maybe this is a Parks and Public Works
14 thing that needs to go into another part of the Town Code,
15 but when those areas are being redeveloped or developed for
16 a first time to require an upgrade to a type of bus stop if
17 VTA supports that.

19 DIRECTOR PAULSON: Typically, VTA dictates that,
20 so we generally take their recommendations, and as Mr.
21 Mullin mentioned before, these projects generally all go
22 through the VTA.

23 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: So, it's their fault.

24 DIRECTOR PAULSON: We'll take a look at that
25 specific scenario and see if there might be some room for

1 improvement in the future, but we'll definitely let our
2 colleagues at Parks and Public Works know as well.

3 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: That's good to know that
4 that's a VTA thing. I can go to their meeting and bug them
5 about that.

6 CHAIR BURCH: Commissioner Burnett.

7 COMMISSIONER BURNETT: The parking lot situation,
8 and I don't know where that comes in in our Design
9 Guidelines, but I know Whole Foods, there has been quite a
10 controversy because the parking spaces are not the
11 dimension they were supposed to be; a lot of people are not
12 going there because their doors are being dinged. So, is
13 there a place in the Objective Design Standards of how the
14 width of a parking space should be?
15

16 DIRECTOR PAULSON: That's addressed in Town Code.
17 We are reviewing the accuracy, or inaccuracy, of the
18 placement of the striping for Whole Foods, but the Town
19 does have a standard, and so we require that standard
20 outside of the Objective Standards.

21 COMMISSIONER BURNETT: It's not in the Objective
22 Standards?

23 DIRECTOR PAULSON: It's in the Town Code.

24 COMMISSIONER BURNETT: Okay, thank you.
25

1 CHAIR BURCH: But, someone is actually looking at
2 that, because I do really agree with that. I don't know if
3 they did them all compact. Anything else on Site? Okay,
4 we're going to move into Building Standards, and Building
5 Massing and Scale. Commissioner Mayer.

6 COMMISSIONER MAYER: I just want to ask a
7 clarifying question about View 1.1c, "The front of the
8 building does not exceed 65' in width." So, that's saying
9 that if the building is not wider than 65', you don't need
10 to do any sort of step-back?
11

12 SEAN MULLIN: I'll defer to Monica. She will be
13 better at articulating this than I.

14 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Okay. You hear that, Monica?

15 MONICA SZYDLIK: Yes, absolutely. These are the
16 overall building massing options. So, yes, you comply with
17 one of these three, and this is the first step at making
18 sure the buildings aren't too imposing and really massive.
19 And then on top of these, there are articulation standards
20 later on, but that is true, if it's no wider than 65', then
21 upper story step-back is not required.

22 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Okay, thanks. And then can
23 you explain b, "Elements visible from the right-of-way"?
24

25 MONICA SZYDLIK: Okay, so this is where the track
changes. When you have a lot of changes, it doesn't work

1 all that great. I would recommend figuring out what that
2 means, glance at the version that doesn't show track
3 changes. What it's doing is picking up on words that we
4 kept, and it actually goes with the text above.

5 SEAN MULLIN: If you look at page 258 of your
6 packet, so we're going to get back into Exhibit 1 that
7 reads, "The front of the building incorporates ground level
8 of podium level community recreation space that is a
9 minimum of 900 square feet, has a minimum dimension of 30',
10 is enclosed by a minimum of two walls, and is designed with
11 landscape elements visible from the right-of-way." So, the
12 track changes just failed there. There are some issues when
13 you do large documents.
14

15 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Sure, understood. I just
16 wanted to understand the intent of that point.

17 MONICA SZYDLIK: It's another strategy for
18 breaking up building massing and ensuring that it does so
19 in a way that introduces good design, and it's usable and
20 landscaped.

21 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Back to c, how did you
22 arrive at the 65' width? I'm most concerned because I
23 understand the intent of this standard of breaking up the
24 massing, and for sure if there are big developments coming
25 along that have big, long walls, we want to break those up,

1 but there would probably be instances where there are
2 smaller scale infill buildings, and I would hate for it to
3 be a situation where it's 70' wide, it's 5' over the 65',
4 but now it has to push back the second floor or something,
5 or do one of these other options, so I'm just wondering how
6 you arrived at the 65'?

7 MONICA SZYDLIK: Yes, absolutely. We basically
8 looked at a lot of buildings in the Town and in the region,
9 and we looked at typical lot sizes, and that was where we
10 felt a solid dimension that could support mid-scale, multi-
11 family buildings. It's always the case when we introduce
12 objective numerical standards that there should be some
13 wiggle room, so I would defer to Sean. He would know better
14 if there is a path for minor modifications that can be
15 approved easily.

16 SEAN MULLIN: Yes, I think a couple of ways that
17 I'd react to this is that if you're building 70' wide and
18 this doesn't work for you, then don't implement c, because
19 one of the things that we heard through our focus groups
20 and community feedback was to give developers more
21 flexibility and options for good design rather than just
22 painting them into a corner and saying, "You have to do
23 this one thing to fix this one problem or this one
24 concern," and so in this standard, B.1.1, the developer is
25

1 welcome to implement any of these strategies to satisfy.
2 You only have to do one, and if, honestly, it doesn't work
3 for them and they're under the right application, they're
4 just going to waive it.

5 That's the reality of the situation. We're
6 approaching this not as, "Oh, they're just going to waive
7 it," we're approaching it more with the carrot of let's
8 write realistic standards that are approachable, easily
9 understood, and do allow for flexibility; and to increase
10 the flexibility that was allowed from the previous version
11 to help entice developers to continue to work with us, and
12 we've had some success, even with the existing document.
13 Obviously, it's not going to be perfect, and maybe 65' is
14 not the right number; that certainly could be up for
15 debate.
16

17 COMMISSIONER MAYER: I just want to say as a
18 general comment that I think these are a huge improvement
19 over the current ones. I mean, it's clear, and I think it's
20 more well thought out. I think it was this particular one
21 I'm a little bit on the fence about, but I think your
22 explanation makes sense, Mr. Mullin. Thanks.

23 DIRECTOR PAULSON: I think the change Mr. Mullin
24 and Ms. Szydlik commented on, any time you're putting a
25 number on some of these things it's not going to be perfect

1 for every scenario. Here, as was mentioned, we're trying to
2 provide some other options, if you don't get boxed in that
3 corner, and also as Mr. Mullin mentioned, depending on the
4 type of product, there may be other opportunities for
5 creativity to address some of these things.

6 CHAIR BURCH: All right. I just saw Commissioner
7 Stump first, then Vice Chair.

8 COMMISSIONER STUMP: This is a question about
9 Fig. B.1.1.c. I don't quite understand the scale here,
10 because they both say max building width of 65', but the
11 one on the left, if I'm thinking of scale, looks a lot
12 wider than the one on the right, so what does the scale
13 mean?
14

15 CHAIR BURCH: I would rather the consultant
16 answer that; they put this together. Monica?

17 MONICA SZYDLIK: Right, so were you referring to
18 Figure B.1.1.c?

19 COMMISSIONER STUMP: Correct.

20 CHAIR BURCH: Correct. When you look at the
21 scale, both say max of 65', but if you look at the scale of
22 each building, it's quite different. I think there's just
23 some explanation on that on figure.
24

25 MONICA SZYDLIK: Yes, it's not intended to be a
scale, really, it's an illustrative only as here are some

1 buildings that would comply with the standard. I should
2 also mention, the 65', we did think about it in terms of
3 missing middle types and kind of like a unit and a
4 staircase and a unit, and so thinking about that kind of
5 configuration, here's one way it could play out.
6 Alternatively, a single unit-wide building might look like
7 the one on the right. So, these are illustrative only to
8 show if you take this option, it could end up looking
9 something like this.

10
11 CHAIR BURCH: Commissioner Thomas.

12 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Could we maybe make them
13 the same width so that it's less confusing?

14 SEAN MULLIN: I've noted that the way this is
15 drawn has caused some confusion, so I think that's the
16 feedback we've received, so we'll look at rather than you
17 all trying to come up with a solution on the fly, we'll sit
18 down and look at improvements to that figure to make it
19 less confusing.

20 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Perfect.

21 CHAIR BURCH: All right, Vice Chair.

22 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Continuing with my hyper-
23 technical corrections, if we look at page 276, in the
24 middle there is the word "building" that's in bold, and it
25

1 connects to the "front of building," so I think we need
2 "the front of *the* building."

3 CHAIR BURCH: On page 276b, is that (inaudible)?

4 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes, it only shows the front
5 of, and then it skips to "building."

6 CHAIR BURCH: Right here, lower case b, if you
7 look at that, the revision is it just says, "The front of
8 the..." Everything else is lined out, and if you go down to
9 c, the next little area, the first part of that is lined
10 out and then it just goes to "building incorporates." So,
11 basically what it reads is "The front of the building
12 incorporates."
13

14 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I guess that's correct.
15 Okay, I withdraw that. Sorry for the waste of your time.

16 CHAIR BURCH: Nope. Anything else in this
17 section, everyone? All right. I'm moving on to Parking
18 Structure Design, so if somebody still has something about
19 the previous section, please say so now. Commissioner
20 Mayer.

21 COMMISSIONER MAYER: I really like this townhome
22 wall shift, so thanks for including that.

23 CHAIR BURCH: That's a good comment. Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER MAYER: We'll take that.
25

1 CHAIR BURCH: Parking Structure Design.

2 Commissioner Sordi.

3 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Figure B.2.3, which is
4 entitled "Above-ground parking structures must be designed
5 with," I just want to say that A confuses the heck out of
6 me. Well, I don't know what a punched opening versus a
7 ribbon opening is. I'll just read the whole thing: "Punched
8 openings in width-to-height proportions the same as those
9 of the primary structure." I don't know what the primary
10 structure is referring to.
11

12 SEAN MULLIN: I can jump in a little bit, and
13 Monica can help support, and in the end, maybe we need to
14 reword this. What we're trying to avoid are the—I'm going
15 to pick on my hometown of San Jose—old parking structures
16 that just have long, uninterrupted chasms of openings, so
17 they're not traditionally fenestrated like a building would
18 be. What this is saying is the punched openings are
19 fenestration; they're proportional openings that are
20 mimicking the same proportions of the building that it is
21 attached to. And there are other strategies here for
22 mitigating that that we see with the metal screens and
23 other things to help dress up a parking structure.
24

25 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Okay, I think I get that.
So, what is a ribbon opening?

1 SEAN MULLIN: Ribbon opening is kind of the same
2 thing. It's just a long, linear stretch with the only thing
3 interrupting it are the columns holding up the building.
4 So, what you see now, and I see a lot of it, a parking
5 structure design is they're fenestrating it more
6 traditionally, or a lot of times because they need so much
7 ventilation, they're putting up metal screens with orate
8 cut-outs. The Kaiser Santa Teresa Hospital just did one
9 that's done pretty well. The airport has one that has the
10 big sculpture on the side with the hands. Those are just
11 hiding the reality behind it that these things have to
12 breath, and so this gives the option of if you're going to
13 put openings in and not dress them up, then they need to
14 have the proportions more like windows, otherwise, you can
15 implement some of these other designs.

17 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Good, thanks.

18 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Maybe a diagram would be
19 helpful for that part, honestly.

20 CHAIR BURCH: For that one.

21 SEAN MULLIN: I've noted a diagram and
22 potentially improving the language to reduce confusion.

23 CHAIR BURCH: Perfect. Anything else on Parking
24 Structure Design?
25

1 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Just a quick note on the
2 screen, like it might be good to include examples of those
3 screened parking structures as try to do this.

4 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, I agree. I've been trying to
5 work through some of this with a couple of different
6 cities, and they do tend to send us to some places like
7 that as examples. If there is a way so that we get
8 something that actually looks nice.

9 SEAN MULLIN: I think we're leaning towards
10 diagrams to be consistent with the document, so I'll work
11 with the consultant to see if there is a way to put it in
12 the diagram form. If not, then maybe some photo examples
13 would be helpful.

14 CHAIR BURCH: Exactly. That would be nice. But
15 model screens can be interpreted a lot of different ways.
16 Vice Chair.

17 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: In 2.1 I had a discussion
18 with Mr. Mullin about what the word "lined" means, and he
19 invited me to come up with some alternative language. Would
20 "setback" work, or not?

21 SEAN MULLIN: Setback really is a loaded word and
22 implies a no-build zone, where what we're trying to do here
23 is hide the parking structure with an activated like a
24 retail storefront, so that the street isn't lined with just
25

1 parking; there's storefront, and then behind it that you
2 can't even see, is the parking garage. I know Commissioner
3 Mayer has his hand up; maybe he's got a suggestion.

4 CHAIR BURCH: Commissioner Mayer.

5 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Architecturally, I
6 understand it and I understood immediately what is meant by
7 "lined" here, so there is no confusion for me there.

8 I just want to say these Parking Structure Design
9 Guidelines 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 are really, really good,
10 really thoughtful; I'm glad these are here. I think
11 diagrams would definitely help illustrate what is intended
12 here, but I think the intention is, as you said, Mr.
13 Mullin, to not have this parking garage right at street
14 level, and I know there are projects in the pipeline here
15 that are proposing at-grade parking garages in areas of
16 town which I don't think they should belong, so I think
17 this is really important here, and thank you for having
18 that.
19

20 DIRECTOR PAULSON: And the architect understands
21 it, but for maybe the general public, I think I've seen
22 "wrapped" or "surrounded by."

23 COMMISSIONER SORDI: Yes, I was just going to
24 suggest wrapped.
25

CHAIR BURCH: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER SORDI: But wrapped implies you go
2 around the sides.

3 SEAN MULLIN: And again, we can work on improving
4 this, because there's a balance. They have to have access;
5 they have to have ventilation.

6 CHAIR BURCH: Right, exactly.

7 COMMISSIONER MAYER: I think a diagram would
8 probably help clear things up.

9 SEAN MULLIN: Yes.

10 CHAIR BURCH: Well, they're kind of is one, but
11 maybe...

12 SEAN MULLIN: More than elevation or something.

13 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, and maybe just an example like
14 within that 30', like you just said, could be retail. I
15 don't know, I think there's a few of us that knows what
16 this means, but I think most people would not. Okay,
17 Parking Structure Design. No, I'm not there yet. I was
18 really trying to stick with that one section, but if nobody
19 has anything else, yes, let's go to Roof Design and the
20 Façade Design and Articulation.

21 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: I had one concern again, and
22 I discussed with Mr. Mullin, which is 3.3, which would
23 allow a single dormer up to 50% of the total roofline at
24
25

1 street-facing façade. To me, that just seems odd. Neither
2 of us were able to find an example.

3 CHAIR BURCH: It does seem excessive.

4 SEAN MULLIN: This is one of the existing
5 standards from the original document. Maybe 50% is not the
6 right number. I struggle to find an example of multi-family
7 showing a shed dormer, but I could definitely see farmhouse
8 high-pitched roofs with the dormer popping out so that
9 you're using that roof volume that far exceeds the 50%, and
10 found plenty of examples of what we're trying to not do,
11 which is maybe a repetitive cookie-cutter peak dormer gable
12 facing all the way across, just repetitive.
13

14 CHAIR BURCH: Agreed.

15 SEAN MULLIN: Honestly, this one hasn't been a
16 challenge to implement, and hasn't been a challenge from
17 the developer side to design to, but maybe 50% is not the
18 right number; happy to entertain that.

19 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Maybe I need to clarify. I'm
20 fine with multiple dormers, my concern is with a single
21 dormer, which would be allowed up to 50%.

22 SEAN MULLIN: This is saying single dormer or the
23 collective, multiple dormers, so if someone wanted to do
24 one long shed dormer, you're going to be limited to 50%. If
25 you wanted to do five dormers, we'd add up the width of

1 those five dormers and see if that's at the 50% threshold
2 or not across that roof length.

3 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes, that makes a lot of
4 sense to me. Maybe I'm beating a dead horse here, but a
5 single dormer in a multi-family building that covered 50%
6 of the total roofline, I don't think a developer would do
7 that, but it would allow it.

8 SEAN MULLIN: It would allow it. I agree, we
9 haven't seen it in the multitude of applications that we
10 have. Not saying it couldn't happen, but typically we're
11 not seeing that.

12 CHAIR BURCH: Commissioner Thomas.

13 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I understand what you're
14 saying and what your concern is, and that would be an odd
15 choice, but I do think that just like some of the other
16 things we've brought up, that there are other aspects of
17 the Design Guidelines that would prevent just one really,
18 really long dormer. Like if the building is really, really
19 big and long, it would have to be broken up in another way,
20 right? Okay.

21 SEAN MULLIN: Yes, there are other standards in
22 here that would require articulating the roof form, but
23 this is specific to dormers and gets back to you're going
24
25

1 to have a primary roof form and dormers are typically
2 subordinate, and you don't want something that's competing.

3 CHAIR BURCH: It wouldn't be practical in any
4 way, shape, or form.

5 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Like a unibrow.

6 CHAIR BURCH: Exactly. Anything else on roof
7 design, guys? No? Then I'm going to move on to Façade
8 Design and Articulation. Commissioner Thomas.

9 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I would just like to say
10 that I think that the changes that were made and what has
11 been incorporated is more specific and provides better
12 guidance, but also better options in a way that we know
13 that that was the intent of this, and again, some of these
14 numbers, I don't know if 70% from my experience, but again,
15 trust consultants and Staff.

16 CHAIR BURCH: I had a question on page 280b.
17 Maybe I just read this wrong or I'm getting tired, but this
18 sounds like it's reading that the habitable projection
19 could be 2' out, and I just found that to be an odd
20 definition of a habitable projection. Like a 2' balcony
21 basically, is that what that means?

22 SEAN MULLIN: I can jump in on this. I believe
23 there was an original standard that would not allow
24 balconies to project out from the main body of the
25

1 building, which then when you're trying to articulate and
2 build a shadow line, all you're getting is just this flat
3 pasted thing, so we worked to try to find the right number
4 to allow some of that balcony to project out. That doesn't
5 mean that the balcony is 2' deep. The balcony could be 8'
6 feet deep, it just means 6' of it is within the body of the
7 building. The other extreme is we don't want the balcony
8 just completely hanging off the end of the building, so it
9 allows, again, more flexibility here.

10
11 CHAIR BURCH: That makes good sense. Thank you.
12 Anybody have anything else? I honestly thought you guys
13 would have more say about this section. Commissioner Mayer.

14 COMMISSIONER MAYER: So, 4.1, "Buildings greater
15 than two stories shall be designed with a differentiated
16 base, middle, and top on any street-facing elevation..."—I
17 agree with that intent—"...by incorporating a minimum of two
18 of the following design strategies:" Maybe I'm not
19 following the track changes properly here, but I'm trying
20 to figure out which one are the...

21 SEAN MULLIN: The track changes failed here
22 again. Immediately underneath where it says 4.2, it should
23 be an a, and it's a, b, c, d, and e, so it's providing five
24 options; it's just the track changes skipped here.
25

1 COMMISSIONER MAYER: (Inaudible) sixty-one has
2 the not track changes.

3 SEAN MULLIN: And this is helpful, because we'll
4 try to clean the track changes document up before we head
5 to Council.

6 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Just give me a second to
7 look at it. Okay, and it's just minimum of two of the
8 following... Okay. The five options, need to pick two, is
9 that correct?

10 SEAN MULLIN: Yes. And through our outreach,
11 those types of strategies were found to be preferred by the
12 developers rather than like point systems of just giving
13 them one solution.

14 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Yes, I think this is better.
15 Thanks.

16 CHAIR BURCH: I have a comment on 4.6, the
17 continuous length facades. I think it's great to say you've
18 got to put windows on there, but much like my favorite
19 project in town, I think a bunch of windows that just have
20 white sheeting behind them and there's zero anything else
21 to them, looks actually worse.

22 DIRECTOR PAULSON: I'm not sure how successful...
23 We have a few projects that have that scenario where
24 they're facing Main Street, and so what we try to do is
25

1 have them have some sort of display or something in those
2 areas.

3 CHAIR BURCH: You can get those blinds with
4 imagery on them, like put some produce on it. Commissioner
5 Mayer.

6 COMMISSIONER MAYER: Would these Objective
7 Standards actually apply to a project like the one you're
8 referring to, since it's just a big box retail?

9 CHAIR BURCH: No, I was just using it as an
10 example.

11 SEAN MULLIN: No. Although if they put three
12 units of housing on the roof, yes.

13 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, it would.

14 SEAN MULLIN: Because it would be mixed-use,
15 multi-family at that point, but no, that's a good point.

16 CHAIR BURCH: My point is pretty much all of the
17 Boulevard is mixed-use, it's all mixed-use, so those are
18 properties that have a much longer street-facing. I think
19 when you've just two windows somewhere it doesn't have the
20 same impact as just a wall of closed looking windows, so I
21 don't know if there's a way to... And I'm not even going to
22 try to wordsmith this, and you might just say no, but
23 something to say blank stupid window.
24
25

1 SEAN MULLIN: We've noted it and we can explore.
2 It's hard to, because sometimes you're building a building
3 without... If it's retail space, you don't know what the use
4 is going to be, you don't know what the tenant is going to
5 be. The example we keep using is a single tenant, purpose-
6 built building...

7 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, if you've got multiple.

8 SEAN MULLIN: ...but if you're building a mixed-use
9 building with multiple retail spaces, you don't know who is
10 going to be in there, but we'll talk about that with the
11 consultant.
12

13 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I don't know if something
15 like a permanent art display could be used instead of a
16 window, like a mural not just painted on a wall, but like a
17 mosaic or something else that...an alternative.

18 SEAN MULLIN: We'll look at it.

19 CHAIR BURCH: Okay, thank you. Anything else on
20 this section? I like the additions about the residential
21 entrance, spelling out what it needs to look like so that
22 there's a bit of a presence to it. If everybody stays
23 quiet, I am going to move to the next section.
24

25 Windows and Doors. All right, am I missing
anything? Did I not get a last page or something? This one

1 has the Materials and Architectural Details on Exhibit 1.
2 Maybe I just didn't get it in Exhibit 2.

3 SEAN MULLIN: It's on page 285 of the packet, in
4 Exhibit 2.

5 CHAIR BURCH: Oh, sorry, it printed really light.
6 My apologies. Materials and Architectural Details. Vice
7 Chair.

8 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: In 7.1a, should we require
9 the street-facing façade to definitely include those, or am
10 I missing something?

11 CHAIR BURCH: So, in a way you're trying to say
12 the main façade, the front-facing façade, should include
13 50% or more of the primary materials?

14 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes, I guess just by adding
15 main and potentially others, that's the concept I'm trying
16 to capture.

17 DIRECTOR PAULSON: I don't know if Monica has any
18 input on this, but this seems to be, you know, you kind of
19 have a material palette. You've got a primary, which is
20 going to be the predominant material, you've got the
21 secondary, and you've got the accent stuff, so I think by
22 default, theoretically that would happen. We could
23 definitely explore adding some more specific language as it
24
25

1 relates to street-facing facades or something along those
2 lines.

3 CHAIR BURCH: By default, the fact that it is the
4 primary material means it is usually predominantly on the
5 front-facing façade.

6 SEAN MULLIN: And there are other standards that
7 would require the 360 design that all these materials need
8 to be on all elevations, not just the front.

9 CHAIR BURCH: Okay. Commissioner Thomas.

10 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I interpreted it
11 differently, that "to 50% or more of a façade," I assumed
12 that meant like of all facades, even though it doesn't say
13 all.

14 SEAN MULLIN: We would calculate each façade.

15 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes, so every façade would
16 require 50% minimum. Okay.

17 SEAN MULLIN: And then in concert with the other
18 requirements that you put all the materials on all sides of
19 the building; we would look at all these things together.

20 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Okay, so maybe that
21 language should be changed, because I think that the Vice
22 Chair interpreted it as one of the facades required 50%. Is
23 that correct, or no?
24
25

1 VICE CHAIR BARNETT: Yes, maybe it should be
2 "all" instead of "a."

3 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

4 SEAN MULLIN: Okay, thank you.

5 CHAIR BURCH: Anything else on this section?

6 MONICA SZYDLIK: If I may, I would agree that
7 changing the word "façade" to "elevation" might clear that
8 up.

9 CHAIR BURCH: Yes, agreed. I like elevations
10 better anyway. Anything else on this section? If we didn't
11 pick something up, speak now or forever hold your peace for
12 another few months or so.

13 Does anybody want to make a motion on this item?
14 Commissioner Stump.

15 COMMISSIONER STUMP: Just going to ask some
16 guidance on a motion, because obviously we've gone and made
17 numerous, you could say, edits, suggested changes,
18 recommendations, so if we're now going to say let's forward
19 this to the Council, the motion is to recommend forwarding
20 this to the Council, does that need to be included noting
21 these edits, changes, suggestions?

22 DIRECTOR PAULSON: Yes, if you could just walk
23 back through each one. Hopefully, you're keeping track.

24 COMMISSIONER STUMP: I can. Right here.

1 DIRECTOR PAULSON: So, no, I think it's as simple
2 as forwarding a recommendation to the Town Council with the
3 direction provided by the Planning Commission this evening.

4 COMMISSIONER STUMP: Okay, then I move to forward
5 a recommendation to the Town Council on proposed changes
6 and additions to the Town's Objective Design Standards for
7 Multi-Family and Mixed-Use, not subject to CEQA review
8 pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15061(b)(3) because it can be
9 seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the
10 changes and additions to the Town's Objective Design
11 Standards for Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Projects would
12 have a significant effect on the environment or projects
13 for which the Objective Design Standards for Multi-Family
14 and Mixed-Use Projects will apply will undergo separate
15 CEQA review and approval.
16

17 CHAIR BURCH: Okay, great. Is there a second?
18 Commissioner Thomas.

19 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I second the motion.

20 CHAIR BURCH: Is there discussion or an optional
21 motion on the table? Seeing none, I'll call the question.
22 All in favor? Passes unanimously, and as this is a
23 recommendation, there are no appeal rights.
24

25 SEAN MULLIN: Correct, and thank you for all the
valuable feedback. (END)