Notes from 7/20/11 Development Code Workshop

Building Intensity

Sidewalks:

- Augment width 8' to minimum 13'. (16' at bulb outs)
    - Allow Sidewalk dining within the 5' setback
    - Articulate how it is to be regulated and reviewed:
        - via future dedication?
        - Control variability of sidewalks so the standard is consistent: via 5' setback across the board or as 12' – 13' setback from curb face?

Note: Need a minimum 12' width for tree well and canopy trees; 3' setback not adequate for landscape/planter strip

Possible median versus wider side walks

Building Heights

- Careful with Density – Westside is not a dumping ground for city density

– Modulate height of a development as it moves toward residential neighborhoods. Use upper story % to regulate how relates to neighbors.

– Consideration of height adjacent to historic residence or designated conservation area (BM)

– Code encourages redevelopment versus adaptive reuse (what risk for non-conformance?)

– Select nodes carefully to avoid solid wall all the way up Avenue

– Top floor standard is inconsistent. Clearer articulation of cornices; percentage of top floor - may want to regulate which side of the building to allow height to be more specific.

– Code must be able to address smaller individual lots – not only larger consolidated lots.

– Keep heights as proposed

– Lower them more

– Allow heights to accommodate affordable housing; but don't overshadow Historic District

– Commercial corridors don't match residential "soft middles" urban nodes are undesirable.

– Infill meant to go on corridors.

– Chipping away at standard will make parcels undevelopable. Need economically viable code.

– Maintain affordable housing; avoid gentrification.

- Less Nodes at T5.5
    - Possible at Dakota Drive
- Keep height at current T5.5 nodes
- Heights okay for affordable housing and if sensitive to historic preservation

- Code that enables proformas raises height
- Renters don't want commercial/development that gentrifies

Alleys

- Alleys buffer residents, but have safety concerns. Need to address in design.
- Alley deliveries inhibit other traffic. Truck widths are 8' 4"; loading areas need 4'+ alignment with a bay. Create a node for side loading.
- Stipulate loading area be taken out of private set back
- One way traffic in alleys for more effective traffic flow
- Caution: If chip away at building envelope; won't be able to develop

Neighborhood Transitions – Rear Yard Setbacks

- 10' setback for 2-story second structure on rear.
- Increase setback for side yards
- Limit 2nd structure to 1-story, then more lenient with setbacks.
– Code for least possible impact to neighbors with 2nd structures.
- Develop more specific site development standard. Also code for building/lot standards like driveways/garages place on the lot.
- Code for entrance locations; window types; deck's orientation location etc. (See Hansen Trust)
- Be mindful of necessary separation between structures when pushing in setbacks from rear lot line.

Primary Building Height – 2nd Story BM Overlay

- Better to design for articulation of buildings versus artificial height/setback standards.
- Allow more flexibility for 2nd stories in building mass (BM) overlay.
- Identify the massing that is appropriate for the characteristic of the neighborhood without coding for the extreme upper story setback.
- Look at other codes that utilize tools
- Primary street upper story % versus step backs
  T4.11 no 50' setback
- Send second story additions to DRC.

Nodes

- Yes and No T5.5 at Dakota
  T4.11 at Shoshone
  Provide Angled Parking

COMMENTS

- Building mass is related to parking requirements.
- More park space
– Not enough resident participating in "node" placement.
– Extra need to define form of upper stories: separation from back etc.
– Alleys – Define how easement functions. Articulate safety in the interim.
– Need more trees. Need utility overlay study (underground infrastructure) to place trees

– Massing – need more options for parking to bring down massing.
– Building corridor means losing views to hills.
– Plazas insufficient, need 11 acres for park.
– Parking has massing impact to meet pro forma.
– Need more engagement for neighbors to provide input.
– Write down the design intent for each street, then justify code and its role to each neighborhood.
– Form follows parking – need that info.
– Consider impact of decision-making when designing standard.
– Avoid artificial limitations. T4.11 and T5.5 1st floor plate height doesn't work for residential.
– Discuss plaza park on the Avenue
– How to retain the character of the Avenue. Code only addresses new development, doesn't allow flexibility in standards for owners of existing buildings who wish to rehab.
– Expand discussion to include diagonal parking
– Identify potential public parking lots
– Examine loading in alleys, etc.
– Bus stops – designate locations for bulb outs
– Re-examine eclectic – too hodge podge. Pick preferences for architectural styles
– Accommodate trees (if need to widen sidewalk – change right-of-way)
– Use intent statements.
– More specific on upper story not just % of coverage for stories.
– Keep up information related to General Plan Policy basis for Code
– T4.11; T5.5 – Possible incentive; how does it work in conflict with concerns over height?
– MS4 will chip away at lot development.
– Alleys could serve as MS4 retention.
– Required specific Floor Area Ratio (FAR) to Park/Plaza Incentive
– Wants east/west graphic to show street level view for pedestrian/bike
– Wants current urban form; focus on removing blight and restoration.
– Another meeting about parks space.