

Development Plan and Community Design Guidelines Consistency

Highlighted Sections	Discussion Items
<i>Avila Ranch Development Plan – Design Framework</i>	
<p><i>ARDP Standard 1.1: Adherence to AASP Building Orientation and Setback Standards</i></p>	<p>The proposed application includes setbacks that are based on recently updated aspects of the City’s Zoning Regulations as they apply to R-3 and R-4 zones. Specifically, instead of a minimum 15-foot front setback, as required in the ARDP, the application shows a 10-foot front setback, which is consistent with City zoning requirements. The applicant has included this modified setback standard as Sheet P-1.8 in the proposed project plans.</p> <p><u>Discussion Item:</u> ARC recommended approval of the 10-foot front setback, which is consistent with Citywide zoning requirements in the R-4 zone. Staff is supportive of applying the less restrictive setback, in part because it is consistent with setback requirements elsewhere in the City, but also because of limited design options that would achieve the City’s housing goals on a relatively small site. The Avila Ranch Development Agreement, Section 8.06, recognizes a need for flexibility during project implementation, and the need to potentially allow for minor deviations from the Development Plan if the project is consistent with the intent of the Development Plan.</p>
<p><i>ARDP Standards 1.2 and 1.6, and related guidelines: Building Height and Setback relationship; driveway orientation.</i></p> <p><i>ARDP Standard 7.3.5: The relationship between building height and setbacks</i></p>	<p>The intent of this standard is to avoid blocking distant views of the background topography through the relationship of setbacks to building height. The ARDP builds on the streetscape and pedestrian orientation standards included in the AASP, and follows the intent of setback requirements included in the Municipal Code related to the R-4 zone. As designed, the project would adhere to the intent of the setback requirements of the R-4 zone as described in the ARDP (see Attachment E, ADRP R-4 Development Standards). Many multi-family units orient away from Earthwood Lane, which addresses potential impacts related to road noise and aesthetics.</p> <p><u>Discussion Item:</u> The maximum building height in R-4 is 35 feet per Municipal Code standards, however, the ARDP does not include a maximum building height. While the ARDP does not include maximum building heights, it does include standards that limit the height of buildings in relation to setbacks to ensure adequate sunlight, preservation of distant views, and building portions are accommodated. With respect to Standard 7.3.5, the project as designed includes building heights that are</p>

Highlighted Sections	Discussion Items
	<p>consistent with the language that building heights be “equal to or at least 2/3 of the distance of the street centerline to the face of the building.” Strict compliance with the remainder of the standard (i.e., that 75% of the units to have one foot of building height for each 1.5 feet of distance from the street centerline) would require building heights to be no more than 26 feet, which is not practical from a design standpoint for multi-family housing of the density anticipated under the ARDP for this site.</p> <p>The applicant proposes a building height ranging from approximately 33 feet to 38 feet, with varying architectural projections within this range. When considered in the context of the need to accomplish multiple General Plan goals related to housing and environmental protection, the proposed design is consistent with the intent of these requirements related to setbacks and building heights. The proposed building height of slightly less than 38-feet is at locations of architectural projections on vertical building elements, and is proposed to enhance the design by varying heights of architectural features. The Avila Ranch Development Agreement, Section 8.06, recognizes a need for flexibility during project implementation, and the need to potentially allow for minor deviations from the Development Plan if the project is consistent with the intent of the Development Plan. ARC recommended that roof projections should be allowed to extend above 35 feet, but should be slightly below the 38 feet originally proposed, and be more rectilinear in form. In response, the applicant has prepared exhibits that redesign the projections to be more rectilinear, and no higher than 37’10”. These are included in Attachment G on Sheets AC-1.0 and AC-1.1.</p>
<p><i>ARDP Standards 7.1.1-7.1.4 and 7.4: Required Architectural Styles, Architectural character, styles, facades and treatment</i></p>	<p>The intent of these standards is to ensure that architectural styles are designed to be appropriate for each land use within Avila Ranch, and to ensure consistency with the overall project vision. Contemporary style is identified in the ARDP as a permitted architectural type, and has been previously applied within the R-2 portion of Avila Ranch.</p> <p><u>Discussion Item:</u> ARC recommended approval of the proposed Contemporary/Mid-Century architectural style, and found it appropriate in the context of the project’s location at the north end of the Avila Ranch project area, where it provides a design transition between the Avila Ranch development and nearby commercial and industrial buildings to the north and west. The</p>

Highlighted Sections	Discussion Items
	<p>style is identified in the ARDP as an appropriate architectural style for Avila Ranch.</p>
<p><i>ARDP Standard 7.1.10: Buildings within R-4 zones shall have covered porches, entries, or walkways that front onto the street.</i></p>	<p>The architecture for the R-4 development has integrated articulation of the building facades to enhance entry points, change in materials, windows, exterior balcony placement and varying roof lines. Individual unit porches and entries that front onto the street would not be feasible with an apartment complex of this density.</p> <p><u>Discussion Item:</u> ARC recommended potential pavement enhancements within the parking lots. Colored and stamped concrete at key locations throughout the parking lots would provide visual cues for areas of pedestrian crossing and entry/exit features. The applicant has prepared a revised exhibit that shows stamped concrete treatment in key locations at driveway entrances and ADA striping through the parking lot. Applicant's exhibit is included on Sheet AC-2.0 in Attachment G.</p>
<p><i>ARDP Standards 8.1.1-8.1.4: Landscaping</i></p>	<p>The proposed project responds to these standards with a landscape plan that enhances and complements the architectural design, as shown on several project sheets, notably Sheets L1.3, L1.4, and L1.5, and the renderings shown on Sheets AS2.0, AS2.1, AS2.2, AS2.3, AS3.0, AS3.1 and AS3.2.</p>
<p><i>ARDP Standard 9.2: Signs</i></p>	<p>The applicant is proposing two (2) monument signs at 5-foot 6-inches in height and 7-foot 6-inches in width, with a sign area of 20 square feet. City Zoning Regulations do not allow monument signs in residential zones, however, an exception can be approved by Planning Commission.</p> <p><u>Discussion Item:</u> ARC recommended approval of the proposed monument sign exception and the overall design of the proposed monument signs to identify each development, provided that the signs are externally lit. Condition of Approval #5 has been included in the draft resolution to require the monument sign to be externally lit, not internally illuminated.</p>
<p><i>ARDP Standards 9.3.2-9.3.8: Lighting</i></p>	<p>Pole light locations and styles are shown in the landscape plans (Attachment B, sheets L-1.1-1.3). Also refer to applicant revisions prepared in response to ARC comments related to lighting and landscaping, which are included in Attachment G.</p>

Highlighted Sections	Discussion Items
	<p><u>Discussion Item:</u> ARC discussed the proposed lighting plan, which includes standard utilitarian LED pole light fixtures throughout the site. In response to ARC comments, the applicant has revised Exhibit AC-2.0 to show more detail about different lighting concepts that are proposed, which are intended to be pedestrian scale and to minimize offsite glare and impacts to nearby residences. This exhibit is included in Attachment G of this agenda report. Condition #9 has been added in the draft resolution to require a photometric plan with maximum light intensity standards to ensure appropriate lighting levels at the time of building permits. Staff recommends approval of the lighting as designed and conditioned.</p>
<p><i>ARDP Standard 11.2: Drainage Design</i></p>	<p>This standard requires that a landscaped drainage swale be included along northern property line of Avila Ranch to facilitate drainage from adjacent property, and to provide screening to the light industrial properties to the north. A concrete drainage channel is proposed with current plans. Through the stormwater management and design review process, a landscaped drainage swale was determined to be insufficient to convey the required 100-year storm event capacity. The alternative solution was to incorporate a “catch and convey” concrete drainage channel system. A wall/fence height exception is included with the proposed project which includes the concrete channel.</p> <p><u>Discussion Item:</u> The ARC recommended approval of the drainage design, including the fence height exemption in recognition of the need for safety related to drainage and to minimize the potential for flooding. Condition #8 has been added which requires landscape screening along the northern and western property lines to provide visual appearance at this location along the edge of parking lots.</p>
<p><i>Fence Design</i></p>	<p>A fence height exception is proposed in order to construct wall/fence combination up to 13-feet in height, where 9 feet is the standard.</p> <p><u>Discussion Item:</u> As proposed, the additional fence height and overall design of the retaining wall and fences is supportable because it allows the for the property to be developed at the density allowed by the ARDP and to address drainage and safety at this location.</p>

Highlighted Sections	Discussion Items
<i>Parking Design</i>	<p>The applicant has designed parking areas to meet the minimum standards of Municipal Code Section 17.72.050 including bicycle parking. Compact parking spaces are proposed, which may be approved by Planning Commission.</p> <p><u>Discussion Item:</u> As allowed by Municipal Code section 17.72.050(F) 2 parking spaces have been replaced with 10 additional bike parking storage. Both short- and long-term bicycle storage is designed to meet the standards of the City’s Active Transportation Plan. Compact parking spaces are proposed in compliance with the City’s Engineering Standards, which allow up to 50% compact spaces with Planning Commission approval.</p>
<i>ARDP Standards 13.1.1 and 13.1.2: Energy</i>	<p>The ARDP was adopted prior to the 2019 energy conservation standards, and thus refers to outdated standards. However, as noted previously, the DA includes performance standards to exceed citywide requirements as they were in place at the time of project approval. An analysis of the consistency with the intent with the DA and the intent of the ARDP is included in the Planning Commission Agenda Report and in Attachment D.</p>
<i>CDG Chapter 5 – Residential Project Design Guidelines</i>	
<i>§ Section 5.2: Subdivision Design and General Residential Design Principles</i>	<p>This section of the CDG includes several key principles related to integrating open space into the design, project scale, and pedestrian orientation. More specifically related to architectural review, the section also calls for durable and low maintenance finishes, the use of a variety of materials, building articulation, and garage orientation. The project is responsive to these issues, and consistent with the intent of these principles. Sheet AX1.0 of the project plans (Attachment B) illustrates a variety of complementary colors and materials that would be applied to the varied design details shown on project renderings in the applicant’s package referenced elsewhere in this agenda report.</p>
<i>§ Section 5.4: Multi-Family and Clustered Housing Design</i>	<p>The ARDP was previously found to be consistent with the CDG, and reflects and expands on many of the same principles articulated in the CDG. Among the principles articulated in this section of the CDG include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site planning should consider the character of surrounding development; 2. Multi-family units should be clustered but separated

Highlighted Sections	Discussion Items
	<p>into smaller buildings if possible;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Pedestrian access should be ensured; 4. Parking and driveways should be safe, visible, functional, and aesthetically pleasing through landscaping; 5. Architecture should be compatible with nearby development, with particular attention given to façade and roof articulation, scale, and features such as balconies and porches to the extent possible; 6. Access to dwelling units should be in small clusters rather than long corridors; 7. Exterior stairways, if needed, should be safe and protected from weather elements; and 8. Accessory structures should be designed to be integral to the project, and not separated or otherwise inconsistent in color or materials used. <p>The project is responsive to these principles. Sheets SP1.0, L1.1-L1.4 of the project plans (Attachment B) show how units are integrated into and have access to pedestrian paseos and common open space. Also see the previous discussion related to architecture, setbacks, and project design with regard to consistency with the ARDP.</p>