



## Design Review Board Staff Report

**Date:** October 20, 2022

**To:** Design Review Board

**Prepared by:** Joan Ryan, Principal Planner  
[Joan.ryan@cityofconcord.org](mailto:Joan.ryan@cityofconcord.org)  
925-671-3370

**Reviewed by:** Mindy Gentry, Planning Manager  
Frank Abejo, Principal Planner

**Subject:** **Continuing the discussion on the City's Objective Design Standards (ODS) document with a focus on the draft standards and diagrams for the Downtown and Neighborhood areas and the different methods to achieve an objective standard.**

**CEQA: Not a project/exempt pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21065, CEQA Guidelines Sections 15060(c) or 15378.**

---

### **Report in Brief**

This Design Review Board (DRB) meeting is a follow-up to the August 29 special joint meeting with the Planning Commission regarding the development of the City's Objective Design Standards (ODS). The focus of this meeting will be to build on the framework of the ODS document by discussing various methods to achieve an objective standard and review, discuss, and recommend specific architecture and site planning design standards for the Downtown and Neighborhood areas.

### **Recommended Action**

Continue the discussion on the City's ODS document with a focus on the draft standards and diagrams for the Downtown and Neighborhood areas and the different methods to achieve an objective standard.

### **Background**

The State has limited a local jurisdiction's ability to apply subjective design standards for qualifying housing projects, whereby the City can now only rely on the application of

objective design standards<sup>1</sup>. Objective standards are those that do not involve discretion or subjective judgment. Those standards can typically be referenced to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion.

The proposed approach will ensure that the City establishes a strategy for new housing developments to maintain quality design with creative, economically feasible, and sustainable standards. More specifically, the City seeks to establish ODS to apply on residential housing development projects when the City's discretionary review is limited or prohibited.

Staff has held three meetings to date, which included the Design Review Board:

- **April 6 - Joint Special Meeting of the Housing and Economic Development Committee, Planning Commission, and Design Review Board** – Previewed the project intent, approach, timeline and invited feedback on important design issues as related to recent DRB and Planning Commission meetings for review of projects. (Attachment A)
- **August 29 - Joint Special Meeting of the Planning Commission and Design Review Board** – Reviewed highlights of prior comments, provided an initial draft outline for the document, and provided opportunity for discussion on specific design issues. (Attachment B)
- **October 13 – Staff Primer for the Special Meeting of the Design Review Board** – Provided outline for the ODS document, and preview of the different methods to achieve an objective standard as preparation for discussion of specific architecture and site planning design standards for the Downtown and Neighborhood areas.

Staff has emphasized the project's goals are to support Concord's tradition of high quality design while generating standards that support the requirements of State law to streamline the processing of housing projects. The design of qualifying housing projects would be required to meet the objective design standards or alternatively, applicants will continue to also have the opportunity to pursue design flexibility beyond the Objective Design Standards under the City's current discretionary review process.

As a result of the August 29 joint meeting, the project team finalized the outline for the ODS document and began preparation of certain sections of the ODS document starting with the Downtown and Neighborhood areas. The discussion and input this evening will help inform the drafting of these sections with a focus on an expanded outline for the Downtown and Neighborhood areas of the document. Staff and the consultant will spend

---

<sup>1</sup> SB 330 defines objective design standards as, "involving no personal or subjective judgement by a public official and being uniformly verifiable by reference to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development applicant or proponent and the public official."

time reviewing the standards for both sections, including a review of both text and diagrams intended to make the standards clear to developers and the public. Staff will be requesting the DRB's review and written comments on sections of the document for submittal prior to the special meeting on November 17.

Staff has also worked with the consultant to modify the project schedule to allow for additional meetings with the DRB to focus on specific design components, particularly around architectural building design and site planning. A second DRB special meeting is scheduled for November 17 to focus on architectural and site planning standards in the Corridors and Special Case (Infill) areas for the ODS document. Following that, a session is tentatively planned with the Planning Commission for December 7.

### **Analysis**

The intent of the ODS project is to create objective design standards based on the City's existing design documents and through this process enhance the existing character within the City as new development and property improvements occur, since the Community Design Guidelines – the City's primary design document – have not been updated in over 30 years. An additional goal for this project is to streamline the City's development process by creating an illustrative companion document demonstrating examples of the design standards, the preparation of new checklists and forms, and establish processes that provide clear guidance to applicants on objective design standards as well as the submittal and permitting requirements.

### Presentation and Discussion

The presentation for the evening will review the outline for the document (Attachment C), the updated timeline (Attachment D) and provide topics of focus for different methods to achieve an objective standard for various design components and establish specific architecture and site planning design standards for the Downtown and Neighborhood areas of the document. Those topics will include site planning and orientation, parking, building massing and articulation, roof treatments, windows and doors, materials, colors, landscape design and details.

The DRB's feedback at the meeting will help form the specifics regarding design as well as selecting the most appropriate tools/approaches (i.e., counts and measures, ratios and calculations, lists, scorecards) to inform the City's ODS document; therefore, participation is highly encouraged (examples Attachment E).

### Next Steps

A DRB special meeting on November 17 will be a similar format to this evening's meeting, but with a focus upon the Corridor and Special Case (Infill) areas. Staff will provide an update to the Planning Commission at a workshop in December. Following the October-December meetings, an update to the full City Council is planned for early 2023 for a progress check-in, to ensure the documents are aligned with the City Council's objectives prior to completing and publishing the public draft for public input.

### **Public Contact**

The Agenda was posted at City Hall and on the City's website at least 10 days prior to the public hearing.

### **Attachments**

- A. Draft Summary Comments, April 6, 2022
- B. Draft Summary Comments, August 29, 2022
- C. Draft Outline for the ODS document
- D. Updated Timeline for the ODS project
- E. [HCD-Technical Assistance Briefing](#) on Objective Design Standards, June 2021<sup>2</sup>

22srdrb.057

---

<sup>2</sup> The full URL is: <https://hcdcagov.app.box.com/s/baznxdyweq6a8txcrb22li0goggodzz6>

**ODS Joint Special Meeting #1 – (HED, Planning Commission, Design Review Board)**

April 6, 2022, 6:30 pm. – Council Chamber

**DRAFT Summary Minutes**

Staff in attendance: Justin Ezell, Tom Capriola, Frank Abejo, Joan Ryan

Consultant: Mukul Malhotra, Principal, MIG

Public: One member of the public, Paul Kephart in attendance

**Pledge** – Mayor requested the pledge be led by Chair Mizutani.

**Roll call** - All members on agenda in attendance, with exception of Jason Laub and Suzanne Alaksa.

**Joint Study Session** - Joan Ryan, project manager for the ODS project provided a brief introduction, thanked all for their attendance, anticipated a 10-month project, noted there will be other opportunities to provide input and that there would be a follow-up DRB/PC joint workshop in May with a full Council session later in the Summer. She indicated the primary purpose of the meeting was to initiate the process of preparing Objective Design Standards in order to comply with new State legislation and to begin by hearing the feedback and experiences of the various members of the Committee/Commission/Board in their review of project designs for the City. She then introduced Mukul Mulhotra as the Principal at MIG, as the presenter for the evening.

Mr. Mulhotra provided his presentation – the powerpoint was provided to participants in advance of the meeting.

Questions/Discussion

- Infill Development in Existing Areas
  - Small lots
  - 1 vs. 2-story
  - Adjoining Single Family (generally single-story ) developments
- Contextual Response
  - Give + take
  - Look at particular districts
- 4-sided architecture
  - Sides/fronts
  - Relevance
  - Context
  - Building offsets
  - Opportunities
  - Major corridors
- Approval Process
  - Preliminary Design at initial advisory level.
  - Style vs. ‘Good looking’
  - Don’t pin into a particular architectural style
  - Texture
- 2-story in one story development

- Respect existing neighbourhood
- Change in styles over a period of time
- Designate districts
  - 1) Downtown
  - 2) Corridor
  - 3) Residential
  - 4) Infill
- ODS Elements of Importance
  - Relief
  - Detail
  - Transitional treatment
  - Different roof pitch (Discussion of 'half stories')
  - Discussion of different projects, i.e. Eichlers, Wisteria near Safeway
  - Sight lines from public road
  - Sight lines from behind house; changing adjacent uses
- Prescribe Variations (in long buildings)
- Variety at different levels
- Elements
  - Dormers
  - Roof pitch
- Themes
  - Variety
  - Diversity of product
  - Consideration of 'fit' and surrounding neighbourhood.
  - History/Heritage preservation
  - Finding Balance
  - Get it Right – this is something we will be living with “legacy” that will shape appearance of City of Concord Good Objective Standards- If replacing existing review process.
  - Look at good examples, avoid mistakes/pitfalls of other cities
  - Continue conversations; going to neighborhoods
  - Keep local control to degree possible
- ODS in Infill – Spirit of Law
- Standards in a non-standard environment – *Reasonable*
- Keeping Affordability while Developing Standards – *Affordable by Design*
- Walk the fine line between Good Design and Flexibility –
- Don't be too restrictive – *Encourage Good Design (ex: Chestnut Development)*
- Percentage of developments to be single-story
- Define Design Districts/Areas
- Allowed to do or not do – *Control Parameters*
- Walkable/bikeable – Cognizant of sidewalk size - *Promote active sidewalks*
- *Opportunities to Direct development in certain areas*
  - *More flexible in certain areas*
  - *Coordinate with Housing Element*

- *Spread diversity in neighborhoods.*

#### Questions continued

- Materials – Depth and structure
- One set of Criteria or more?
  - Craftsman, Ranch, Mission, Farmhouse, how to address style?
  - Downtown vs. City Overall
  - *Local Streets vs. Corridors*
- Building setback (example of Development standard)
- Want to maintain variety (Use of percentages – one approach)
- Relate to Neighborhood Context
- *Simple designs – consider \$ and impact on development*
- *Objective yet Flexible – Is there potential or a method to do both?*
  - *Concern with prescriptive and the issue of being too strict.*
  - *Don't want to short cut Design Review.*
- How to standardize 4-sided architecture?
- Potential for a “Menu Strategy” to assure good design but retain flexibility-want to consider
- ‘Cantebury’ Neighborhood, example of specific design.
- Bike paths adjacent to trees – need standard.
- Small lot detached – side elevation may not be important
- Address turning corners of building (materials wrapping)
- Form over style; Create good texture/fabric of City with good architecture
- Infill Standards – Contextual Variation.
- Renaissance, Wisteria, Gateway Building noted as good examples of form/architecture
- Eichler mentioned in terms of variety, history
- *Dimensions for relief*
- *Context when backing to single family, esp. single-story*
- *If a building burns down, can they go with ODS instead of original design?*

#### Public Comment

Paul Kephart – Lives north of Downtown – distinction between objective/subjective is important and presentation answered many of his questions. He believes that the historic area North Todos Santos (NTS) should have its own standards. He questioned how the General Plan gets applied.

#### Comments of the Joint Session

Weinmann – What makes Concord is its architectural diversity. Infill for different areas needs to be considered. For example, the recent Clayton Way project is an example of one that didn't fit.

Barbour – Concerned with the aspect of no public review for these ministerial projects. It's important we get these ODS right for that reason. This will be the legacy for the future in terms of appearance of the City.

Mizutani – prescriptive limits should be considered. Want staff (and Commission?) to look at examples from other cities. It is a process, so want to get it right (limited comment). "Heritage to preserve" some have levelled historic homes (not necessarily in Concord) and built modern, important to find a balance.

Barbour – Thanked staff, noted how much work of staff goes on behind the scenes.

Mayor Aliano – Appreciated the conversation. Wants to keep local control. Communicating with the architects, hearing the communication, experiences was helpful. Listening to the "Menu" concept was interesting. Wants to continue the discussion of what is the balance, will be relying on the PC/DRB to give their comments and shape the project and standards.

Shelby – Infill situations make strict application of standards difficult at times, but balance is needed; don't want to turn off applicants to not use them and thus not develop within the City. Hard to create standards for non-standard environment. Will not be able to address every situation. Affordability – standards should not drive prices higher; can we do something with affordability in mind.

Moore – Progress is often difficult. This movement is a tough situation for developers, seems as though it may stifle creativity for architects. Keep in mind costs. Façade breaks cost money – need to walk the line and balance. He cautioned be careful about prescribing style; let professionals do their job. Will be walking a tight line between affordability and good design. In listening to the conversation, one approach may be to set a standard for X% of homes in subdivision need to be single story, particularly when infill parcel backing to existing residential.

McGallian – affordable by design is good approach, likes concept of setting percentage of single story for infill. Chestnut Subdivision is a good example of a project that provided context to neighbourhood. If in downtown, near BART, there won't be much we can do, want to be clear what we can and can't control. Massing is important; active sidewalks is important and good for Economic Development. Promote certain standards, such as Trees, but need standards for distance to sidewalks to ensure pedestrians on sidewalks can get by. Want bikeable community.

Shelby – Can we direct development by having easier standards on sites that we want to move or promote in certain areas?

Barbour – Spread diversity of product out through neighborhoods, not Crystal Ranch.



**Objective Design Standards Project**  
**August 29, 2022**  
**Draft Summary Minutes**

**ODS Joint Special Meeting #2 – (Planning Commission, Design Review Board)**

August 29, 2022, 6:30 pm. – Permit Center Conference Room

**DRAFT Summary Minutes**

Staff in attendance: Tom Capriola, Joan Ryan, Ryan Lenhardt

Consultant: Mukul Malhotra, Principal, MIG, Christine Thomson, Senior Project Manager

Public: None in attendance

**Pledge** – Chair Shelby led the pledge.

**Roll call** - All members on agenda in attendance (Chair Shelby, Vice-Chair Moore, Ms. Alaksa, Mr. Barbour, Jill Finn (Excused); and PC: Mr. Mizutani, Mr. Mercurio, and Mr. Laub.

**Joint Study Session** - Joan Ryan, project manager for the ODS project provided a brief introduction, thanked all for their attendance, indicated the primary purpose of the evening was to gain consensus as to the framework or outline for the document. She also passed around some document examples (also linked to staff report) from other cities providing Objective Design Standards from Walnut Creek, Dublin, Gilroy and State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for the group to peruse during the meeting. She then led the introductions of staff, consultants and PC/DRB members around the room. She then handed it off to Mukul Mulhotra, Principal at MIG, to start the presentation. He provided a few introductory statements.

Ms. Thomson provided the presentation – the powerpoint was provided to participants in advance of the meeting and the project team engaged the PC/DRB group at three stopping points during the presentation. The project team engaged the group in a discussion of a variety of photos of single family and multi-family projects.

Discussion

- John-Want to continue to be aware of new concepts; for example, alternate modes of transportation.
- Kirk-How are we going to ensure the standards promote affordability, need to be aware of resulting costs of standards that are put in place.
- Jason-There are other contributors and issues that impact affordability including rising interest rates, for example.
- Kirk-Just because something is less expensive to build does not mean builder will sell at a lower cost, sometimes it will just mean higher profits; the market will drive sales prices.
- Craig- Purpose- would like to respond in terms of massing, affordability and addressing requirements for single story homes in certain contexts.

- In 60s-70s in Concord, 90% of the product was single story, single family homes and it was affordable, now the younger generation with jobs cannot find affordable housing for purchase, sometimes even for rent.
- Kirk – Corridors within the City can be very different.
- Ray-Sometimes the same street can change quite a bit as it goes through the City. Standard may not be similar.
- Ray-for subdivisions with corner lots onto busier streets, may want a particular standard in terms of placement of the house or even massing.
- Kirk – provide lots of work for single family residential clients, there needs to be special dispensation for affordability and recognition of how to keep things affordable.
- Staff member Tom Capriola reminded the group that there will still be another lane available, whereby developers may go through the discretionary Design and Site Review application process, which may be a lengthier process, but that will still be available to them.
- Mukul – noted to affordability that in certain situations, side or rear facades may not be important depending on context to other buildings (existing or proposed). (*Example, side elevations at Wisteria Subdivision across from Safeway on Willow Pass.*)
- Kirk- with regard to building types, a multi-family building even in same zoning can be very different for example the Renaissance vs. the Carleton Senior building on Broadway which is more simple.
- Kirk reference “A Field Guide to American Homes” as a good example of looking at styles and what elements make up the various styles.
- Joan- noted that for this project we are trying to remain style agnostic, leaving flexibility for architectural styles, other than for the downtown which already has its guidelines.
- Some concern was voiced as to providing standards that do not become outdated.
- Joan noted that staff regularly updates the policy documents as time evolves with regular development code updates and provided the example of recently updating the Downtown Guidelines twice, so the ODS may need to be and probably will be updated over time.
- Also want to take into account the interface between two areas where you have different types of uses, for example duplexes and multi-family or single family single story residential and a more dense product.

#### Photo example discussion – Walnut Ave. Neighborhood

- Single story- what makes it attractive? vertical prominent entry, roof design is interesting, colors earthtone; what makes it not attractive? Solar panels prominent on the corner. Discussion of consideration of potential standards for corner properties, particularly on main road.
- May want to consider mandatory vs. advisory standards or implementing a menu option whereby you are required to do 5 of 10 items for example.

#### Photo example discussion – La Vista project

- Single story, small lot- what makes it attractive? Articulation, use of colors/materials.
- What make is not attractive? Buildings too close, do not account for proximity of windows/privacy.

-Ray-objective standard for placement with respect to site layout should be considered, with respect to corners and which street to front onto. *Also may consider lot width and single story.*

Photo example discussion – wall fronting onto corner

- Most felt should be some minimal requirement for landscaping hedge to screen masonry wall; indicated attractive example of landscaped wall at Treat and Cowell Road (NW corner).

Photo example discussion – Renaissance, Park Central (Legacy) and the Grant

- What's working on these examples? Windows, window placement, relief, roof mass.
- Mukul noted a roof may not be as important visually at 5 stories, simply because it is not visible to most.
- No blank facades (regulate)
- Garage doors should be enhanced if greater than X% of façade.
- No more than X ft. of wall area with no fenestration.
- 2 tracks needs to be shown within the document; clearly explain in introduction the process and options.
- Kirk – scale, massing, composition are important.
- Some don't have massing but have good detailing and are still attractive projects; for example the Grant.

On corners should identify primary façade/secondary façade.

- Need to give direction on landscape setback areas. Provided example of Hidden Glen Subdivision (old Elks Lodge) on Willow Pass Road. The project has a very attractive landscape and wall design that provides interest with an adequate landscaped setback. Need to provide guidance particularly on main corridors like WPR.
- Kirk – early review is important, to be able to review projects early is best, sometimes applicants come in and are already committed to one design with 92 sheets. DRB is very open to seeing projects early on.
- Joan – noted that the City does have a Preliminary Application process, but often applicants do not want to take advantage of that (Conceptual Design Review) because they are timeline driven and think this will slow them down, but often those who go through Conceptual have a quicker process, because they have less return meetings to the Board.
- Kirk – encouraged “testing” projects to see how the ODS standards we come up with are working.
- Joan noted this is something staff did when the Development Code was being prepared, which was helpful to the process.

Meeting concluded at 8:30 pm.



## **TITLE: Multiple Family Residential Objective Design Standards**

### **PART I: INTRODUCTION**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

- a. Focus on three elements (1) good design, (2) affordability, (3) housing production
- b. Other considerations, such as sustainability?

### **PART II: STANDARDS**

#### **II. OVERARCHING OBJECTIVE DESIGN STANDARDS**

- a. Site Plan
- b. Architectural/Building Design
- c. Landscape Design
- d. Details

#### **III. DOWNTOWN STANDARDS**

- a. Site Plan
  - i. Site Planning and Orientation
  - ii. Parking
- b. Architectural/Building Design
  - i. Massing and Articulation
  - ii. [Architectural Style](#)
  - iii. Roof Treatments (SCSP, p. 80)
  - iv. [Mixed-use Buildings with Ground Floor Retail/Commercial Use \(SCSP, p. 80\)](#)
  - v. Windows and Doors (SCSP, p. 80)
  - vi. Materials (SCSP, p. 80)
  - vii. Colors
- c. Landscape Design
- d. Details

#### **IV. CORRIDOR STANDARDS**

- a. Site Plan
- b. Architectural/Building Design
- c. Landscape Design
- d. Details

#### **V. NEIGHBORHOOD STANDARDS**

- a. Site Plan
  - i. Site Planning and Orientation
  - ii. Parking
- b. Architectural/Building Design
  - i. Massing and Articulation
  - ii. Roof Treatments
  - iii. Windows and Doors
  - iv. [Detailing](#)
  - v. Materials
  - vi. Colors
- c. Landscape Design
- d. Details

#### **VI. SPECIAL CASE (INFILL) STANDARDS**

- a. Site Plan
- b. Architectural/Building Design
- c. Landscape Design
- d. Details

### **PART III: APPENDIX**

#### **VII. Appendix**

**TITLE: Multiple Family Residential Objective Design Standards**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

- a. Focus on three elements (1) good design, (2) affordability, (3) housing production
- b. Other considerations, such as sustainability?

**II. OVERARCHING OBJECTIVE DESIGN STANDARDS**

- a. Site Plan
- b. Architectural/Building Design
- c. Landscape Design
- d. Details

**III. DOWNTOWN STANDARDS (Generalize Unique Features)**

- a. Site Plan

- i. Site Planning and Orientation (DCDG, p. 25)

Setback

- 1. Buildings adjacent to a street with ground floor non-residential uses shall have front entry features oriented to the primary street and zero-foot setback. **[GRAPHIC: Section]**
- 2. If buildings are adjacent to a residential street with residential entrances at the ground floor, buildings shall be setback a minimum of ten feet from the property line (existing Design Guidelines propose a minimum four-foot setback). **[GRAPHIC: Section]**

Setbacks are specified per the City Zoning Code (Development standard Table: 18.45.030 - potential update).

- 3. Steps, stoops, porches, patios, and terraces shall be allowed in the building setback zone.

Steps, stoops, porches, patios, and terraces in the building setback zone are specified per the City Zoning Code (Development Standard Table 18.150.140 - potential update).

Entry Location

- 4. Shared entries for larger residential buildings shall be through a prominent entry lobby or courtyard facing the street.
- 5. Buildings that are not adjacent to a street shall have front entries that are oriented to interior common areas such as paseos, courtyards, and useable open space.

Elevated Entries

- 6. Buildings with residential units at ground level shall have their ground floor elevated a minimum of 18 inches above the street level provided that local accessibility codes are met (Best practice suggests providing privacy from street through other design elements (landscape, setback, etc.) no elevation change for to prioritize active use and accessibility).

Entry Connectivity

7. Direct pedestrian access shall be provided between the public sidewalk and primary building entry.
8. Direct pedestrian access shall be provided between any back of house retail entry and the public sidewalk and between mid-block courtyard space and surface parking. **[GRAPHIC: Plan]**

ii. Parking (DCDG, p. 25)

Parking Location

1. Parking shall be located either in an underground or in a parking structure with garage entrances located in alleys or side streets. Active uses and storefronts shall be located along primary street frontages.
2. If surface parking is unavoidable, parking shall be located in surface lots at the rear of the building that can be accessed from the rear of the property.
3. Parking located between a building and a pedestrian route to the BART station is prohibited.

Parking Efficiency

4. Parking entries shall be consolidated in both multi-unit residential buildings and in mixed-use developments. In shared ramp conditions, secure access for residential parking shall be provided.

Parking Screening (not a focus in DCDS – see CDG)

b. Architectural/Building Design

i. Massing and Articulation (DCDG, p. 26)

Building Mass

1. Building shall be massed to at an interval of XX feet (such as 25, 50, 75, 100-feet) to related to the typical 50-foot-wide parcel width (**Best practice: indicate an interval of 25 feet relative to a 50-foot typical lot size to reduce building mass**). **[GRAPHIC: Block Axon]**
2. Where buildings occupy more than XX percent of a block, the building mass shall be relieved using a mid-block courtyard space (**Best practice: possibly 75 percent of a block to reduce building mass**).

Step Back

3. Above the first floor, building floors shall be stepped back from the first-floor building plane a **minimum of eight** and a **maximum of 10 feet** from the required setback line.
4. Intrusion into the step-back plane up to the allowable maximum allowed height is allowed for up to XX percent of the building massing (**Best practice: up to 25 percent of the building massing**).

Building Wall Variety

5. All building walls facing a street or public open space shall be articulated for at least XX percent of each wall length. All other building walls shall be articulated for at least XX percent of each façade length (**Best practice: 80 percent of wall length facing public street or open space, 60 percent other walls façade length – consider flexibility, affordability**).
6. The massing of building walls shall be broken up using a combination of at least three of the following approaches:
  - a. Identification of three design strategies for base, middle and top
  - b. Changes in wall plane of a **minimum of four feet and a maximum of eight feet**
  - c. Use of recessed and/or protruding window openings and entrances and similar relief
  - d. Balconies
  - e. Trims, projections, and reveals along different levels of wall surfaces Use of at least two distinct materials and colors along wall surfaces
  - f. Vertical pilasters that reflect internal building structure and/or are integral to the selected architectural style **[GRAPHIC: Photo]**

#### Wall Depth

7. Building elements such as entrances, bay windows, and balconies shall project at **least two feet but no more than three feet** and balconies shall have a **minimum depth of four feet**.
8. Building details such as cornices, bases and tops of columns, and arches that project at least XX inches and on the first floor and a minimum of XX inches on upper floors. (**Best practices: set two inches on lower floors and minimum of six inches on upper floors**).

#### ii. Architectural Style

1. No architectural style is preferred or required.
2. *NOTE: Subjective section on Scale and Proportion (subjective – omit?) (DC DG, p. 27) and styles specified include: Spanish Colonial Revival style and Mediterranean Revival style*

#### iii. Roof treatments (DCDG, p. 38)

##### Roof Form Variety (Street Block)

1. A variety of roof forms and designs along a street block shall be used to create visual interest at the top of multiple adjacent buildings.
2. Roof lines shall be vertically articulated along the street frontage using at least one of the following architectural elements:
  - a. varying roof form
  - b. varying roof height/level changes
  - c. eave overhang with exposed rafters
  - d. parapets

- e. saddles
- f. gables
- g. hip and valleys
- h. dormers
- i. shed

#### Roof Form Depth and Detail

- 3. Contemporary roof styles can include lower-sloped roofs with deeper overhangs of between XX and XX feet (**Best practice: between two and three feet**).
- 4. Flat roofs that shall include a minimum of XX of the following details (Best practice: include a minimum of two):
  - a. profiled caps
  - b. cornice edges
  - c. parapet

#### Roof Integration

- 5. Roof-mounted mechanical units shall be integrated into the design using one of the following approaches:
    - a. increased slope
    - b. screening
  - 6. Mechanical equipment shall not be visible when measured from the sidewalk on either side of the adjacent streets or from occupiable rooftops at XX feet above the grade of the horizontal surface (Best practice: identify measurements point, such as six feet above).
  - 7. Gutters and other means to collect rainwater from roof runoff shall be integrated into roofing design using a minimum of two approaches:
    - a. colors
    - b. material
    - c. shape
  - 8. Roof-mounted lights are prohibited.
  - 9. Rooftop gardens that occupy a minimum of XX percent of the usable rooftop areas shall be provided (**Best practice: set a five percent or other proportion minimum relative to the size of the rooftop**).
  - 10. Intensive and extensive green roofs shall be explored (incorporated? DCSP p. 94) for all rooftops. (see Sustainable Design) (**Best practice: require inclusion if appropriate – consider impacts to design flexibility, costs, or other concerns**).
  - 11. Integrating photovoltaic panels shall be explored (incorporated?) (**Best practice: require inclusion if appropriate – consider impacts to design flexibility, costs, or other concerns**).
- iv. Mixed Use Buildings with Ground-Floor Retail/Commercial Use (DCDG p. 35)

#### Commercial Setback



1. Ground floor retail space shall be setback a minimum of ten feet to provide for outdoor seating opportunities (existing Design Guidelines propose a minimum of **two feet and a maximum of five feet setback** to accommodate outdoor seating).

Setbacks are specified per the City Zoning Code (Development standard Table: 18.45 - potential update). Steps, stoops, porches, patios, and terraces in the building setback zone are specified per the City Zoning Code (Development Standard Table 18.15 - potential update).

#### Taller First Floor

2. Floor-to-ceiling heights of ground-floor commercial spaces shall be a minimum of XX and a maximum of XX feet (**Best practice: minimum of 16 feet minimum and a maximum of 24 feet**).

#### At-grade Entry

3. Ground-floor entrances for commercial uses shall be designed to be level with the elevation of the adjacent public sidewalk or at least not more than two feet above the immediately adjacent sidewalk grade.
4. For tenants over XX gross square feet, entries shall occur at a minimum of every XX feet (**Best practice: apply to tenants over 20,000 gross square feet and a minimum of 50 feet between entries**).

#### Commercial Wall Variety

5. Ground-floor commercial uses shall be visually distinct from the rest of the building façade, using a minimum of two of the following approaches:
  - a. change in materials
  - b. changes in color
  - c. canopies and awnings
6. Building walls that face a street shall include human scaled detailing through the use of at least two of the following approaches:
  - a. reveals
  - b. belt courses
  - c. cornices
  - d. expression of structural or architectural bays
  - e. recessed windows or doors
  - f. material or materials module changes
  - g. color and/or texture differences
  - h. strongly expressed mullions
  - i. awnings
  - j. arcades
  - k. porticos
7. The street level building front shall consist of at least XX percent clear vision glass where retail or other community-oriented uses are planned; Heavier tinted, mirrored, or reflective glass shall be prohibited (**Best practice likely to indicate 60 percent clear vision glass**).

8. The integration of pedestrian archways and trellises shall be considered (included?) for the purpose of creating a shaded pedestrian way along the front of the first floor.

#### Commercial Wall Elements

9. A wide band above the first floor of at least XX feet shall be integrated into the commercial front wall (Best practice: set a minimum dimension, possibly four feet).
10. Any street level facade where retail, recreational, or civic uses are planned shall consist of at least XX percent window area. Tint lower than XX percent visible light transmission (VLT), mirrored, or reflective glass shall be prohibited (Best practice: 60 percent window area; 70 percent visible light transmission).

#### Signage and Image

11. The street level shall include signage using a minimum of two sign types (Best practice: with residential development, residential mixed use as focus, limit inclusion in ODS and potentially cite for further guidance):
  - a. Edge signage
  - b. Awning signage
  - c. Blade signage
  - d. Wall signage
  - e. Window signage
  - f. Window display

#### v. Windows and doors

##### Window Alignment

1. On the side elevations of building where the side faces and is within XX feet of a residential use on an adjacent property, windows shall be placed to avoid direct lines of site into windows on the adjacent property. Exceptions are allowed where the windows on the proposed development are opaque or otherwise treated to obscure views. (Best practice: 40 feet in neighborhood area, but downtown may require a smaller distance)

##### Window Detail

2. Detailing windows shall include at least one of the following approaches:
  - a. recessed to contrast with wall surface
  - b. grided ironwork
  - c. frame around windows and lintels
3. Weather protection shall be provided at individual residential unit entries and primary entrances to commercial uses in the form of overhangs, awnings, porch roofs, or similar projection and that are of the same materials and colors as the building's architectural design.

vi. MaterialsMaterial Change

1. Material transitions along any façade shall only occur on the inside corner of plane change. When material changes need to happen in the same plane, trims, cornices, or other architectural elements shall be used to create a corner for material transition.

Material Variety

2. For buildings taller than XX stories, the use of stucco shall be limited to a maximum of XX percent of any façade that faces a street or open space (Best practice: set a maximum number of stories and maximum coverage area, such as a maximum of two stories limited to a maximum of 60 percent of any facade).
3. For buildings taller than XX stories, unbroken multi-story sections of the same material, texture, or color shall not be used for more than XX feet of façade length and more than XX of the number of floors in height (Best practice: set a qualifying number of stories, such as buildings taller than 3 stories, a maximum of 65 feet of façade length and two thirds the number of floors). **[GRAPHIC: Skin Axon]**
4. At least two materials shall be used on any building facade, in addition to glazing and railings. Any one material must comprise at least XX percent of any building facade, excluding windows and railings (Best practice 20 percent minimum for any façade).

Material Palette (Table recommended – combine primary, secondary, prohibited)

5. The following materials are permitted for exterior façades:
  - a. Finished wood, wood veneer, engineered wood, and wood siding
  - b. Stucco
  - c. Stone Masonry or Cast Stone
  - d. Brick
  - e. Clay tiles
  - j. Fiber-reinforced cement siding and panels
  - k. Exterior Insulation Finishing System (EIFS)
  - l. Metal – residential with a commercial first floor only
  - m. Canvas – awnings only
  - n. Glass (transparent, spandrel) – ground-floor only
6. The following materials are prohibited exterior façade materials:
  - o. Vinyl siding
  - p. Plywood
  - q. Plastic or vinyl fencing
  - r. Chain link fencing

Façade Type/Material? Prohibition

7. Buildings with false facades or false fronts, exclusive of parapets used to shield rooftop equipment, are prohibited.

vii. Color (and Materials)Color Range

1. An earth-tone color palette shall be required for all structures (see definitions, e.g. RGB code of 964B00).

Color Variety

2. Buildings shall utilize a minimum of XX colors on all facades, inclusive of trim. Changes in color due to a change in building material are not considered an additional color (Best practice: a minimum of two colors).
3. The number of colors appearing on the entire building exterior shall be limited to a maximum of four color (or four tones of the same color), including trim and accent colors (Best practice: a maximum of four colors).

Difficult Color/Material - Glass/Florescent

4. Large expanses of glass and highly reflective materials are prohibited except on the ground-floor for commercial spaces.
5. The use of fluorescent or neon colors is prohibited.

## e. Landscape Design

i. Landscape EnhancementsInclude Planted/Softer Material

1. Landscaping shall be required for all qualifying projects.  
Open space/Unit is specified per the City Zoning Code (Development standard Table: 18.45.030 - potential update).
2. Incorporate at least two of the following methods to include landscaping:
  - a. Potted plants
  - b. Hanging baskets under a roof overhang
  - c. Landscaped public space
  - d. Green walls
  - e. Planter boxes as a streetscape element
3. Pavers and concrete alternatives shall be required for a minimum of XX percent of the hard surface of the project. (Best practice: include 5 percent minimum relative to overall paving and concrete).

Include Active/Passive Recreation Areas

4. Incorporate a minimum of XX passive and XX active recreation areas from the following list (Best practice: require inclusion of 1 active; 1 passive):
  - a. Bocce ball

# ADJUSTED SCHEDULE – September 2022

