City of Del Mar
Memorandum

TO: Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: Kathleen Garcia, Planning and Community Development Director
Via Kristen M. Crane, Acting City Manager
By Matt Bator, AICP, Senior Planner

DATE: October 3, 2016

RE: Quarterly Update and Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Development Review Process Citizens’ Advisory Committee

Following its July 18, 2016 update to the City Council, the Ad Hoc Development Review Process Citizens’ Committee focused its efforts on the issues and problems related to the preservation of privacy and primary views, the control of bulk and mass, and the preservation of existing landforms and vegetation. Utilizing subcommittees to research and study the problems that typically arise within these subject areas, the full Committee is now presenting the City Council with a report (Attachment A) that: 1) identifies each of the above-cited problems; 2) explains why the problems exist; 3) recommends how the problems can be improved and/or resolved; and 4) recommends work tasks for staff and/or consultants to undertake that would result in the changes needed to address these specific problem areas of the City’s development review process.

In short, the recommended solutions and work tasks fall into three main categories for action: 1) Creation of illustrated/text Design Guidelines, 2) Zoning Code revisions, and 3) Creation of searchable development review-related databases. The Committee acknowledges that the recommendations and related implementation tasks would constitute a significant work effort and recommends that the City Council allocate budgetary resources for staffing and for the retention of a consultant to work with staff.

The Planning and Community Development Department has reviewed the Committee’s recommendations and proposed work tasks. Staff is supportive of the recommended methodologies for addressing the identified issues and problem areas. However, as a departmental work program, the recommendation of the Committee will create specific staff and budgetary needs. Preliminary estimates developed by the Planning and Community Development Department estimate that managing consultants and completing the work tasks recommended by the Committee would require approximately 1,100 hours of staff time, which represents approximately .6 FTE (Full Time Equivalent) or 60% of one staff person’s yearly effort. This would provide time for writing the Zoning Code revisions, managing a consultant for the Design Guidelines and creating the database for the desired inventories. This is beyond current staff capacity
in terms of available time. The City Council may also choose to phase some of these work tasks in order to spread the staffing load over a longer time with existing staff. It is anticipated that the majority of the Design Guideline effort would be prepared and facilitated by a consultant who has specific expertise preparing such documents. Consultant costs for the Design Guidelines are estimated to be approximately $50,000 to $75,000. If directed by the City Council, staff would solicit competitive bids from the City’s contracted “on-call” qualified consultants to refine this estimate.

This staff time would be in addition to the time estimated for the new Citizens Participation Program (CPP) that was directed by the City Council at the September 6, 2016 meeting. The estimated time for staff to administer the CPP, manage the process and attend one of the two CPP meetings is approximately 18 - 20 hours per CPP application. Design Review Permit applications have ranged between 40 and 70 applications per year, which could result in 750 to 1,300 hours of staff time. This is equivalent to .4 to .7 FTE, or 40% to 70% of a full time staff person’s yearly workload. Rather than this role being assumed by one individual for all CPP processes, it is envisioned that this would be distributed between all staff planners for the projects they are assigned. Staff will return to City Council with a recommendation for both short term and long term staffing associated with the cumulative direction, if it cannot be accommodated within current staffing.

Staff recommends that the City Council accept the Ad Hoc Development Review Process Citizens’ Advisory Committee’s report/recommendations and direct staff to develop a work program for completion of the suggested work tasks and retention of a consultant to assist in the creation of interpretive Design Guidelines, Zoning Code Amendments and a development issues database.

Attached, please find reports from the subcommittees comprised of members of the Ad Hoc Development Review Process Citizens’ Advisory Committee. These subcommittees studied the identified areas of concern: views, privacy, land conservation, and bulk and mass. We are submitting these reports and recommendations to City Council for next steps, after hearing presentations from each of the four subcommittees, reviewing and discussing their written reports, and receiving staff feedback and public testimony. We believe that the recommendations in each of the reports are on target, and that moving towards an implementation process is now in order. With that in mind, we feel that the top three priorities for next steps should be:

1) **DESIGN GUIDELINES.** Staff or a consultant should be assigned the task of preparing draft guidelines incorporating the recommendations and work product of each of the four subcommittees. These guidelines should be drafted by the same person, or team of persons, so that they are well integrated and consistent across the four topics (view protection, privacy protection, bulk and mass, and land conservation), recognizing that there is overlap in all four subject areas (e.g., views are impacted by bulk and mass, as are privacy and land conservation). The draft guidelines should contain graphic illustrations as well as text. A starting point should be the design guidelines of the 20+ relevant California cities reviewed by the subcommittees.

2) **PROPOSED CODE CHANGES.** Based on the subcommittees' work products, staff or a consultant should be assigned the task of identifying which issues are best addressed by code changes rather than design guidelines. While guidelines are needed to implement and explain existing code language, they cannot amend or change the code. Therefore, where the Ad Hoc subcommittees have identified areas that should be modified or updated, that task should be undertaken and brought back to the Council in the form of suggested code revisions. These code changes are essential in ensuring greater clarity, objectivity, and consistency. Revisions could add important definitions or new language, refresh dated information, clarify areas that are currently ambiguous, and could enact zone-specific design standards where appropriate to achieve objectives. Once enacted, these code changes would then be implemented by the relevant guidelines.

3) **DATABASE ACTIONS.** We believe that staff is in the best position to manage the important task of building a database which, over time, will become a reliable, searchable, database of all pertinent design review information. Having such a database will serve the DRB, applicants, and the community well. It could serve as a repository for important decisions, and could help bring consistency to the process, while reducing the vagaries that inevitably come from project-by-project review without historical context. In that sense, having a database will help reduce subjectivity and foster objectivity in all the DRB processes.

The first step would be to identify the relevant categories of information that should be collected in a database. Our recommendation is for records on primary viewing areas, landscaping conditions, protected views, and the like, which should be collected on all-new projects so that the City begins to establish a working database. Where practicable, review of existing files should be undertaken to add historical information to the database, but it is recognized that the ability to do this may be somewhat limited.
While we encourage the City Council to move forward with the above action steps, the Ad Hoc Committee does not believe its work is completed, and intends to continue working to identify solutions to the remaining problems identified and reported to the City Council in February and July of 2016. Committee members will also be available to work with staff and consultants in their efforts to develop design guidelines and Code-based design review standards, and to implement amendments to existing ordinances. We also believe the Ad Hoc Committee can play an important role in recommending and facilitating the public outreach efforts that will be needed for proposed changes.

In order to avoid overburdening staff with additional work tasks beyond those included herein, the Committee will defer any new recommendations until the end of the first quarter of 2017.
The City Council has received reports from the Committee in February 2016 and July 2016 outlining correctable problems with the single-family development review process in Del Mar. Subsequent to the July meeting, Council Liaisons Mosier and Worden recommended that the Committee initially narrow its focus to three specific areas of the development review process: privacy, views, and bulk and mass. The Committee has recommended a fourth area of focus—land conservation (LC)—due to testimony from the former Planning Manager and Design Review Board (DRB) members, indicating that the LC ordinance and the related Design Review Ordinances (DROs), had proven to be the most problematic area of review.

Ad Hoc Committee members have spent considerable time meeting, researching, and discussing these issues in the subcommittee groups, and as a result, have identified an overarching need that, if addressed, could effectively address and even solve many of the identified problems. First and foremost, there is a clear need for Del Mar to have Design Guidelines that will provide quantifiable standards and criteria to add clarity and detail to the DROs that are used by the DRB in its deliberations. Whether the issues are related to views, privacy, bulk and mass, or land conservation, in each case, the subcommittees recommend that a professionally developed set of Design Guidelines—with illustrations, comparative examples, and a greater level of detail—should accompany the ordinances.

Earlier this year, the Ad Hoc Committee identified the 22 California cities which had a comparable or higher median household income than Del Mar. These “peer income” cities are all extremely desirable places to live, and like Del Mar, share a strong commitment to preserve and enhance already high property values. We found, however, that many of these jurisdictions possess design review rules, policies, and Zoning Code provisions that are far more restrictive than Del Mar’s. Many also have Design Guidelines that are very explicit, and include illustrations and photographs that demonstrate what is acceptable or unacceptable in such critical areas as view blockage, excessive bulk and mass, and neighborhood incompatibility. They also often included depictions of alternative ways that projects might comply. Design Guidelines produced by municipalities vary, ranging from detailed architectural design manuals such as those used in Santa Barbara and Los Gatos, to guidelines that focus on specific areas of review such as Tiburon and Saratoga, which has recently updated its comprehensive guidelines to address sustainability issues such as permeability and water efficient landscaping. Incorporated in this memo are a few sample pages of these guidelines (on pages 10-13) to give an idea of what other jurisdictions offer. We believe that Del Mar should begin the process to develop guidelines that are appropriate for our unique city, taking into account our resources, the needs of our community and our specific design challenges.

Many design review issues vary in significance depending on the specific location within a community. Design Guidelines, however, tend to be citywide in focus. The Committee believes that there is an opportunity to more effectively achieve community goals by taking advantage of an under-utilized section in the Zoning Code titled Design Review, which is a tool for addressing neighborhood-level design issues. The Committee also believes that the Zoning Code should be amended so that it more clearly identifies the type of development that the City wants to encourage and is consistent with the Community Plan.

Given the above findings and conclusions, the Committee now requests that the Council direct staff to move forward in the process to begin the implementation of the work tasks outlined in this report.
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OVERALL PROBLEM STATEMENT
As the footprint and volume of new residential developments in Del Mar continue to increase, the private and public view corridors tend to be threatened, with negative impacts on neighborhoods and existing homes.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS
a) There are insufficient guidelines to define or illustrate how much and what kind of view blockage is unreasonable, which leads to the appearance of subjectivity and arbitrariness in the design review process.
b) There are inadequate methods for keeping track of designated primary living spaces and other aspects such as view impacts on a house from previously approved projects.
c) There is no standardized methodology to establish the degree of view blockage from a designated primary living area.
d) There are no clear guidelines to establish the impact of landscaping changes to the loss or gain of view corridors.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE VIEWS SUBCOMMITTEE
1) Create guidelines with pictorial examples of what constitutes “unreasonable view blockage” from a private residence or from a public right-of-way. Utilize existing design guideline documents from comparable cities/jurisdictions to develop effective presentations.
2) Develop and maintain a database of designated primary living spaces or pre-existing view-takings from previous development projects that have come before the DRB to memorialize the designation of determined primary living spaces and primary views.
3) Develop a standard methodology for presentation of view blockage concerns or impacts. Such methodologies could include standardized placements and field-of-view settings for photographic evidence and standardized descriptions of the contextual nature and percentage of scenic view that would be blocked.
4) Designate and memorialize through mechanisms such as covenants, view easements, landscape installation and maintenance agreements, and binding permit conditions any landscaping changes in a project that have a significant impact on the Design Review Board finding that the project does not constitute unreasonable view blockage.
5) Add view protection design review standards by zone where doing so would help achieve overall view protection goals.

WORK TASKS: VIEWS
1) Work with staff and/or consultant to develop design guidelines for assessing view impacts on private and public view corridors. Utilize suitable guidelines from jurisdictions that have strong view protection principles such as Tiburon Hillside Design Guidelines and the Rolling Hills Estates View Protection Ordinance as a starting point in the process of creating guidelines for Del Mar.
2) Work with staff and/or a consultant to design and set up a database of view-related decisions for properties that come before the DRB, agreements of which the City is notified, and establish a methodology for researching Del Mar city records in order to record historical view-related decisions to the extent feasible.
3) Work with staff to develop suitable standards for photographic or modeling methodologies in documenting potential view blockage from neighboring residences or public rights-of-way.
4) Work with staff and/or consultants to develop a formal mechanism for recording and memorializing restrictions on building or landscaping that have been conditions of project approvals.
PRIVACY SUBCOMMITTEE

OVERALL PROBLEM STATEMENT
As new residential developments seek to expand, improve views, and change the location of structures on a property, neighboring houses and outdoor spaces may lose some aspects of the privacy that they previously enjoyed. Protection of neighbor privacy becomes even more important in Del Mar with the increase in building volume, lot coverage, and preferences for expanded outdoor living/entertaining spaces.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS
a) There are no clear guidelines or examples that give guidance to distinguish between “reasonable” and “unreasonable” expectations of privacy.
b) There are no zone-specific or neighborhood-specific code provisions, Design Guidelines, or Design Review standards to help determine the nature of privacy that is reasonably expected in a given environment.
c) There are no clear guidelines or regulations regarding the use of screening elements such as fencing or landscaping that may be used and/or memorialized to mitigate privacy issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PRIVACY SUBCOMMITTEE
1. Define “privacy” in the DROs, specifically add a Section E. to 23.08.040 Definitions with a definition of “privacy.” Include impacts on privacy from visual, light, and sound intrusions, and privacy impacts as a result of distance separation between properties.
2. Define “neighborhoods” vis-à-vis impacts on privacy.
3. Privacy recommendations need to be integrated with the issues of “bulk and mass.”
4. Develop City of Del Mar Design Guidelines that are clearly illustrated with pictorial examples of what constitutes reasonable/unreasonable invasion of privacy in terms of siting and the placement of windows, decks, outdoor living areas, and other structures on a project. These illustrations can be in the form of drawings, photographs, or a combination of both, in order to make the restrictions and opportunities comprehensible for all.
5. For reasonable assurance of neighbor privacy, create specific standards based on the zone/area and neighborhood character regarding lines-of-sight, distance between structures, and other standards that will help ensure privacy. Add the element of “privacy” in considering zone-specific design guidelines, addressing the variables found in different areas of Del Mar (e.g., the beach zone, hillside neighborhoods, bluff/slope/hillside zone, etc.)
6. Create mechanisms such as covenants or easements that designate components such as landscaping or fencing that will mitigate the intrusion on neighboring residences’ privacy. Ensure that such requirements “run with the land” so that they are binding on future owners.

WORK TASKS: PRIVACY
The committee recommends that Del Mar city staff or an engaged consultant can best target their work on the following tasks:
1. The staff or a consultant could write updated definitions addressing the issues of privacy outlined above. The Ad Hoc committee has studied guidelines from more than 20 other cities and believes the development of Design Guidelines for Del Mar can be extremely valuable. The committee can identify sample guidelines from these other jurisdictions that are most adaptable for use in Del Mar. Staff and/or a consultant are then needed to prepare draft Design Guidelines for Del Mar, using these sample guidelines as a starting point: Los Altos Residential Design Guidelines, Tiburon Hillside Design Guidelines, Santa Barbara Single Family Residence Design Guidelines, and Santa Barbara Outdoor Lighting Ordinance
2. The staff or a consultant could develop zone-specific Design Review standards addressing privacy concerns.
3. The staff or a consultant could research and propose legal mechanisms such as covenants, easements, or a landscape installation and maintenance agreement to protect privacy.
OVERALL PROBLEM STATEMENT
In important ways, the goals of the Community Plan and Design Review Ordinances (DROs) to protect natural landforms are not being achieved. We are disproportionately losing natural terrain in spite of land conservation regulations.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS
A) Natural landforms are being lost in ways that are cumulatively significant to Del Mar and contrary to the goals of the Community Plan.
   1) The codes and DROs do not clearly identify what natural landforms are desirable and should be preserved, nor do they describe desirable ways to use grading, terracing, and screening techniques to better integrate development into the natural terrain.
   2) Grading and retaining walls are being used in ways that sometimes compromise natural landforms unnecessarily and create undesirable visual impacts.
   3) The Bluff Slope and Canyon Overlay Zone does a mostly credible job of landform protection in the R-1-40 zone and in limited R-1-14 areas, but does not apply in other zones.
B) The codes and DROs do not provide clear guidance on how to best use grading techniques nor do they provide clear guidance on what is encouraged and what is discouraged.
   1) Unnecessary or excessive grading or use of retaining walls sometimes occurs in anticipation of development or for other purposes.
C) Important vegetation is being lost unnecessarily incident to grading and site preparation
   1) Lots are sometimes cleared and grubbed, or subjected to exempt temporary grading, removing major vegetation (no LC or other permit required).
   2) The Land Conservation Ordinance and the city’s policies on retention and replacement of important vegetation are not well integrated with the design review process.
   3) The rules on replacement of removed vegetation are not clearly described except for protected trees, and even as to protected trees, replacement rules are not uniformly applied.
   4) The Del Mar streetscape can be adversely impacted when existing natural edges along street frontages are disturbed.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE LAND CONSERVATION SUBCOMMITTEE
1. Guidelines can be developed to:
   a. Improve identification of important landforms and vegetation.
   b. Give graphic examples of how to work around important landforms and vegetation through setbacks, slope density formulas, and other strategies.
   c. Identify and graphically present strategies for grading and use of retaining walls to minimize landform disruption.
   d. Describe and graphically present how to utilize terrace grading and development strategies to make projects more subservient to the natural landforms.
2. Code amendments can be pursued to:
   a. Ensure that major clearing and grubbing and exempt temporary grading require review.
   b. To address any differences in the rules that are appropriate zone by zone.
3. The processes for review of clearing, grubbing, grading, vegetation management, and development can be better integrated so that applicants, neighbors, and reviewers see the full picture.
   a. Processes to be integrated could include: Land Conservation review; the City’s Public Tree Policy Manual; Tree removal permits; the Trees, Scenic Views, and Sunlight Ordinance; Policies on replacement of trees and major vegetation; the city’s Storm Water rules; fire protection concerns; and Climate Action Plan and Sea Level Rise implementation. Note: The committee believes this integration task is important but beyond the scope of its charter. The committee recommends it be addressed by staff or perhaps referred to the Sustainability Advisory Board.
WORK TASKS: LAND CONSERVATION

The committee recommends that Del Mar city staff or an engaged consultant can best target their work on the following tasks:

1) The Ad Hoc committee has studied guidelines from more than 20 other cities and believes the development of Design Guidelines for Del Mar can be extremely valuable. The committee can identify sample guidelines or ordinances from these other jurisdictions that are most adaptable for use in Del Mar. Staff and/or a consultant are then needed to prepare draft Design Guidelines for Del Mar, using these sample guidelines/ordinances as a starting point: Tiburon Hillside Design Guidelines, Rolling Hills Estates - Grading in Residential Districts and the Moraga Hillside Development Permit.

2) The committee recommends that major clearing and grubbing and exempt temporary grading that have the potential to remove important vegetation be subject to review. Staff or consultant help is needed to study that issue and determine what kind of process should be created.

3) The committee recommends that the processes for review of grading, vegetation management, storm water management, fire protection, and Climate Action Plan implementation be better integrated. This task should be pursued by staff or a consultant, or perhaps referred to the Sustainability Advisory Board.

4) Consultant or staff help is needed to study and recommend how to integrate Bluff Slope and Canyon (BSC) Overlay Zone-type landform protections into zones other than the R-1-40 and the limited R-1-14 areas to which the BSC currently applies, where doing so can be useful in better preserving natural landforms. Because lots in zones other than the R-1-40 are much smaller, this task is not as simple as extending the existing BSC overlay to other zones.
OVERALL PROBLEM STATEMENT
Current development trends have led to more intensive development of residential parcels in Del Mar that is not always compatible with the size, volume, massing, scale, and bulk of homes in existing neighborhoods.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS
a) The DRO's are not reinforced by guidelines or illustrations that clearly demonstrate what constitutes unreasonable bulk and mass, which can lead to the perception that the design review process is both subjective and arbitrary.

b) The Zoning Code does not prescribe how bulk, mass, and volume should be regulated. The further the Zoning Code diverges from how the DRB applies the DROs, the more likely the design review process will be perceived as subjective and arbitrary.

c) There are very few zone-specific or neighborhood-specific design review standards that clarify for the applicant or neighbors what constitutes excessive bulk and mass relative to a project’s surroundings and environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM BULK & MASS SUBCOMMITTEE
For the DRB to fulfill its quasi-judicial function in a more consistent and objective manner, improved review standards are needed. The subcommittee has identified the following as specific areas that should be addressed through Zoning Code amendments and Design Guidelines. Design Guidelines should be developed, featuring pictorial and comparative examples of structures and siting within a neighborhood context. Visual examples clearly demonstrating what does and does not constitute excessive bulk and mass, and guidance on how bulk and mass can be best minimized, are essential.

1. BULK & MASS/ EXEMPT FLOOR AREA – The DROs and Zoning Code should be updated to provide more effective guidance on aspects of a project that may be contributing to bulk and/or mass. For example, covered porches, loggias, and decks are features that may enhance the building’s design, appearance, and function or may contribute to excessive mass, scale, and bulk.

2. RESIDENTIAL DESIGN/VOLUME – The DROs and Zoning Code should be updated to better address how second-story volume, and in some cases single-story volume, affects the streetscape and/or neighboring side and rear yards.

3. NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY – A serious effort should be made to craft a working definition of “neighborhood” for use in the DROs that can also be used to create a “checklist” for evaluating neighborhood compatibility. For an example, see City of Los Altos Neighborhood Compatibility Worksheet.

4. PROPORTION – The DROs and Zoning Code should be clarified to address how the architectural elements of a structure affect the appearance of bulk and mass to assure they are in proportion to the overall structure size.

5. CORNER LOTS & NONCONFORMING AND CONSTRAINED LOTS – The DROs and Zoning Code should be updated with specific provisions to address the overall mass of a structure on a nonconforming lot, corner lot, topographically constrained lot, or a highly visible lot at the end of a street.

6. HILLSIDE (UPSLOPE) LOTS – The DROs and Zoning Code should be updated to ensure that proposed structure(s) maintain a scale and form that blends with a hillside area by minimizing the perception of bulk and the overall height of the structure(s).
7. **SETBACKS/LOT COVERAGE RATIOS** – Setbacks should be further evaluated to determine how generally established front yard setbacks on a street can be maintained as the redevelopment of existing structures occurs. This evaluation should include how setbacks might be used to better integrate projects into their neighborhoods by addressing the appropriate setback from adjacent properties in proportion to the size and height of the new structure. Lot coverage ratios should be evaluated to determine if they are effectively regulating excess bulk and mass.

8. **SECOND- STORY DECKS** – The DROs and Zoning Code should be updated to give specific guidance on second-story decks, including when and how they are best incorporated into a project, and how wall elements, guardrails, furniture, or outdoor fireplaces/kitchens can be added without contributing to the bulk or scale of a project.

9. **RETAINING WALLS/ BASEMENT LEVEL GARAGES** – The DROs and Zoning Code should be updated to give more clear and effective guidance on how best to minimize the appearance of bulk, in relation to the use of retaining walls in designing driveways, basements, and basement level garages.

10. **RETENTION OF MATURE LANDSCAPING** - The DROs should be modified to encourage the retention of mature landscaping to partially mitigate the impacts of excessive bulk, mass, and volume.

**WORK TASKS: BULK & MASS**

Draft guidelines adapted to Del Mar need to be prepared to address the items outlined above using the guidelines from other jurisdictions as a starting point, particularly the Design Guidelines of Santa Barbara, Saratoga, and Tiburon.

The preparation of a checklist such as the Laguna Beach Residential Guidelines Checklist would be a valuable tool in encouraging compliance with the guidelines.

1. Draft Zoning Code amendments to address the concerns identified above in items 1-6, and 8-10 and to recommend zone specific Design Review standards where appropriate. These drafts can be based upon the code provisions of other cities and adapted to Del Mar, relying particularly on the Zoning Code provisions of Los Altos, Saratoga, and Santa Barbara.

2. A field survey of existing setbacks should be conducted in key areas of critical residential zones to determine how actual existing setbacks compare to Zoning Code defined setbacks is recommended. Collection of this data will allow for determining whether Zoning Code defined setbacks need to be modified.

3. The staff or a consultant could survey relevant approved DRB projects to determine how actual lot coverage ratios compare to Zoning Code defined lot coverage ratios.

4. The staff or a consultant could develop zone-specific Design Review standards addressing bulk and mass.

5. Similar to the recommendation of the Land Conservation subcommittee, we recommend an effort to better integrate the City’s rules and regulations on retention and provision of landscaping incident to the development process so that interested parties can see and understand the rules all in one place. This integration goes beyond the scope of our committee’s charter, but we believe it is important and should be taken on by staff or a consultant. The effort should include review, updating, and integration of the city’s Public Tree Policy Manual, tree protection ordinance, Trees, Scenic Views and Sunlight ordinance, the Climate Action Plan and its call for increasing the tree canopy, guidelines for replacing landscaping, fire protection needs, water and urban runoff issues.
**EXHIBIT A: DEFINITION OF IMPORTANT TERMS**

*Source: Single Family Residence Design Guidelines, City of Santa Barbara, June 2011.*

- **Bulk:** The qualitative visual perception of the composition and shape of a structure’s massing. Bulk is affected by variations in height, setbacks, and step-backs of upper stories.

- **Massing:** The qualitative arrangement of a structure’s bulk, including relative openness and solidity.

- **Proportion:** The quantitative relative sizes and dimensions of architectural elements and details, as they relate to each other and to the entire structure.

- **Scale:** The qualitative proportional relationship of a structure and its architectural elements/details to human beings.

- **Volume:** The quantitative three-dimensional measurement of a structure’s height, width, and depth combined.
EXHIBIT B: EXAMPLES FROM OTHER CITIES’ DESIGN GUIDELINES

City of Laguna Beach

Section B: Design Review Criteria
Design Articulation

Courtyards and Open Space
Courtyards, decks, terraces and other site features can be used to break up the perceived mass of a building and create spaces that provide privacy and interest.

Design Objective: Site and building design should be integrated to create areas of open space that reduce perceived building mass.

4.5 Give as much design consideration to outdoor areas as to indoor areas, considering existing development and neighboring properties.

Building Mass, Scale and Form
Residences should be designed at an appropriate scale with respect to the existing natural and built environments. The mass and scale of proposed residences must be compatible with existing development in the surrounding neighborhood (Chapter 11).

A building envelope is the three-dimensional area that defines the maximum limits to which a structure may be built on a lot without the need of a variance. Building envelopes are defined in the Municipal Code. The actual development allowed will typically be less than the maximum designated by the general standards for the zone because of site-specific conditions identified during the design review process. Additional zoning regulations, such as building site (lot) coverage, floor area ratios, and landscaped-open-space requirements, will also impact the maximum building potential.

Design Objective: Existing residential development in the vicinity of a project site should serve as a guide for appropriate building mass and scale. Excessive building mass must be avoided.

4.6 Divide a larger building mass into smaller modules.
- Provide variation in wall setbacks along all sides of the property.
- Avoid excessive numbers of roof planes.

4.7 Use building volumes efficiently.
- Consider locating some floor area below grade to reduce massing while avoiding excessive grading.
- Avoid creating large, unused under-floor area or attic space.
City of Tiburon

INDEX

GOAL 1 REDUCE EFFECTIVE BULK
1. CUT BUILDING INTO HILLSIDE
2. TERRACE BUILDING USING SLOPE
3. REDUCE EFFECTIVE MASS WITH VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL ARTICULATION
4. FOLLOW HILLSIDE CONTOURS
5. FOLLOW CONTOURS WITH HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS
6. AVOID DOWNHILL CANTILEVERS
7. AVOID LARGE RETAINING WALLS
8. USE MATERIALS TO REDUCE BULK
9. USE UNDERGROUND SPACES TO REDUCE BULK
10. AVOID SINGLE FORM SOLUTIONS

GOAL 2 REDUCE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
1. USE FORM AND MATERIALS WHICH BLEND WITH TEXTURE OF ENVIRONMENT
2. DO NOT USE LARGE EXPANSES OF SINGLE MATERIAL
3. USE NATIVE MATERIALS WHEREVER POSSIBLE
4. USE NON-REFLECTIVE MATERIALS
5. SCREEN FOUNDATIONS AND UNDERSIDES OF STRUCTURES
6. CONTROL WINDOW PLACEMENT FOR PRIVACY AND VIEW
7. USE ENERGY-SAVING FEATURES
   A. EARTH BKMS, SHAD ED WALLS
   B. PLACE WINDOWS FOR OPTIMUM UTILIZATION OF SUN
   C. SOLAR PANELS
8. MAKE THE LANDSCAPE WORK FOR YOU

GOAL 3 PRESERVE ACCESS TO VIEWS
1. LOCATE NEW STRUCTURES FOR MINIMUM INTERFERENCE
2. PLAN LANDSCAPING TO AVOID VIEW BLOCKS
   A. TREE TYPES AND PLACEMENT
   B. DO NOT BLOCK VIEWS OF DISTANT NEIGHBORS
3. PRESERVE EXISTING VIEWS
   A. SITE BUILDING AWAY FROM EXISTING STRUCTURES
   B. CUT CORNER OF BUILDING IF NECESSARY
4. DESIGN FOR QUALITY, NOT QUANTITY, OF VIEW
5. VIEW FRAMING
6. MAXIMIZE BOTH VIEW AND PRIVACY
7. AVOID PARTIAL VIEW BLOCKAGE
   A. PROTECT VIEWS IN MAJOR ROOMS
   B. FOREGROUND, MIDDleground, BACKGROUND
   C. CENTER OF VIEW
   D. DO NOT BLOCK MAJOR FEATURE OF VIEW
   E. DO NOT BLOCK SMALL VIEW
   F. MEASURE VIEW BLOCKAGE PROBLEM

TIBURON DESIGN GUIDELINES
DRAWN BY: JEAN A. ORR

NOTE: TREES AND VEGETATION DO NOT REDUCE SOUND LEVELS APPRECIABLY. TREE SCREENING IS NOT GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE FOR ACOUSTIC PURPOSES
City of Los Altos

Residential Design Guidelines

- In a diverse character neighborhood, good neighbor design has its own design integrity while incorporating some design elements and materials found in the neighborhood.

- Mitigation for items such as size and bulk may be used for some designs depending on the relationship of a home to its neighbors.

TRANSITIONAL CHARACTER NEIGHBORHOODS:

Transitional character neighborhoods are those that are in the process of changing their character and identity. Major changes include two-story additions in a one-story neighborhood, large homes in a neighborhood of small homes, and many upgraded homes in a neighborhood of older, smaller designs.

- In a transitional character neighborhood, a good neighbor design reduces the abrupt changes that result from juxtaposing radically different designs or sizes of structures; proposed projects should not set the extreme and should be designed to soften the transition. Significant deviations could be cause for mitigation.

4.2 SITE PLANNING

Integration of your home with the site is an important aspect to good design. How your home is sited on its lot in relation to your neighbors, the placement of the garage and
City of Santa Barbara

Compatibility Guidelines and Techniques

Volume: A Quantitative Measurement

The home above has significantly less measured volume than the home below.

Bulk: A Qualitative Visual Component

Although these homes have very similar square footages, the picture below may appear “bigger,” in part because of the volume’s massing.