

# DESIGN REVIEW ISSUES OUTLINE

*Del Mar Ad Hoc Development Review Board Citizens' Advisory Committee*

*Updated with red dot letters up to 11/3/15 and public testimony up to 10/22/2015*

---

**DRAFT** for review by Ad Hoc Committee at 12/1/2015

## **Contents**

<b>1. DRB PROCEDURES &amp; PRACTICES</b> .....	2
1.1. Is the Process Fair and Open?.....	2
1.2. Issues with DRB Hearings.....	3
1.3. Expectations of DRB as Decision Makers .....	3
<b>2. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PROGRAM</b> .....	4
2.1. Overall CPP Issues .....	4
2.2. CPP Process Issues .....	4
<b>3. DESIGN REVIEW ORDINANCE</b> .....	5
3.1. The Role of the Design Review Board.....	5
3.2. Applicant and Neighbor Expectations.....	5
3.3. Sections of DRO Requiring Standards of Reasonableness/Interpretive Guidelines .....	6
3.4. Does the DRO Require New Regulatory Sections? .....	6
3.5. Does the DRO Require Any New or Revised Definitions?.....	7
3.6. Problems with Applying the Design Review Ordinance.....	7
<b>4. RELATED ORDINANCES: TREES, VIEWS &amp; GRADING</b> .....	7
4.1. Trees / Urban Forest .....	7
4.2. Land Conservation.....	7
4.3. Trees, Scenic Views, and Sunlight .....	8
<b>5. THE ZONING CODE</b> .....	8
5.1. Design Standards by Zone.....	8
5.2. Accessory buildings.....	8
5.3. Setbacks .....	8
5.4. Basements.....	8
5.5. Partially Enclosed Outdoor Covered Areas.....	9
5.6. Building Height .....	9
5.7. Non-Conformities .....	9
<b>USEFUL LINKS RELATED TO DESIGN REVIEW</b> .....	9

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony
<b>1. DRB PROCEDURES &amp; PRACTICES</b>	
<b>1.1. Is the Process Fair and Open?</b>	
1.1.1. Community rights versus applicants' rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Kinney, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 11/2/15</li> <li>&gt; Dominy, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
1.1.2. Subjectivity/Predictability/Objectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15 &amp; 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Baum, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Fisher, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Church, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
1.1.3. Neighborhood acrimony as a result of DRB process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Baum, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> </ul>
1.1.4. Notifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Myers, 7/31/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
1.1.5. Adequacy of review time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Myers, 7/31/15</li> </ul>
1.1.6. Access to project information (website, on-site, planning department counter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Myers, 7/31/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
1.1.7. Transparency and accuracy of project information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Myers, 7/31/15</li> </ul>
1.1.8. Is information made available in a timeframe and a manner that allows the general public and DRB members to understand the projects that are proposed? (Examples: 3-D computer or physical modeling, streetscape rendering, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Fisher, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Dominy, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Church, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
1.1.9. Need for educational material/brochures/web page explaining how DRB process works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McGowan, 11/11/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 11/2/15</li> </ul>
1.1.10. Ground rules for communication amongst parties involved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Fisher, 10/6/15</li> </ul>

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony
1.1.11. Cost of regulatory approvals / How much time it takes to go through the DRB process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15 &amp; 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 11/2/15</li> <li>&gt; Peto, 10/29/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas, 11/3/15</li> </ul>
1.1.12. Scope of the ADR (administrative review) process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> </ul>
1.1.13. Post-DRB compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
1.1.14. DRB Ombudsman / Mentors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
1.1.15. Serial applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
<b>1.2. Issues with DRB Hearings</b>	
1.2.1. Is the hearing process structured to maximize public participation? Example: rebuttal time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Eskeland, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
1.2.2. Is the process structured so DRB members have an adequate opportunity to make a thorough analysis of a project? For example, should there be limits on number of projects per each DRB agenda/meeting or strict time limits on meeting length?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
1.2.3. Practice of DRB project continuances versus denials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McDonald, 10/20/15</li> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
1.2.4. Limitations on public testimony at DRB hearings by proximity of residence to project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15 &amp; 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> </ul>
1.2.5. The decision-making process during the hearing (e.g., designing on the fly, responding to project modifications, timing for project modifications)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> </ul>
1.2.6. Discussions/judgments focused on application of DROs and not extraneous factors (e.g., having applicable DRO on screen during DRB discussion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 11/2/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> </ul>
<b>1.3. Expectations of DRB as Decision Makers</b>	
1.3.1. Professional qualifications of members and composition of the DRB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Baum, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Kinney, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 11/2/15</li> <li>&gt; Church, 10/6/15</li> </ul>

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony
1.3.2. Educational/training requirements for DRB members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 11/2/15</li> <li>&gt; Fisher, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
1.3.3. Division of labor between staff and the DRB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15</li> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
1.3.4. Attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
1.3.5. Site Visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
1.3.6. Availability of DRB members to neighbors & applicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> </ul>
1.3.7. Role of the DRB Chair in controlling the meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> </ul>
1.3.8. Role of the Ex-Officio member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15 &amp; 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fisher, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Church, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
1.3.9. Terms / term limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> </ul>
1.3.10. Practice of disclosures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
<b>2. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PROGRAM</b>	
<b>2.1. Overall CPP Issues</b>	
2.1.1. Is the CPP effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
2.1.2. Benefits of CPP compared to alternatives such as conceptual design review / two-step process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15 &amp; 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
<b>2.2. CPP Process Issues</b>	
2.2.1. Does the CPP process cover enough projects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> </ul>

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony
2.2.2. Need for uniform conduct of Citizen Participation Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
2.2.3. What parties (required/expected) should participate in the CPP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McGowan, 11/11/15</li> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15</li> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> </ul>
2.2.4. Imbalance of expertise between neighbors and applicants/representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McGowan, 11/11/15</li> </ul>
2.2.5. Pre-CPP meeting with affected neighbors including walkover of neighbor's lot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15</li> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
2.2.6. Should story poles be required at the CPP stage of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McGowan, 11/11/15</li> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
2.2.7. How to communicate project information to neighbors not attending CPP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
2.2.8. Soliciting consent of neighbors to project plans at CPP stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McGowan, 11/11/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
2.2.9. Communicating neighbors' concerns to Planning Department and the DRB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
2.2.10. Does the information made available at the CPP meetings allow the general public to fully understand the projects that are proposed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> </ul>
2.2.11. Projects that require additional CPP hearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
2.2.12. Tracking and reporting on project changes post-CPP meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
<b>3. DESIGN REVIEW ORDINANCE</b>	
<b>3.1. The Role of the Design Review Board</b>	
3.1.1. Arbiter, judge, or critic?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15 &amp; 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 11/2/15</li> <li>&gt; Peto, 10/29/15</li> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Fisher, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Church, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
<b>3.2. Applicant and Neighbor Expectations</b>	
3.2.1. Relationship of the DRO to the Community Plan and Zoning Codes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> <li>&gt; Church, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.2.2. How applicants and neighbors view those relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> </ul>

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony
<b>3.3. Sections of DRO Requiring Standards of Reasonableness/Interpretive Guidelines</b>	
3.3.1. View obstruction (private views)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Pavelko, 10/30/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Eskeland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/5 &amp; 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 11/2/15</li> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.3.2. View obstruction (public views)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
3.3.3. Massing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.3.4. Non-FAR elements that add bulk & mass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.3.5. Visual impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.3.6. Impervious lot coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> </ul>
3.3.7. Removal of established landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
3.3.8. Relationship to neighborhood ( examples: noise, landscaping, odors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Havaland, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Furgatch, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Fisher, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Church, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.3.9. Privacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> <li>&gt; Fried, 11/2/15</li> </ul>
3.3.10. Up-slope (hillside) lots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.3.11. Corner lots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
<b>3.4. Does the DRO Require New Regulatory Sections?</b>	
3.4.1. What issues require standards of reasonableness and/or interpretive guidelines for the DRO?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McDonald, 10/20/15</li> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15</li> </ul>
3.4.2. Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McDonald, 10/20/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
3.4.2.1. Water conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
3.4.2.2. Energy efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
3.4.2.3. Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> </ul>

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony
3.4.3. Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McDonald, 10/20/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
<b>3.5. Does the DRO Require Any New or Revised Definitions?</b>	
3.5.1. “Articulation”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
3.5.2. “Unreasonable”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.5.3. “Neighborhood”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
3.5.4. “Bedroom”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Haviland, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
<b>3.6. Problems with Applying the Design Review Ordinance</b>	
3.6.1. Grading, hillside integration, retaining walls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.6.2. Protection of native and drought tolerant landscaping and natural landforms (i.e. sandstone outcrops)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Bekkar, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
3.6.3. Balancing design elements that add visual interest, such as articulation, with design elements that add excessive height and massing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
3.6.4. Homes with mass and height that are out of scale with and do not blend into the natural hillside setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
3.6.5. Visual impact and privacy concerns with roof-top decks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
3.6.6. Landscape design that emphasizes hardscape in the front setback area and contains elements that are not complementary to the neighborhood streetscape.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
<b>4. RELATED ORDINANCES: TREES, VIEWS &amp; GRADING</b>	
<b>4.1. Trees / Urban Forest</b>	
4.1.1. Efficacy of existing tree ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15</li> </ul>
4.1.2. Removal of protected trees outside the Design Review process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
4.1.3. Protected trees that impact views.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
4.1.4. Conditioning projects with replacement trees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
4.1.5. Preservation of the urban forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>
<b>4.2. Land Conservation</b>	
4.2.1. Landform modification versus preservation of neighborhood character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> </ul>
4.2.2. Is information made available in a timeframe and a manner that allows the general public to understand the impacts of substantial changes in grade on adjacent projects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> </ul>

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony
<b>4.3. Trees, Scenic Views, and Sunlight</b>	
4.3.1. Cost to neighbor to enforce violations of ordinance	>
4.3.2. Incentives for neighbors to block views	>
4.3.3. Consistency with DRO	>
<b>5. THE ZONING CODE</b>	
<b>5.1. Design Standards by Zone</b>	
5.1.1. Lack of a planning tool that allows design review standards to be implemented by neighborhood or zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Fisher, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Dominy, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
5.1.2. In the Floodplain Overlay Zone, balancing flood plain requirements with neighborhood compatibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 9/15/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Fisher, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Dominy, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
<b>5.2. Accessory buildings</b>	
5.2.1. Use of accessory buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McDonald, 10/20/15</li> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
<b>5.3. Setbacks</b>	
5.3.1. Light wells	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
5.3.2. Setback encroachments (examples - bay windows, chimneys)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15</li> <li>&gt; Scott, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
5.3.3. Hardscape	>
<b>5.4. Basements</b>	
5.4.1. Minimizing visual impact of below-ground basements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Wilson, 11/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Dominy, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
5.4.2. Minimizing visual impact of partially-exempt basements/garages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Countryman, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Dominy, 10/6/15</li> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/6/15</li> </ul>
5.4.3. Should there be limitations on the size of basements and where on the lot they can be built?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McDonald, 10/20/15</li> <li>&gt; Gad, 10/21/15</li> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15</li> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Birnbaum, 10/22/15</li> </ul>
5.4.4. Adequacy of on-site parking requirements related to basements/definition of “bedroom”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; McDonald, 10/20/15</li> <li>&gt; Levine, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Michalsky, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15</li> <li>&gt; Kinney, 10/22/15</li> </ul>

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony
5.4.5. 4-foot vertical/horizontal separation rule for basements/garage	> Gad, 10/21/15 & 10/6/15
<b>5.5. Partially Enclosed Outdoor Covered Areas</b>	
5.5.1. Minimizing visual impact	> Wilson, 11/3/15
5.5.2. Should partially enclosed outdoor covered areas be restricted to a percentage of FAR or counted as floor area?	> Gad, 10/21/15 > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15
<b>5.6. Building Height</b>	
5.6.1. Bluff, Slope & Canyon Zone: application of height limit	>
<b>5.7. Non-Conformities</b>	
5.7.1. Nonconformity 50% building valuation formula	> McDonald, 10/20/15 > Scott, 10/6/15

**USEFUL LINKS RELATED TO DESIGN REVIEW**

- ✚ **City of Del Mar Community Plan:**  
<http://www.delmar.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/250>
- ✚ **All City Development Documents:** <http://www.delmar.ca.us/164/City-Development-Documents>
- ✚ **All City Development Applications & Guides:**  
<http://www.delmar.ca.us/138/Development-Applications-Guides>
- ✚ **Design Review Ordinance:** <http://www.delmar.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/1388>
- ✚ **Applicant’s Guide to Design Review:**  
<http://www.delmar.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/1037>
- ✚ **Design Review Board Checklist:**  
<http://www.delmar.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/1042>
- ✚ **Applicant’s Guide to Citizen’s Participation Program :**  
<http://www.delmar.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/52>
- ✚ **Story Pole Handout:** <http://www.delmar.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/91>