

DESIGN REVIEW ISSUES OUTLINE

Del Mar Ad Hoc Development Review Board Citizens' Advisory Committee

Updated with red dot letters up to 12/1/2015 and public testimony up to 11/17/2015

Distributed to Ad Hoc Committee for 1/5/2016 Meeting

Contents

1. DRB PROCEDURES & PRACTICES	2
1.1. Is the Process Fair and Open?.....	2
1.2. Issues with DRB Hearings.....	5
1.3. Expectations of Design Review Board Members as Decision Makers	5
2. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PROGRAM	7
2.1. Overall CPP Issues	7
2.2. CPP Process Issues	7
3. DESIGN REVIEW ORDINANCE	8
3.1. The Role of the Design Review Board.....	8
3.2. Applicant and Neighbor Expectations.....	8
3.3. Sections of DRO Requiring Standards of Reasonableness/Interpretive Guidelines	9
3.4. Does the DRO Require New Regulatory Sections?	10
3.5. Does the DRO Require Any New or Revised Definitions?.....	11
3.6. Problems with Applying the Design Review Ordinance.....	11
4. RELATED ORDINANCES: TREES, VIEWS & GRADING	12
4.1. Trees / Urban Forest	12
4.2. Land Conservation.....	12
4.3. Trees, Scenic Views, and Sunlight	12
5. THE ZONING CODE	12
5.1. Design Standards by Zone	12
5.2. Accessory buildings.....	13
5.3. Setbacks	13
5.4. Basements	13
5.5. Partially Enclosed Outdoor Covered Areas	14
5.6. Building Height	14
5.7. Non-Conformities	14
5.8. Variances	14
USEFUL LINKS RELATED TO DESIGN REVIEW	15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
1. DRB PROCEDURES & PRACTICES	
1.1. Is the Process Fair and Open?	
<p>1.1.1. Community rights versus applicants' rights</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Dominy, 10/6/15 > Kinney, 10/22/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Fried, 11/2/15 > Grant, 11/3/15 > Pavelko, 11/3/15 > Ellis, 11/9/15 > Peck, 11/10/15 > Vafiadis, 11/16/15 > S. Scheele, 11/16/15 > B. Scheele, 11/16/15 > Ruh, 11/17/15 > Emerson, 11/17/15 > Reinick, 11/17/15 > Pavelko, 11/17/15 > Castile, 11/17/15 > Schroeder, 11/17/15 > Howard, 11/17/15 > Leeger, 11/17/15 > Wolfson, 11/17/15 > Rothnem, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > E. Wilson, 11/17/15 > T. Haviland, 11/17/15
<p>1.1.2. Subjectivity – Predictability - Objectivity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Fisher, 10/6/15 > Church, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/6/15 > Scott, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/21/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Baum, 11/3/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15 > Grimm, 11/3/15 > Grant, 11/3/15 > Pavelko, 11/3/15 > S. Scheele, 11/16/15 > B. Scheele, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Ruh, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > Stubbs, 11/17/15 > Quinn, 11/30/15 > Howard, 11/17/15 > Gad, 11/17/15 > Smith, 11/17/15 > E. Wilson, 11/17/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > B. Wilson, 11/17/15 > Prater, 11/17/15
<p>1.1.3. Neighborhood acrimony as a result of DRB process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Fried, 10/22/15 > Baum, 11/3/15 > Thomas, 11/3/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15 > Bingham, 11/3/15 > Belk, 11/3/15 > S. Scheele, 11/16/15 > B. Scheele, 11/16/15 > Ruh, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > Emerson, 11/17/15 > Watkins, 11/17/15 > Stubbs, 11/17/15 > Winn, 11/17/15 > Pavelko, 11/17/15 > Coughlin, 11/17/15 > Leeger, 11/17/15 > Rothnem, 11/17/15 > Roland, 11/17/15 > P. Posner, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > E. Wilson, 11/17/15 > K. Posner, 11/17/15
<p>1.1.4. Timeliness of Notifications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Myers, 7/31/15 > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Levine, 11/17/15
<p>1.1.5. Adequacy of review time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Myers, 7/31/15
<p>1.1.6. Access to project information (website, on-site, planning department counter)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Myers, 7/31/15 > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Levine, 11/17/15 > Sandvik, 11/17/15
<p>1.1.7. Transparency and accuracy of project information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Myers, 7/31/15 > Rang, 11/17/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
<p>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 and to allow the general public to provide timely feedback to applicants? (Examples: 3-D computer or physical modeling, streetscape rendering, etc.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Fisher, 10/6/15 > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Dominy, 10/6/15 > Church, 10/6/15 > Scott, 10/6/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Belk, 11/3/15 > Fried, 11/3/15 > Rang, 11/3/15 > Myers/Gregory, 11/16/15 > Lockwood, 11/17/15 > Emerson, 11/17/15 > Levine, 11/17/15 > Druker, 11/17/15 > Winn, 11/17/15 > Castile, 11/17/15 > Rang, 11/17/15 > Roland, 11/17/15 > Dempsey, 11/17/15 > E. Wilson, 11/17/15 > K. Posner, 11/17/15 > Sandvik, 11/17/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
<p>1.1.9. Need for educational material/brochures/web page explaining how DRB process works</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Fried, 11/2/15 > Fried, 11/3/15 > McGowan, 11/11/15 > Lockwood, 11/17/15 > Levine, 11/17/15 > Roland, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > E. Wilson, 11/17/15 > K. Posner, 11/17/15 > Quinn, 11/30/15
<p>1.1.10. Ground rules for communication amongst parties involved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Fisher, 10/6/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
<p>1.1.11. Cost of regulatory approvals / How much time it takes to go through the DRB process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Gad, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/21/15 > Fried, 10/22/15 > Peto, 10/29/15 > Fried, 11/2/15 > Thomas, 11/3/15 > Fried, 11/3/15 > Vafiadis, 11/16/15 > Howard, 11/17/15
<p>1.1.12. Scope of the ADR (administrative review) process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Myers/Gregory, 11/16/15
<p>1.1.13. Post-DRB compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Abarbanel, 11/17/15 > Myers/Gregory, 11/16/15
<p>1.1.14. DRB Ombudsman / Mentors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Stubbs, 11/17/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
1.1.15. Serial applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Levine, 10/22/15
1.2. Issues with DRB Hearings	
1.2.1. Is the hearing process structured to maximize public participation? Example: rebuttal time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > T. Haviland, 10/22/15 > S. Eskeland, 10/22/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15
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"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15
1.2.3. Practice of DRB project continuances versus denials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > McDonald, 10/20/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15
1.2.4. Limitations on public testimony at DRB hearings by proximity of residence to project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Gad, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/21/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Pavelko, 11/3/15 > Myers/Gregory, 11/16/15 > Ruh, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > Pavelko, 11/17/15
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"> > T. Haviland, 10/22/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15
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"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Fried, 11/2/15 > Thomas, 11/3/15 > Grimm, 11/3/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > Stubbs, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15
1.3. Expectations of Design Review Board Members as Decision Makers	
1.3.1. Professional qualifications of members and composition of the DRB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Church, 10/6/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Kinney, 10/22/15 > Fried, 11/2/15 > Baum, 11/3/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Handzel, 11/3/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > Levine, 11/17/15 > Druker, 11/17/15 > B. Wilson, 11/17/15
1.3.2. Educational/training requirements for DRB members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Scott, 10/6/15 > Fisher, 10/6/15 > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Fried, 11/2/15 > Grant, 11/3/15 > Fried, 11/3/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > Levine, 11/17/15 > E. Wilson, 11/17/15
1.3.3. Division of labor between staff and the DRB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Gad, 10/21/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Handzel, 11/3/15 > Levine, 11/17/15 > Leeger, 11/17/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15
1.3.4. Attendance at DRB Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >
1.3.5. Site Visits by DRB Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Levine, 10/22/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15
1.3.6. Availability of DRB Members to neighbors & applicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Wilson, 11/3/15
1.3.7. Role of the DRB Chair in controlling the meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Bingham, 11/3/15 > Belk, 11/3/15
1.3.8. Role of the Ex-Officio Member of DRB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Fisher, 10/6/15 > Church, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/21/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > Levine, 11/17/15
1.3.9. Terms / term limits for DRB Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15
1.3.10. Practice of disclosures at meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
2. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PROGRAM	
2.1. Overall CPP Issues	
2.1.1. Is the CPP effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Birnbaum, 10/22/15 > Belk, 11/3/15 > Stubbs, 11/17/15
2.1.2. Benefits of CPP compared to alternatives such as conceptual design review / two-step process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Gad, 10/6/15 > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/21/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Birnbaum, 10/22/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15 > Sandvik, 11/17/15
2.2. CPP Process Issues	
2.2.1. Does the CPP process cover enough projects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Levine, 10/22/15
2.2.2. Need for uniform conduct of Citizen Participation Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Bolker, 11/3/15 > Lockwood, 11/17/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
2.2.3. What parties (required/expected) should participate in the CPP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Gad, 10/21/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15 > McGowan, 11/11/15 > Levine, 11/17/15 > Abarbanel, 11/17/15 > Stubbs, 11/17/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15 > Pavelko, 11/17/15
2.2.4. Imbalance of expertise between neighbors and applicants/representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > McGowan, 11/11/15 > Roland, 11/17/15 > K. Posner, 11/17/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
2.2.5. Pre-CPP meeting with affected neighbors including walkover of neighbor's lot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Scott, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/21/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Bolker, 11/3/15 > Dempsey, 11/3/15
2.2.6. Should story poles be required at the CPP stage of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/21/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Wilson, 11/3/15 > McGowan, 11/11/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
2.2.7. How to communicate project information to neighbors not attending CPP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15
2.2.8. Soliciting consent of neighbors to project plans at CPP stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > McGowan, 11/11/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
2.2.9. Communicating neighbors' concerns to Planning Department and the DRB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Roland, 11/17/15
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"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
2.2.11. Projects that require additional CPP hearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Levine, 10/22/15
2.2.12. Tracking and reporting on project changes post-CPP meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15
3. DESIGN REVIEW ORDINANCE	
3.1. The Role of the Design Review Board	
3.1.1. Arbiter, judge, or critic?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Fisher, 10/6/15 > Church, 10/6/15 > Birnbaum, 10/22/15 > Peto, 10/29/15 > Fried, 11/2/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15 > Druker, 11/17/15
3.2. Applicant and Neighbor Expectations	
3.2.1. Relationship of the DRO to the Community Plan and Zoning Codes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Church, 10/6/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Keeling, 11/17/15 > Watkins, 11/17/15 > Abarbanel, 11/17/15 > Leeger, 11/17/15 > P. Posner, 11/17/15 > E. Wilson, 11/17/15 > Sandvik, 11/17/15
3.2.2. How applicants and neighbors view those relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Scott, 10/6/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15 > Vafiadis, 11/16/15 > Keeling, 11/17/15 > Watkins, 11/17/15 > Gellens-Stubbs, 11/17/15 > Schroeder, 11/17/15 > E. Haviland, 11/17/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Leeger, 11/17/15 > E. Wilson, 11/17/15 > B. Wilson, 11/17/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15
<p>3.3. Sections of DRO Requiring Standards of Reasonableness/Interpretive Guidelines</p>	
<p>3.3.1. View obstruction (private views)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Birnbaum, 9/15/5 > Gad, 10/6/15 > Scott, 10/6/15 > S. Eskeland, 10/22/15 > Birnbaum, 10/22/15 > Pavelko, 10/30/15 > Fried, 11/2/15 > Pavelko, 11/3/15 > Fried, 11/3/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/3/15 > Bingham, 11/3/15 > Shank, 11/8/15 > E. Haviland, 11/17/15 > L. Eskeland, 11/17/15 > Prater, 11/17/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15
<p>3.3.2. View obstruction (public views)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Birnbaum, 10/22/15 > Fried, 11/3/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/3/15 > Lockwood, 11/17/15 > Garrett, 11/17/15 > E. Haviland, 11/17/15 > L. Eskeland, 11/17/15 > Prater, 11/17/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15
<p>3.3.3. Massing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Scott 10/6/15 > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Maxey-Allison, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15
<p>3.3.4. Non-FAR elements that add bulk & mass</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Scott, 10/6/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Handzel, 11/3/15 > Myers/Gregory, 11/16/15 > Castile, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > T. Haviland, 11/17/15 > Prater, 11/17/15
<p>3.3.5. Visual impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Castile, 11/17/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > E. Haviland, 11/17/15 > Prater, 11/17/15
3.3.6. Impervious lot coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Maxey-Allison, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Coughlin, 11/17/15 > Redondo, 11/17/15
3.3.7. Removal of established landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Dempsey, 11/3/15 > Maxey-Allison, 11/16/15 > Farrell, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Lockwood, 11/17/15 > Castile, 11/17/15 > Redondo, 11/17/15 > Rang, 11/17/15 > E. Haviland, 11/17/15 > Dempsey, 11/17/15
3.3.8. Relationship to neighborhood (examples: noise, landscaping, odors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Rang, 9/1/15 > Furgatch, 10/6/15 > Scott, 10/6/15 > Fisher, 10/6/15 > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Church, 10/6/15 > Scott, 10/6/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Haviland, 10/22/15 > Bolker, 11/3/15 > Sharp, 11/9/15 > Farrell, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Emerson, 11/17/15 > Castile, 11/17/15 > Howard, 11/17/15 > E. Haviland, 11/17/15 > Roland, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15
3.3.9. Privacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Fried, 11/2/15 > Fried, 11/3/15 > Ruh, 11/17/15 > Roland, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15
3.3.10. Up-slope (hillside) lots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Davies, 11/17/15
3.3.11. Corner lots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Davies, 11/17/15
3.4. Does the DRO Require New Regulatory Sections?	
3.4.1. Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Scott, 10/6/15 > McDonald, 10/20/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
3.4.1.1. Water conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Scott, 10/6/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Sandvik, 11/17/15
3.4.1.2. Energy efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Scott, 10/6/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Sandvik, 11/17/15
3.4.1.3. Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Davies, 11/17/15
3.4.2. Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Scott, 10/6/15 > McDonald, 10/20/15 > Howard, 11/17/15 > Dempsey, 11/17/15
3.5. Does the DRO Require Any New or Revised Definitions?	
3.5.1. “Articulation”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15
3.5.2. “Unreasonable”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Scott, 10/6/15
3.5.3. “Neighborhood”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >
3.5.4. “Bedroom”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Haviland, 10/6/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15
3.6. Problems with Applying the Design Review Ordinance	
3.6.1. Grading, hillside integration, retaining walls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Rang, 9/1/15 > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Rang, 11/3/15 > Rang, 11/17/15 > L. Eskeland, 11/17/15
3.6.2. Protection of native and drought tolerant landscaping and natural landforms (i.e. sandstone outcrops)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Bekkar, 10/22/15 > Dempsey, 11/3/15 > Maxey-Allison, 11/16/15 > Farrell, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Redondo, 11/17/15 > E. Haviland, 11/17/15 > Dempsey, 11/17/15 > Prater, 11/17/15
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"> > Handzel, 11/3/15 > Maxey-Allison, 11/16/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15
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"> > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Davies, 11/17/15
3.6.5. Visual impact and privacy concerns with roof-top decks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Prater, 11/17/15
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"> > Maxey-Allison, 11/16/15 > Farrell, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
3.6.7. Tracking previous determinations by the DRB related to the establishment of a primary living area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 11/3/15 > Bingham, 11/3/15
4. RELATED ORDINANCES: TREES, VIEWS & GRADING	
4.1. Trees / Urban Forest	
4.1.1. Efficacy of existing tree ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Gad, 10/21/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Lockwood, 11/17/15 > Roland, 11/17/15
4.1.2. Removal of protected trees outside the Design Review process.	>
4.1.3. Protected trees that impact views.	>
4.1.4. Conditioning projects with replacement trees.	>
4.1.5. Preservation of the urban forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Dempsey, 11/3/15 > Maxey-Allison, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Lockwood, 11/17/15 > Redondo, 11/17/15 > Dempsey, 11/17/15
4.2. Land Conservation	
4.2.1. Landform modification versus preservation of neighborhood character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Rang, 11/17/15
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"> > Rang, 9/1/15 > Rang, 11/3/15 > Rang, 11/17/15
4.3. Trees, Scenic Views, and Sunlight	
4.3.1. Cost to neighbor to enforce violations of ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Shank, 11/8/15 > E. Haviland, 11/17/15
4.3.2. Incentives for neighbors to block views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Rang, 9/1/15 > Shank, 11/8/15 > E. Haviland, 11/17/15
4.3.3. Consistency with DRO	
5. THE ZONING CODE	
5.1. Design Standards by Zone	
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"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Scott, 10/6/15 > Fisher, 10/6/15 > Dominy, 10/6/15
5.1.2. In the Floodplain Overlay Zone, balancing flood plain requirements with neighborhood compatibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Birnbaum, 9/15/15 > Scott, 10/6/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Fisher, 10/6/15 > Dominy, 10/6/15
<p>5.2. Accessory buildings</p>	
<p>5.2.1. Use of accessory buildings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > McDonald, 10/20/15 > Levine, 10/22/15
<p>5.3. Setbacks</p>	
<p>5.3.1. Light wells</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15
<p>5.3.2. Setback encroachments (examples - bay windows, chimneys)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Scott, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/21/15
<p>5.3.3. Hardscape</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >
<p>5.4. Basements</p>	
<p>5.4.1. Minimizing visual impact of below-ground basements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Wilson, 11/3/15 > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Dominy, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/6/15
<p>5.4.2. Minimizing visual impact of partially-exempt basements/garages</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Countryman, 10/6/15 > Dominy, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/6/15 > Ruh, 11/17/15 > Castile, 11/17/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15
<p>5.4.3. Should there be limitations on the size of basements and where on the lot they can be built?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Rang, 9/1/15 > McDonald, 10/20/15 > Gad, 10/21/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Birnbaum, 10/22/15 > Price, 11/3/15 > Ellis, 11/9/15 > Sharp, 11/9/15 > Peck, 11/10/15 > Maxey-Allison, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Coughlin, 11/17/15 > Ruh, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15 > Levine, 11/17/15 > Stubbs, 11/17/15 > Gellens-Stubbs, 11/17/15 > Winn, 11/17/15 > Reinick, 11/17/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15 > Coughlin, 11/17/15 > Schroeder, 11/17/15 > Howard, 11/17/15

ISSUES	Citations from Public Testimony / Red-Dot Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Gad, 11/17/15 > Riedman, 11/17/15 > Roland, 11/17/15 > Dempsey, 11/17/15 > Prater, 11/17/15 > Belk, 11/31/15
<p>5.4.4. Adequacy of on-site parking requirements related to basements/definition of “bedroom”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > McDonald, 10/20/15 > Levine, 10/22/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Ehrenfeld, 10/22/15 > Kinney, 10/22/15 > Maxey-Allison, 11/16/15 > Davies, 11/17/15 > Rang, 11/17/15 > Thomas, 11/17/15
<p>5.4.5. 4-foot vertical/horizontal separation rule for basements/garage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Gad, 10/6/15 > Gad, 10/21/15
<p>5.5. Partially Enclosed Outdoor Covered Areas</p>	
<p>5.5.1. Minimizing visual impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Wilson, 11/3/15
<p>5.5.2. Should partially enclosed outdoor covered areas be restricted to a percentage of FAR or counted as floor area?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Thomas/Fried, 8/3/15 > Gad, 10/21/15 > Michalsky, 10/22/15 > Wilson, 11/3/15 > Coughlin, 11/17/15 > Ruh, 11/17/15 > Gellens-Stubbs, 11/17/15 > Reinick, 11/17/15 > Coughlin, 11/17/15 > Howard, 11/17/15 > Roland, 11/17/15 > T. Haviland, 11/17/15
<p>5.6. Building Height</p>	
<p>5.6.1. Bluff, Slope & Canyon Zone: application of height limit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >
<p>5.7. Non-Conformities</p>	
<p>5.7.1. Nonconformity 50% building valuation formula</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Scott, 10/6/15 > McDonald, 10/20/15 > L. Eskeland, 11/17/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15
<p>5.8. Variances</p>	
<p>5.8.1. DRB Applications requiring a variance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Levine, 10/22/15 > S. Eskeland, 11/30/15 > Crabtree, 12/1/15

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>