ADDRESSING THE LIST OF PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS
Del Mar Ad Hoc Development Review Process
Citizens' Advisory Committee
DRAFT: FOR REVIEW & DISCUSSION 2/23/2016

IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS & CONCERNS PRESENTED TO CITY COUNCIL 2/16/2016	Planning Staff's Suggestions (from 1/20/2016 memo)	Suggested Ad Hoc Subcommittee Assignment
(1) COMMUNICATION, TRANSPARENCY, PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF HOW THE DRB WORKS	(a) Updating "Guides to the Process" series to include guides for citizens. (b) Filming a video explanation of the purpose for and process of design review.	**Research Subcommittee**
(2) NEED FOR IMPROVED INFORMATION ELECTRONICALLY	(a) Posting of up-to-date iterations of project plans on the City's web site. This suggestion carries some complexities due to architects' copyrights on plans. (b) Use webpage to list all active permits and their status (using City's TRAKiT system), on a bi-weekly basis so all interested can view; this would include CPPs that we are made aware of (applicants could send us their CPP notices to post online).	**Website Subcommittee**
(3) DRB PROCESS DOESN'T ALLOW ENOUGH TIME FOR ADEQUATE REVIEW	(a) Requirement for posting the most current set of development proposal plans at project site, along with contact information for applicant and architect, engineers and other representatives who could answer the public's questions about project.	**CPP Subcommittee**
(4) NEED FOR LESS SUBJECTIVITY IN DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS	(a) Similar to the set of Implementing Guidelines adopted by the City Council for the Downtown and Beach Overlay Zones, these would provide an explanation of the purpose of the DRO section and examples about how it is to be enforced. As an example, DRO Section 23.08.077A calls for projects to be in scale with other structures in the neighborhood. However, this broad language does not identify what constitutes a neighborhood. Is it the immediate block on which the property is located? How is this to be applied in cases where nearby properties are in a different zoning classification or have a different historic pattern of development?	**Research Subcommittee**

IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS & CONCERNS PRESENTED TO CITY COUNCIL 2/16/2016	Planning Staff's Suggestions (from 1/20/2016 memo)	Suggested Ad Hoc Subcommittee Assignment
(5) DRB SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS ARE NOT ALWAYS CONSISTENT OR STANDARDIZED	(a) Staff tracking of designations made by the DRB of the primary living areas of properties. Staff or City-retained third party to take photos at residences from which potential view blockage claims are made using consistent parameters, such as type of camera lens (35mm SLR or iPhone/iPad equivalent), height above floor vantage point, taken at specified distance from the interior of the window(s) in the room claimed to the primary living area. In addition, take photos of rooms contended to be the primary living area of a residence. (b) Apply a consistent set of parameters, in terms of scale, elevations shown from street frontage level view and plan sheet components. (c) Requirements for change-of-grade plans that are more easily understandable to laypersons, perhaps using color-coding and 3-D representations of areas of cut and fill and locations and heights of retaining walls. This is an area where interested parties seem to have the most difficulty understand the site changes that would result from a proposed project.	**DRO Subcommittee**
(6) DRB DELIBERATIONS NEED TO REMAIN FOCUSED ON THE DROs		**DRO Subcommittee**
(7) THE CPP PROCESS NEEDS TO BE IMPROVED	(a) Institute a pre-DRB meeting workshop ("Advisory Design Review" or "Two Step Process") where the public and DRB members can meet with staff and the applicants for questions. This will not only provide an additional opportunity for people to understand the project design and potential impacts, but can have the added effect of making the DRB meeting itself more efficient.	**CPP Subcommittee**

IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS & CONCERNS PRESENTED TO CITY COUNCIL 2/16/2016	Planning Staff's Suggestions (from 1/20/2016 memo)	Suggested Ad Hoc Subcommittee Assignment
(8) THE DRB COULD BENEFIT FROM IMPROVED TRAINING AND CONTINUING EDUCATION	(a) Setting a consistent schedule for training sessions. As setting a date with so many parties is often the reason that training schedules "slip," applicants for membership on the DRB should be required to make a commitment as part of the application forms and at their appointment interviews before the City Council to reserve dates on their calendars not only for attendance at the usual 4th Wednesday of each month but also for the consistent, calendared (twice yearly?) training sessions. (b) Including training session agenda items on reading and interpretation of project plans, including site plans, floor plans, elevations, landscape/irrigation plans. These agenda items could include guest appearances by architects, landscape architects, engineers as part of training sessions for training on understanding development proposals and options for alternatives.	**DRO Subcommittee**
(9) TO ENHANCE NEIGHBOR COMMUNICATION & UNDERSTANDING, THE CITY COULD CAPITALIZE ON EXPERTISE OF FORMER DRB MEMBERS & EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS		**CPP Subcommittee**

ADDRESSING THE LIST OF PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS
Del Mar Ad Hoc Development Review Process
Citizens' Advisory Committee
DRAFT: FOR REVIEW & DISCUSSION 2/23/2016

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Research Subcommittee (Doyle, Farrell, Graybill, Jamison): Issues (1) and (4)
- Design Review Handbook for Neighbors (including Good Neighbor Policies)
- Design Guidelines

CPP Subcommittee (Doyle, Meredith, Graybill, Feder): Issues (3), (7) and (9)
- Project review time
- CPP modifications; Advisory Design Review/Two-Step Process
- Former DRB members as educators, Ex-officio architect, Ombudsman

DRO Subcommittee (Feder, Meredith, Olson): Issues (5), (6), and (8)
- Project submittal requirements/standardization (improved visualization); view obstruction documentation
- DRB training
- DRO focus in meetings

Website Subcommittee (Doyle, Giebink): Issue (2)
- Website functionality