Meeting Objectives

• Review **approach** for effective date/pipeline projects
  • Confirm staff recommended approach

• Review **revisions** to existing proposed tools based on testing
  • Confirm revisions for inclusion in Final Strategy

• Review **new tools** proposed by testers and/or community
  • Determine which tools should be included in Final Strategy

Note: Final Strategy Report will be reviewed in November meeting. The Final Strategy Report will be used to draft redline text amendment.
AGENDA

• Pipeline Projects/Effective Date
• Testing Outcomes
• Break
• Review revisions to existing proposed tools
• Review new tools proposed by testers and/or community
• Next Steps
Effective Date Approach
KEY MILESTONES

- November 2017: Final Strategy Report Released
- January 2018:
  - Task Force Review of Redline Text Amendment
  - Public Review Draft Released
- February/March 2018:
  - Planning Board
- April/May 2018:
  - City Council Adoption
BALANCING EQUITY & EFFECTIVENESS
3 APPROACHES

1. Align Effective Date with Adoption Date
   • Benefits:
     • Fast implementation of new standards
     • Would not allow a gap in the garden court moratorium
   • Disadvantages:
     • Is not equitable for existing projects that have made significant investment based on current regulation

2. Existing projects continue under existing regulations, new projects adhere to new regulations
   • Benefits:
     • Is equitable for existing projects that have made significant investment based on current regulations to continue under current regulations
     • Requires new projects that have not made significant investment to adhere to the new regulations
     • Would not allow a gap in the garden court moratorium
   • Disadvantages:
     • Limited number of existing projects could have a slot home outcome

3. Delay effective date
   • Benefits:
     • Is equitable for existing projects that have made significant investment based on current regulations to continue under existing regulations
   • Disadvantages:
     • Delays implementation of standards for old and new projects
     • Creates a gap in the garden court moratorium unless extended
Staff Recommended Approach

Existing projects (with a formal SDP submitted prior to the effective date) may continue under existing regulations.

New projects (where a formal SDP has not been submitted by the effective date) must adhere to new regulations upon the effective date.

- Benefits:
  - Is equitable for existing projects that have made significant investment based on current regulations to continue under current regulations.
  - Requires new projects that have not made significant investment to adhere to the new regulations.
  - Would not allow a gap in the garden court moratorium.

- Disadvantages:
  - Limited number of existing projects could have a slot home outcome.
Existing projects (with a formal SDP submitted prior to the effective date) may continue under existing regulations.

New projects (where a formal SDP has not been submitted by the effective date) must adhere to new regulations upon the effective date.
Testing Outcomes
C-MX-3: 80 S Madison

Major Comments:
• Unit orientation needs to address both streets
• Allow for 5’ backup area to encroach into side setbacks
• Reduced drive-way dimensions would allow for more/larger units.
C-MX-3: 80 S Madison

Major Comments:
- Unit orientation needs to address both streets
- Allow for 5’ backup area to encroach into side setbacks
- Reduced drive-way dimensions would allow for more/larger units
U-MX-3: 3708 N Tejon

Major Comments:
- Unclear on the requirements for the corner unit orientation standards
- Impacts to stair enclosures
U-MX-3: 3708 N Tejon

Major Comments:

- Unclear on the requirements for the corner unit orientation standards
- Impacts to stair enclosures
U-MS-2: 1459 S Pearl Street

Major Comments:
- The entry features encourage breakdown of the built form
- Consider reduction of the building form at the rear of the site
- No rooftop decks in rear 35% of lot
G-MU-3: 50 S Clarkson

Major Comments:
• Unit orientation is imperative
• Consider a minimum depth for entry features
• Concerns over allowing units to have front doors on side interior
G-MU-3: 50 S Clarkson

CPD Testing
G-MU-3: 1714 N Grove Street

Major Comments:
• Entry feature will address human scale.
• Entry feature alone will not address lack of public realm engagement, consider residential use standard
• Reduced heights makes sloped roofs difficult
• 1:1 stepback for stair enclosures should be easy to accomplish
• 20’ is generous enough for the block sensitive setback and maintain context sensitive yards
• Increased build-to is reasonable, an exception might be needed for access drive
G-MU-3: 1714 N Grove Street

Major Comments:
- Entry feature will address human scale.
- Entry feature alone will not address lack of public realm engagement, consider residential use standard
- Reduced heights makes sloped roofs difficult
- 1:1 stepback for stair enclosures should be easy to accomplish
- 20’ is generous enough for the block sensitive setback and maintain context sensitive yards
- Increased build-to is reasonable, an exception might be needed for access drive
G-MU-3: 1841 Hooker Street

CPD Testing
U-RH-2.5: 2929 E 23rd

Major Comments:
- Include reduced drive aisle dimensions on RH (12'/18')
- Half-story rule is too generous and perceived as full story.

Consider:
- Additional side setback when units face the side
- Preventing roof decks in the rear 35%
- Further downsizing the project (height and depth)
U-RH-2.5: 2929 E 23rd

Major Comments:
- Include reduced drive aisle dimensions on RH (12’/18’)
- Half-story rule is too generous and perceived as full story.

Consider:
- Additional side setback when units face the side
- Preventing roof decks in the rear 35%
- Further downsizing the project (height and depth)
U-RH-2.5: 2929 E 23rd

Major Comments:
- Include reduced drive aisle dimensions on RH (12'/18')
- Half-story rule is too generous and perceived as full story.
- Consider:
  - Additional side setback when units face the side
  - Preventing roof decks in the rear 35%
  - Further downsizing the project (height and depth)
G-RH-3: 501 N Steele Street

CPD Testing
BREAK
REVISIONS TO EXISTING TOOLS

• Building Design Tools
• Site Design Tools
• Vehicular Design Tools
REVISIONS TO BUILDING DESIGN TOOLS

REQUIRE UNITS ORIENTED TO THE STREET

Revise standards to better address corner lots and ensure appropriate outcomes on all street frontages.

If units only orient to primary street, we still get a slot home on the side street.

Revise language to require unit orientation on both streets with exceptions provided for the corner unit.
ENTRY FEATURE FOR STREET-FACING PEDESTRIAN ENTRY

- Maintain entry feature requirement of porch, patio, or canopy.

Introduce minimum depth of 5’ for a porch or patio to the definition.

Introduce a minimum depth of 3’ for a canopy to the definition.
DECREASE MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT IN FEET

- Maintain reduced height for flat roofs
  - 2 Story MX/MS: 30’
  - 3 Story MX/MS: 38’
  - 3 Story MU/RO: 35’

- Introduce height limit for sloped roofs
  - 2 Story MX/MS: 35’*
  - 3 Story MX/MS: 45’*
  - 3 Story MU/RO: 40’*
  *Existing height allowance
REVISIONS TO SITE DESIGN TOOLS

INCREASE MINIMUM STREET SETBACK

• Maintain recommendation for minimum primary street setbacks

• Introduce side street setback to a minimum of 10’
REVISIONS TO SITE DESIGN TOOLS

ALLOW SIDE STREET SETBACK ENCROACHMENTS

• Maintain proposed setback encroachments
• Allow for a 5’ vehicle back out to encroach into the side street setback when screened.
INTRODUCE BUILD-TO EXCEPTION

• Maintain proposed build-to revisions
• Introduce build-to exception for vehicular access drive when no alley is present.
REVISIONS TO PARKING DESIGN TOOLS

REVISE OFF-STREET VEHICLE PARKING AREA DIMENSIONS

• Maintain internal drive access width of 12’
• Revise drive aisle width to 20’
• Apply to any side-by-side attached residential project (i.e. row house) no maximum to number of units
Does the task force agree with the proposed revisions to the standards presented and described in the provided document?
ADDITIONAL TOOLS FOR TASK FORCE CONSIDERATION
STANDARDS ADDRESSING PROTECTED DISTRICTS

• Current standards relating to protected districts
  • In 3+ story district, upper story setback above 27’ (15’/25’)
  • Increased side and rear setbacks

• Proposed standards for consideration
  • Limit rooftop and second story decks in rear 35% when adjacent to protected district with same standard
  • Increase rear setback for primary structure to align with protected district building form standards (12’/20’)

SLOT HOME EVALUATION & TEXT AMENDMENT
STANDARDS ADDRESSING PROTECTED DISTRICTS
**STANDARDS ADDRESSING PROTECTED DISTRICTS**

Existing Protected District Standard 15’ setback at 27’

Proposed limitation on roof top decks in rear 35%

Proposed increased rear setback
STANDARDS ADDRESSING PROTECTED DISTRICTS

• Current standards relating to protected districts
  • In 3+ story district, upper story setback above 27’ (15’/25’)
  • Increased side and rear setbacks

• Proposed standards for consideration
  • Limit rooftop and second story decks in rear 35% when adjacent to protected district with same standard
  • Increase rear setback for primary structure to align with protected district building form standards (12’/20’)

• Staff Recommendation:
  • Limit roof top and second story deck locations when adjacent to protected district with same standard
  • Increased rear setbacks when adjacent to a protected district
INCREASE TRANSPARENCY STANDARDS

• Existing Standard:
  • 30% Primary Street
  • 25% Side Street
  • Alternatives for wall design, wall display, etc.

• Proposed Standard for Consideration:
  • Increase transparency standards on primary and side street

• Staff Recommendation:
  • Increase transparency standards on primary and side street
INTRODUCE SIDE INTERIOR SETBACK IN MX/MS/RX

- Current Standard in MX/MS/RX Districts
  - 0’ Side Interior
  - Typical outcome is 5’ (required by Fire Code for openings)
- Standard For Consideration
  - Increase side interior setback to align with MU/RO approach?
- No Staff Recommendation

- Any task force recommendation would need to clearly address the problem statement.
INTRODUCE RESIDENTIAL STREET LEVEL USE REQUIREMENT IN MU/RO

• Current Standard in MU/RO
  • None, vehicle uses may be the only street level use within the building

• Standard for Consideration
  • Explore a requirement for street level residential uses?

• No staff recommendation

• Any task force recommendation would need to clearly address the problem statement.
Minimal Residential use at the street level
~15' residential use at the street level
TASK FORCE CONFIRMATION

• Does the task force agree with the additional tools for protected districts and transparency to be included in the final strategy report?

• Anything else?
**Next Steps**

- **October 19:**
  - Task Force Meeting to review testing/community comments and proposed revisions/additions
- **November 1:** Planning Board Information Item
- **November ?:** LUTI Informational Item
- **November 16:**
  - Task Force Meeting to review final Strategy Report (strategy report will inform the drafting of the code amendment)
- **November – December:**
  - Internal drafting and reviews