

**Title 21 Committee Meeting Notes – Friday, December 2, 2005**

**Pg. 416 L 28-29**

**Committee:** There seems to be two standards applied here, mixed use and residential.

**Planning:** Mixed use standards relate to placement on lot, the residential standards relate to the building itself.

**Pg. 416 L 32**

**Committee:** It is difficult to enforce encouragement.

**Planning:** It is also difficult to find language showing flexibility.

**Pg. 416 L 38-40**

These are new distances (now 6 – 10')

**Pg. 417 L 9**

**Committee:** Will this raise security concerns?

**Planning:** This came through consultation with Real Estate Task Force. It doesn't mean the landscaped area has to be heavily shrubbed.

**Pg. 417 L 13-15**

**Public:** This section increases the required size of parking lots.

**Pg. 417 L 34-35**

**Planning:** This step down is to create a visual transition between different zones and street.

**Public:** If on a corner this could cause step down on both sides.

**Planning:** We'll look at that.

**Pg. 418 L 18-19**

**Public:** Why is "CMU not allowed as primary"? Can be manufactured many ways. Some smooth faced CMU can be colored, shaped as bricks, etc. This section needs to look at the alternatives, not create a blanket prohibition.

**Pg. 418 L 29-30**

**Committee:** Windows were at 10% but now increased to 12%. Why is that?

**Planning:** The intent was to provide more windows on the front and backs of buildings.

**Public:** Why not let the market decide this?

**Planning:** There are many buildings in Mt. View that have very few windows and there is more criminal activity there.

**Public:** I don't think that criminal activity concerns should be in the building codes.

**Pg. 419 L 4**

**Committee: Why no more than one curb cut every 100 ft. here? What is the concern? Planning: This is so the whole area doesn't get paved.**

**Committee: What about pedestrian walkways?**

**Planning: We are only trying to reduce driveways here. We will clarify.**

**Pg. 419 L 16-18**

**Public: Is the intent here to make all entryways roofed?**

**Planning: No. It's performance based.**

**Public: I'm not sure that it's conveyed well.**

**Pg. 419 L26**

**Committee: What about the dumpster prohibition in this section?**

**Planning: We plan to reduce this to tri plex from 6 plex.**

**Committee: We have dumpsters at some single family homes in our area. Could we do this by zone?**

**Planning: We might be able to do it that way.**

**Public: This doesn't reflect temporary bins for construction. Also some home based business may need dumpsters.**

**Committee: Temporary dumpsters are allowed elsewhere. We're in multi family section so this doesn't cover single family homes, correct?**

**Planning: It should be moved to apply to all residential areas. There may be some tweaking needed here. We allow dumpsters in 4-6 plexes but they have to be screened.**

**Pg. 419 L 33 Garages**

**Public: This is going to cause problems and use extra space if you have to have a driveway to the garages and also a turn around.**

**Planning: The concern is using a front yard set back area for parking. The wording does need help.**

**Pg. 420 L 6-7**

**Public: I have a problem with placement of garage doors being offset 2 ft. Why do we need it? It just adds expense.**

**Planning: The object is to break up the plane on the face of a building. What people don't like about multi family housing is how it looks. We are trying to upgrade for future development, to integrate with what is already there.**

**Committee: Making the costs of building higher will raise apartment rents. We'll need to use more land to do this and land costs will go up.**

**Planning: That is not the objective. We are trying to better utilize the land we have.**

**Pg. 420 L 13-15**

**Committee: By underground do you mean daylight parking which is more like 2/3 underground?**

**Planning:** It could be that or fully underground. Underground parking is more desirable than above ground parking.

**Committee:** When you fully enclose garages you put costs through the roof.

**Committee:** I'm hoping that the approach will be different in rural areas or with different density areas.

**Pg. 421 L 8**

**Committee:** A pedestrian oriented façade is unclear. Does it require awnings? Can you see if that's what we mean by this?

**Pg. 421 L 12**

**Public:** 60% of ground floor facade is quite a bit.

**Planning:** The idea was for depth. If we want shade and snow cover then it has to be functional.

**Public:** Sketches would be helpful here. **Planning:** Yes.

**Committee:** We already shovel the sidewalks.

**Public:** This may be a problem in the summer. It causes shade at a time when people appreciate sunlight. Awnings also accumulate and shed snow into the street or the edge of the sidewalk.

**Pg. 421 L 17**

**Public:** Do I have to put a roof over sidewalks?

**Planning:** This is so there won't be rain or snow falling on tenants in multi family. We want to think about/solve problems before they happen.

**Public:** I believe this language is in the building code. It seems like it's being said twice.

**Pg. 421 L 27**

**Committee:** Is a wind study simple to do and are there firms that do that sort of thing?

**Planning:** There are firms to do these studies.

**Public:** A ten story building is a good place to do this.

**Pg. 421 L 34-36**

**Committee:** This makes more sense than the other step down requirement (on bottom of page 417).

**Planning:** If there's a street you wouldn't need to do this.

**Pg. 422 L 38-39**

**Committee:** Who determines "unnecessary substantial shade"?

**Planning:** You can avoid this by moving the building on the lot or stepping it down. There are ways to minimize shadows on buildings.

**Committee:** It depends on who has the tallest building. If you have a 4 story building and build a 2 story there's no problem but if you have a 10 story building and build a 15 story it creates shadows.

**Public:** If you have options they need to be viable, this one seems very limited.

**Planning:** It's a choice to choose this specific option. Higher buildings have more impact than smaller buildings. When building in mid town or downtown mixed use areas people already there don't want to lose access to views and sunshine.

**Public:** I think planning has gone into the area of architecture.

**Planning:** We have great architects but some buildings could have been built better. If you're building a large building, the intent is to be aware of the impact to the surrounding area. It may be that for certain projects we do like other cities and have an architect on retainer for consulting on design.

**Committee:** People in this town seem to value their view more than shade or sun.

**Planning:** We haven't done any analysis for which views are better than others.

**Committee:** I would hope that the architectural people would weigh in on this. If there are better or more realistic options, we should consider them.

**Planning:** Local architects have already helped on this section.

**Pg. 423 L8-12**

**Public:** Why does it have to be as pretty on the back side of building as the front?

**Planning:** There are options to choose in this section that will determine what's done.

**Pg. 423 General comments**

**Public:** The options should be useful.

**Committee:** They are for certain buildings. Maybe it would be helpful to determine another option to add in this section, since we have heard of problems with 2 out of 7 listed options.

**Public:** Contextual design would be a way to add another option (possibly in the section on façade appearance).

**Planning:** Will you come up with the language for that? **Public:** Yes.

**Planning:** That's why it would be nice to have a designer on retainer. It would be helpful at least at first while we implement these ideas.

**Pg. 423 L 27**

**Public:** What about the façade appearance?

**Planning:** We forgot to add after facade appearance (one option required).

**Pg. 424 L21-22**

**Public:** This section is unclear.

**Planning:** We are looking at rewording here. We have heard this comment before.

**Pg. 425 L 21**

**Committee:** I don't understand what microclimate wind mitigation is.

**Public:** At five stories you would probably need wind analysis study.

**Planning:** We know we need to change some wording in this area.

**Pg. 426 L 11**

**Committee:** My memory was that earlier we had talked about 30,000 sq. feet being a better defining space for large commercial. I believe we looked at examples of the different sizes of buildings when we talked about this in the last draft.

**Planning:** Possibly, but this is already an increase over the current 20,000 feet.

**Pg. 426 L 34**

**Public:** Why is T 111 excluded? There are a lot of varieties including cedar, stainable, etc. that are really nice. It certainly looks better than board and batten.

**Committee:** Originally we were talking about apartments going up with cheap T 111.

**Planning:** This is the large commercial section. The last draft complaints centered around this prohibition in multifamily residential.

**Committee:** Are you taking into consideration these other types of T 111?

**Planning:** No, we'll look at it.

**Pg. 426 L 35-36**

**Public:** There are many schools and commercial buildings using concrete blocks because it is economical and limits graffiti. You've banned products that are used a lot and can be really nice. This material is more attractive than concrete tilts which are still permitted.

**Planning:** Point taken. We will look at this. We are trying to say that these products should be used with other materials on a façade.

**Pg. 427 L 4 Permanent Outdoor Display**

**Committee:** Is this new? **Planning:** Yes.

Do the enclosed garden centers at Lowe's and Home Depot fit in here? What is the definition of outdoor? What is the impact on current business? Would a lumberyard fit in here?

**Planning:** We'll have to look at this. We are recommending breaking up the B3 district, which should also impact this. We don't want big retail stores in some districts.

**Pg. 427 L 22-26**

**Public:** Does this prohibit downtown merchants from having T-shirt racks on the sidewalks?

**Planning:** No, that's in the ROW.

**Committee:** Does this prohibit AIH from having equipment chained up in front of their store?

**Planning:** Wording may need change. The idea is not to totally block required walkway.

**Committee:** This should be clarified. **Planning:** Yes.

**Pg. 428 L 3-4**

**Committee:** Does a small business have to have two entrances if it's on a corner lot?

**Public:** Look at lines 29-32.

**Planning:** It's an option.

**Committee:** It's an option for a principal structure or large business, but required for a secondary or smaller structure?

**Planning:** The question for the community is what kind of streetscape do we want for the city.

**Committee:** I heard a lot from the community last year on this topic. I anticipate lots of discussion here.

**Public:** Economics have to come into play here. This will be hard on small business.

**Planning:** Maybe it needs to be accompanied by exemptions.

**Pg. 429 L 27**

**Public:** Large buildings need a flat roof. The PAC wouldn't have problems if it had a flat roof.

**Planning:** We don't disagree with you.

**Committee:** If there is a new roof form option, please let us know. Public input would be appreciated.

**Next meeting:** Friday, December 9<sup>th</sup> at the Planning Dept. 9 am –11  
The goal is to finish Chapter 7