

## **R4C/R2A Advisory Committee**

### **Questions for Visiting Planning Commission Member**

#### **Purpose**

---

- Answers from ORC representative about their understanding of what they have proposed, the goals, and motivation for what they are trying to achieve.
- An opportunity for interchange with someone from the ORC, so that they cannot dismiss us as irrelevant to the process.

#### **Lot Combinations**

---

- Maximum size for lot combinations—the Advisory Committee set a standard. Planning Commission proposed to use a case-by-case approval process, but presents no standards. Acceptance of the process needs known standards. What are the standards?
- What is the legal prohibition against establishing a maximum lot size in a given zone, such as R4C?
- What is the legal basis that allows setting a minimum lot size in a given zone, as we currently do?
- How did ORC come to the conclusion that max lot size of 6,535 sf insufficient? This sf brings 62% of buildings into conformity?
- Land Use Element of Master Plan (p. 72) does not mention ORC's recommendations for lot combination. Elaborate?
- Discuss the 4 conditions listed under Parcel combinations in your report: would they apply for all lot combinations or not for those in the new group housing zone?
- What size of development within this zone would be controlled by lot combination standards and what size would not?

## **Overlay District/Design and Massing Standards (Group Housing Zone)**

- Outside of the Overlay zone, what approval standards would be proposed and how would these differ from what would be used in the Overlay Zone?
- What problems would this new zoning solve?
- How is livability improved for both home owner and tenant residents by the new zoning?
- How does the new zoning relate to present R2B Student Group Housing? Would the same standards be applied?
- What specific data did the ORC use to justify proposing a new group housing zone?
  - Did they conduct surveys?
  - Who specifically supports this proposal and why?
  - What were the pros and cons they considered when making this proposal?
- How did the ORC decide where to draw the red line boundary to delineate the proposed Group Housing zone? Apparently a request from a homeowner in area resulted in the zone boundaries being changed? Was there any discussion by the ORC on this? It seems completely arbitrary.
- What is the market for organized group housing?
- What design standards would you be suggesting and how would they vary based on the type of development.
- What massing standards would be in place beyond the changes proposed regarding FAR?
- What do you mean by compatibility, compatibility with what?
- Confirm that the recommendation at this time is to use an Overlay District only to establish a zone for Group Housing opportunities.
  - Confirm for the committee that what you have proposed is a **rezoning** of a section of R4C properties to allow more flexibility through use of premiums, and Floor area limitations
- Rezoning of the area identified in the Central Area Plan (1992?) for Group housing opportunities.
- What was the ORC's working definition of "group housing"?

- What types of use development would be included as group housing
- Clarify the boundaries of the area for proposed rezoning
  - What criteria were used for designating these boundaries
  - Comment on the size of the proposed area
- Clarify the standards being recommended for this new zoning
  - Min, maximum lot size
  - Area, height
  - Setbacks
  - Open space
  - Allowable density
  - Occupancy
  - Parking
- What types of premiums will be offered
  - What community benefits would be extracted in return for these premiums
  - Would they be easily evaluated “hard” standards that are quantifiable
  - Can you be specific about what is meant by pedestrian-friendly
- How does the ORC envision Lot Combination Standards would be used to control the Overlay Zone
  - Would you discuss the 4 conditions listed under Parcel combinations in your report would they apply for all lot combinations or not for those in the new group housing zone?
  - What size of development within this zone would be controlled by lot combination standards and what size would not
  - What design standards would you be suggesting and how would they vary based on the type of development
  - What massing standards would be in place beyond the changes proposed regarding FAR
  - What do you mean by compatibility, compatibility with what?

## **Side Setbacks**

---

- What was your operating principle in recommending a reduction in side setbacks for 85% of the structures in R4C and for recommending repeal of the conflicting land use buffer for non-vehicular use areas
- Has ORC thought about requiring non-vegetation buffers. Might work better for small areas yet still create separation.

## **R2A**

---

- What was your goal in wanting to reconsider the lot size required for R2A?

## **Parking**

---

- Please explain decisions about parking spaces. Master Plan Land Use Element, Action F. (P. 72) states that off street parking should not be reduced.

## **Other**

---

- Master Plan addresses pressure on adjacent neighborhoods, how does ORC findings support this concern.
- What is the ORC's definition of redevelopment?
- Would all of R4C be rezoned R2B? Case by case.
- How did ORC decide to base building mass by FAR?