

MID-COAST REGULATIONS MEETING NOTES

February 28, 2000

- Two issues came out of the fieldtrip: (1) new development standards, and (2) design review would improve house size and appearance.
- Everyone seemed to agree on what the really unsightly structures were, e.g., two houses on Coronado. The question becomes, what can be done to prevent the worst.
- House appearance can be affected by surrounding development. Houses plunked down in existing developed areas look worse than a group of houses built at the same time by the same builder, i.e., creating the local character.
- A problem may be that owner-builders pick least expensive design and are inexperienced with what final product would look like.
- It's difficult to determine the effect of day light plane requirements in the field (without knowing where the parcel lines are).
- Community character is hard to define, do we mean 1920 character, 1930 character, 1950 character, or 1990 character?
- Maybe we should consider the character of specific blocks/subareas of the community.
- A FAR standard should be a guide, not a hard and fast standard.
- In the Mid-Coast, building architecture is eclectic.
- What's unattractive are houses that are not maintained, e.g., junk piles and camper shells in the front yard.
- If design review can prevent houses that most people agree are unacceptable, then design review can be effective.
- We may need to adjust the draft FAR standard after we develop height and daylight plane standards, i.e., this is an iterative process.
- The FAR standard could be different for different clusters of parcel sizes, i.e., a curve rather than a straight line.
- The purpose of a FAR standard is to balance house size against parcel size.
- The purpose of a height standard is whether you want two stories or one story.
- The purpose of a Daylight Plane is to control how a house relates to the ones next to it.

- The purpose of Design Review is to respond to aesthetics where quantitative standards don't provide the remedy.
- Our challenge is to create an objective system around a subjective topic.
- Architects generally build within the development standards, and then Design Review is for tweaking/fine tuning to improve aesthetics.
- Dennis' numbers are unprecedented. Even in the most lenient Bayside communities, the largest allowable FAR is .53 for 5,000 sq. ft. Dennis' proposal is .57 for 5,000 sq. ft.
- Any FAR on the coastside is unprecedented.
- We should develop a separate FAR standard for parcels <5,000 sq. ft., and parcels ≥5,000 sq. ft.
- Design Review could be revised^{xo} allow for adjustments in the FAR when a house is built between two large houses.
- Designate the supply of small lots (<5,000 sq. ft.) as a means to provide affordable housing.
- Our mission is not affordability, but house size and community compatibility.
- The reason many want smaller houses is the desire for a "small town" community, i.e., a rural/open feeling.
- Houses not crowded together reduce bulk because of the greater separation distance.
- 2,500 – 2,600 sq. ft. floor area (Joe Guntren's preferred house size).
- For next meeting, plot parcel size vs. house size, and overlay prior S-17 limits, interim ordinance limits, and Dennis Doherty's proposal.

GB:cdn – GDBK0335_WCP.DOC
 (3/10/2000)