

MCC Recommendation on MidCoast Zoning Ordinance.

5/10/00

1. Floor-Area-Ratio:

(*) For all residential (R-1) districts, an FAR of 53% for all conforming parcels within their zoning district. For nonconforming parcels, an FAR of 48%.

Example: In the S-17 district, parcels less than 5,000 sq. ft. would have an FAR of 48%. Similar for the S-9 (10,000 sq. ft.) and the S-10 (20,000 sq. ft.) districts.

(*) Parcels from 99% to 95% of minimum zoning size shall have their FAR reduced at a ratio of 1% for every percent less than 100% until the FAR of 48% is reached.

Example: A 4900 sq. ft. lot in the S-17 District is 98% of the required minimum - its FAR would be reduced by 2%, from 53% to 51%. A 9600 sq. ft. lot in the S-9 District is 96% of the required minimum - its FAR would be reduced by 4%, from 53% to 49%.

Parcels less than 3500 sq. ft. would have the requirement for covered parking removed.

2. (*) Home Improvement Exceptions:

HIE would NOT allow a structure to exceed the FAR.

3. Height:

28 ft. in all R-1 districts except the section of the S-9 district east of Highway 1, measured as the vertical distance from any point on the natural grade to the topmost point of the building immediately above.

Limited Height Exemption For Steep Building Sites with 30% slope or greater: In cases where steep localized terrain presents architectural and design difficulties, the Design Review Committee may grant an exemption to allow 33 ft. maximum building height for

(*) a. any portion of the house that is within the appropriate center percentage (40%) of the length or width,
(*) or:

b. The downslope wall.

(*) For the S-9 district east of Highway 1, the height limit of 32 ft would be established for parcels 10,000 sf or greater. Parcels less than 10,000 sf, and the S-9 district west of Highway 1 would have a height limit of 28 ft.

4. Daylight Plane:

A daylight plane shall be required, unless a structure exhibits significant facade articulation. The choice would be subject to approval by the Design Review Committee.

The daylight plane is established by measuring either (1) along the front and rear setback lines, or (2) along the side setback lines, as determined by the applicant, a vertical distance of 20 ft. from the natural grade, and

then inward at an angle of 45 degrees until maximum building height is reached.

Architectural features, including dormers and gables may extend into the 45 degree angled portion of the daylight plane, provided that:

(*) Dormers and Gables Located within the center 60% of the building length or width:

The combined length of such features on each building side does not exceed 40% of the side on which they are present and height from natural grade does not exceed 24 ft. or;

the combined length of such features on each building side does not exceed 30% of the side on which they are present and height from natural grade does not exceed 28 ft.

Cornices, eaves, roof overhangs, chimneys, stairways, decks and similar features may extend up to two feet into the daylight plane.

Chimneys, pipes, mechanical equipment, antennae and other similar features may extend into the daylight plane up to 36 ft. as required for safety and efficient operation.

The Design Review Committee would approve the choice of facade articulation upon finding that: (1) all building facades will be well articulated and proportioned, and (2) each building wall will be broken up so as not to appear shear, blank, looming or massive to neighboring properties. Facade articulation can be achieved through the placement of decks, bays, windows, balconies, porches, overhangs, cantilevered features, and other projecting or recessing architectural details.

(*) The DRC shall have approval on the applicant's choice of either front/rear or side daylight plane usage.

5. Design Review Committee

All new development would be subject to design review by a design review committee. The design review committee process would be similar to the corresponding committee processes in effect on the Bayside. The three member committee would be appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Two members shall be licensed architects who reside in San Mateo County. The third member shall be a resident of the unincorporated community in which the project being reviewed is located. Four persons could be appointed to serve as the third member, i.e. one each representing Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, and Miramar, respectively.

(*) The third member(s) shall be appointed by the Board from candidates recommended by the MidCoast Community Council

(*) Initial design review criteria shall be existing policies and guidelines in the LCP, General Plan, Community Design Manual and any other applicable documents for the MidCoast Area, as well as the basic principles defined by the Zoning Ordinance Study group.

Revised design review criteria and standards would be developed as a component of the Mid-Coast LCP Update Project. The project is currently scheduled to begin with scoping sessions to be held in July, 2000.

(*) Input from members of the new DRC, by benefit of their continuing experience with review of designs submitted in the coastal area, shall be an integral part of the process in developing the revised criteria and standards.

6. Staffing and support:

The P&Z Committee also recommends that the Council write a letter to Supervisor Rich Gordon asking that he carry a proposal through the budget process which would add a new MidCoast planner position in the Planning Department. This new planner would focus solely on MidCoast issues and would help satisfy the need for additional staff which will be created by the establishment of these new ordinances, the formation of the Coastside Design Review Committee, and the development of detailed Design Review Criteria through the upcoming LCP review process.

[return to MCC P&Z page](#)