

ITEM V-A: COMMUNITY DESIGN VISIONING COMMITTEE PROGRESS UPDATE / DRAFT COMMUNITY DESIGN GUIDELINES

REQUEST

Staff is forwarding the latest draft of the revised Community Design Guidelines developed by the Community Design Visioning Committee to the Planning Commission for review and comment. The Planning Commission's comments will be forwarded to the City Council for final consideration at its March 19th meeting.

BACKGROUND

The Community Design Visioning Committee is a ten-member ad-hoc advisory committee appointed by the City Council in August 2007. The Council's specific charge for the committee was to update the now 13-year old Community Design Guidelines document with a particular emphasis on the commercial and multi-family sections, and direction to create new guidelines for compact residential housing. The Community Design Guidelines have not been updated since their adoption in 1995, and the City Council felt that it was necessary to include representation by a broad spectrum of stakeholders that could bring a variety of viewpoints to the discussion. As such, the CDVC membership was chosen to represent a broad cross-section of the community and is comprised of decision makers (one representative each from the Planning Commission and Design Committee), two design professionals, a Building Industry Association representative, and five at-large appointees that represent residents, builders, and other interests.

The CDVC formally convened on September 19, 2007 and has held nine meetings (the tenth and final meeting will occur on February 25th, subsequent to publishing of this report). Many issues have been discussed and debated by the Committee over the course of six months. The CDVC's Draft Recommendation Report to the City Council summarizes the discussions of the Committee and ultimate approach and resolution to key issues. The Draft Recommendation Report is included for the Planning Commission's information as Attachment 1. The Draft Community Design Guidelines has been included as Attachment 2. For comparison, the existing Community Design Guidelines have been included as Attachment 3.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

On January 24th, staff made an informational presentation updating the Planning Commission regarding the progress made by the Community Design Visioning Committee in revising the Community Design Guidelines. At the check-in, the Planning Commission expressed several concerns regarding the application of the new Guidelines and review process. The CDVC appreciates the Planning Commission's input and has made a concerted effort to ensure the Commission's concerns are addressed. Several revisions to the draft Guidelines have been made to respond to the Commission's concerns and comments.

The following represents a summary of the Commission's comments and the CDVC's response:

| <i>Commission Concern or Comment</i> | <i>CDVC Response or Action Taken</i> |
|---|---|
|---|---|

| Commission Concern or Comment | CDVC Response or Action Taken |
|---|---|
| 1. Need flexibility; continue ability to negotiate based on market conditions | The draft guidelines attempt to enhance and reinforce a flexible approach by identifying desired end results and providing suggested best practices of how to achieve them rather than mandating a particular design approach. The CDVC recognizes that a flexible approach is paramount to successful implementation of the Community Design Guidelines. |
| 2. Photo examples not from Roseville; from other more expensive areas | The CDVC made a concerted effort to include relevant local examples of compact residential product types. However, compact residential product types are relatively new to Roseville and there are not many examples to choose from; therefore, other relevant examples from comparable communities were incorporated. |
| 3. Don't want additional layers/approval process | Design review is already a requirement for all non-residential and multi-family projects. The review process for Compact residential recommended by the CDVC adapts the existing review process for non-residential; it does not introduce an entirely new process. The CDVC spent considerable time ensuring that any recommended process would not significantly affect processing timeframes or predictability. |
| 4. Let design be market driven | With the exception of a few key "priority shall," the guidelines represent a list of "best design practices" and acknowledge that consideration should be given to market conditions and other key challenges. |
| 5. Need to provide developer incentives to meet guidelines | Recommendations for incentives are included in the Draft Recommendation Report (see Attachment 1) |
| 6. Statement of Design Intent seems like extra work; why needed? | The Statement of Design Intent (SDI) was recommended by the CDVC to allow project proponents to explain the design approach and the project's consistency with the Design Guidelines when presenting to the City. It would also allow an opportunity to identify key design features and challenges and "value" decisions incorporated into project designs. The SDI is intended to help streamline the review process by providing necessary information to the City earlier in the process so that the City can better understand the design and tailor its comments in response to the project proposal. This formalizes a practice that many project applicants and architects already perform. |
| 7. If committee can't agree on things- assume Guidelines must not be flexible | As with any committee process, discussion, debate, and airing and understanding of alternative view points is necessary to build consensus. Since the Planning Commission check-in, several key breakthrough decisions and agreements have been made by the Committee, which are outlined in the Draft Recommendation Report. |
| 8. Does application need to be revised? | The application submittal checklists would be updated to include the Statement of Design Intent, if approved by Council. |
| 9. How many new guidelines are being added; do they create obstacles | <p>The Community Design Guidelines are intended to implement the goals and policies of the General Plan Community Design Component, which express and represent the overall Community's expectations for the design of projects within the City. The General Plan specifically identifies the Community Design Guidelines and design review process as the implementation measures for achieving these goals and policies.</p> <p>The Compact Residential Design Guidelines (CRD) represents the only new section of the Community Design Guidelines document. CRD contains 61 guidelines in the context of three overarching design</p> |

| Commission Concern or Comment | CDVC Response or Action Taken |
|---|---|
| | <p>objectives: Site Design, Architectural Design, and Public Space Guidelines. Each subsection contains, on average, 20 guidelines.</p> <p>The existing Community Design Guidelines for commercial projects contains 127 guidelines; multi-family contains 113, compared to the revised draft which reduces the number of guidelines to 99 and 87, respectively.</p> |
| 10. Redoing a process that already works | There is no process for the review of compact residential currently in place. The CDVC's wanted to ensure that the design guidelines created translated to projects on the ground. The CDVC's recommendation to the Council is that the CRD Guidelines be implemented through a defined review process as outlined in the Draft Guidelines (see Attachment 2). |
| 11. Address four-sided architecture on commercial | A "priority shall" of the revised Guidelines require architectural treatment to all elevations of a building facing public areas (streets, plazas, open space, residential, etc.) See Section II - CC-47: "Architectural treatment shall be applied to all elevations of a building facing public areas..." (does not mandate how to achieve this – leaves to creativeness of designer) |
| 12. Add curb appeal | Addressed by identifying key minimum standards identified as "priority shall." The "priority shall" differentiate what is absolutely required to meet the minimum intent of the Guidelines, vs other suggested best practices to enhance project design. Reduces ambiguity in implementation. |
| 13. "Tone it down"; want fewer guidelines | See response to comment #9 above. The revised draft CDG reduces the number of Guidelines already in place for non-residential projects. |
| 14. Multi-family projects shouldn't always require Tot Lot, Pool, and Rec Room - just one | The draft Guidelines suggest the provision of amenities, but do not mandate them. The provision of on-site amenities should be considered in context of the proximity of other recreational opportunities. Some projects may have a need for more on-site amenities than others due to distance from City parks, etc. |
| 15. Adding to application seems like a burden/opposite flexible | See response to Comment #6 above. The Statement of Design Intent recommended by the CDVC is intended to streamline the process by providing more pertinent information up front. |
| 16. "Should" and "Shall" are not flexible words | The Council's charge for the Committee was to strengthen the existing guidelines and ensure that the Community's design expectations were reflected in the Guidelines. As defined and endorsed by the CDVC, "shall" is an obligatory requirement tied to an underlying Ordinance, policy, adopted standard, or design priority identified by the CDVC; "should" is strongly recommended and should be honored if at all possible. |
| 17. Concern that there is redundancy | As noted in response to Comment #10, no process currently exists for review of Compact Residential but is recommended by the CDVC. Design review is already required for non-residential by the Zoning Ordinance. As previously mentioned, the design review process is identified by the General Plan as the process by which the City's standards are implemented. |
| 18. Would "review tools" save applicant time? | That is the CDVC's expectation. See responses to Comments #6 and #15. |
| 19. Don't want homogenous community <i>because</i> of guidelines | The Guidelines attempt to avoid homogeneity by discouraging duplication in design ("copy cat" effect) and encouraging original designs that consider and compliment the context of adjacent projects (see CC-40) and not dictating a specific design solution. |
| 20. Need good reasons to make | The Council's direction in forming the CDVC was to examine and make |

| Commission Concern or Comment | CDVC Response or Action Taken |
|--|--|
| changes (if the process isn't broken, do we need to fix it?) | recommendations in three targeted areas: commercial, multi-family, and compact residential. |
| 21 Concerned that we are creating bureaucracy / adding time and money to process | <p>Guidelines are already in place and design review is already required for non-residential and multi-family projects. Tentative Maps already require review and approval at a public hearing; the design review component for Compact residential is intended to “piggy-back” onto the map approval process; therefore, not increasing processing timeframes or adding unnecessary steps in the process.</p> <p>In response to this concern, the CDVC requested that staff examine what other communities in the region required residential design review. As indicated in Section E of the Recommendation Report, all of our regional neighbors require residential design review; most require review for all product types. The proposed Guidelines are more narrow in their application, applying only to product types at 7 units per acre or higher (Medium Density Residential or higher).</p> |
| 22. Concern that there is a misunderstanding between should and shall | See response to Comment #16. The Committee shared this concern and identified minimum requirements to reduce ambiguity. |

CONCLUSION

As reflected in the responses to Commission comments above, as well as the discussion summary provided in the Draft Recommendation Report, the CDVC has taken its Council charge seriously and has attempted to address the concerns of the Planning Commission and other stakeholder groups. The CDVC appreciates the Planning Commission’s participation and respectfully requests that the Planning Commission review the draft Guidelines and forward any comments to the City Council for final consideration at its March 19th meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Community Design Visioning Committee Draft Recommendation Report to the City Council
2. Draft Community Design Guidelines
3. Existing Community Design Guidelines (adopted 1995)