

1240

The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in underlined in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.

Direction

PC

CC

ISSUE 1: Protecting the Unique Qualities of Residential Neighborhoods (Page 7) PC review 7/20/2015 CC review 10/19/2015

Option 1: Maintain existing R-1 standards for all neighborhoods.

Option 2: Introduce tailored development standards for individual residential neighborhood.

Option 3: Allow case-by-case deviations to R-1 standards.

New Option: Introduce additional standards/exceptions based on lot characteristics and existing development patterns.

X

X

- Retain 25 feet height limit
- 27 feet height exception for the following circumstances:
 - Addition to historic structures that is designed to match the roof pitch of the historic structure within the area of new addition.
 - Lots greater than 6,000 sf in size
 - Lots with width 60 feet wide or more.
 - Lots on a steep slope. Steep slope is defined as a lot having an average slope of 25% or greater.
 - Max plate height of structure does not exceed 22 feet.
- Retain current requirement for second story setbacks at 15 % of lot width
 - Add exception to second story setback for lots that are 30 feet wide or less.
- Secondary Structure in Rear Yard
 - Decrease rear yard setback from 8 feet to 4 feet.
 - Maintain 17.15.140.G “The width of detached garages or carports in the rear yard is limited to twenty-one feet. The height is limited to fifteen feet (nine feet to the top of the wall plate) for secondary structures located a minimum of 8 feet from the rear property line. However, the planning commission may approve an exception to allow additional height if necessary to match the architectural style of the existing primary structure.”
 - Secondary Structures less than 8 feet from the side yard may not exceed 12 feet in height.
 - Maintain required 2 foot landscape buffer between driveway and property line.
 - Maintain front setback (40 feet), side yard setback (3 feet) and setback from primary structure (3 feet)
 - Add statement in residential zoning districts an existing garage located within the required setback areas are legal non-conforming structures that may be updated but the non-conformity may not be expanded.

Issues and Options Matrix		
<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
ISSUE 2: Maintaining and Enhancing the Village Character (Page 8) <u>PC and CC reviewed 4/30/2015</u>		
Option 1: Maintain existing standards with advisory design guidelines.		
<p>Option 2: Establish new building form and character standards. The Zoning Code will establish mandatory site and building standards to maintain and enhance the Village character. These would apply to non-residential and mixed-use development. New standards could address the following design concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum setbacks to keep buildings and their entrances close to the sidewalk. • Permitted treatment of setback areas (e.g., plazas and landscaping, no parking) • Minimum building width at street edge (defined as percentage of lot width) to maintain a continuous presence of storefronts. • Buildings oriented towards a public street with a primary entrance directly accessible from the sidewalk. • Maximum length of unarticulated/blank building walls. • Required storefront transparency (percentage clear glass) • Maximum building/storefront width (require larger buildings to be broken down into a pedestrian-scale rhythm with individual building bay widths) • Surface parking location (at rear or side of buildings, not between a building and a street-facing property line). • Frequency and width of driveways crossing sidewalks. • Requirements or incentives for residential front porches. 	X	X
<p>Option 3: Incorporate design guidelines as standards in the Zoning Code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Incorporate applicable design criteria from the Central Village Design Guidelines into the Zoning Code update.</u> 	X	X
<p>Option 4: Remove reference to Central Village Design Guidelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>This modification would require applicants to follow the development standards in the code without any guidance from the guidelines. The guidelines would be repealed during the zoning code update. The reference could be reintroduced after the City prepared updated design guidelines for the Village</u> 	X	X
Notes:		

1240

The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in underlined in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.

Direction

PC

CC

ISSUE 3: Accommodating High-Quality Development on 41st Avenue (Page 10) PC review 5.18.2015

Option 1: Maintain Existing Regulations.

Option 2: Increase Parking Flexibility.

- Allow greater commercial parking flexibility through shared parking studies for multi-tenant commercial properties
- Residential mixed with office space may be considered within shared parking study.
- Residential mixed with commercial/restaurant/entertainment is problematic due to overlap in demand on parking.

X

X

Option 3: Create incentives for desired improvements.

Option 4: Strengthen connection to 41st Avenue Design Guidelines.

Option 5: Streamline Permitting Process.

- Allowing commercial uses to occupy existing commercial spaces up to XXX square-feet without a CUP (limit to be established in draft code)
- Only requiring a design permit for large commercial uses which involve significant exterior modifications (to be defined in draft code)
- Create administrative permits and minor use permits

X

X

Notes from 5.18.2015 Planning Commission meeting:

- Repeal existing 41st Ave design guidelines until such time that they can be comprehensively updated. Incorporate applicable design criteria from the 41st Ave Design Guidelines into the Zoning Code update.

1240		
<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
ISSUE 4: Protecting Retail Vitality on 41st Avenue (Page 11) PC review 5.18.2015		
Option 1: Maintain existing regulations.		
Option 2: Add new findings for professional and medical office uses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only partial support New findings for professional and medical office use must be objective and measurable; not nebulous. 	Partial support	X
Option 3: Encourage professional and medical office uses in certain locations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Commission supported increase flexibility in office space in general. Directed staff to principally permit office space up to a newly established limit south of Capitola Road and require conditional use permit for new retail conversions to office north of Capitola Road. Support Office on 2nd and 3rd story as principally permitted without size limitations in all commercial areas. 	X	X
Option 4: Introduce new limitations for professional and medical office uses.		
Issue #5: Parking (Page 12)		
Issue #5A: Number of Required Parking Spaces (Page 13) PC review 5.18.2015 CC review 10.19.2015		
Option 1: Maintain Existing Requirement.		PENDING
Option 2: Modify Parking Requirements for Certain Land Uses in All Areas.		
Option 3: Create Location-Based Parking Standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The updated Zoning Code will establish location based parking requirements for the different commercial districts within the City, including neighborhood commercial, community commercial, central village, and industrial. The central village parking standards will not change. <u>CC: Modify existing 6 seat allowance for restaurant to a square foot allowance for dining area. Decrease required parking requirement for area not utilized for dining.</u> Single-family residential parking standards will not change. <u>CC: max covered parking 1 space for single-family</u> 	X	X
Option 4: Allow parking reductions for multi-tenant commercial uses with Planning Commission approval. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain reductions in the number of required parking spaces for multi-tenant commercial developments supported by a parking study. Exclude mixed-use projects that contain residential. <u>CC: Allow residential mixed use in CC (Bay Avenue and 41st Avenue)</u> All reductions require approval by Planning Commission after making special findings. Finding that adequate parking is provided on-site as demonstrated by a parking study and reduction does not result in spillover parking impacts on neighborhoods. 	X	X

1240		
<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
Option 5: Allow for reductions By-Right.		
Issue #5: Parking (continued)		
Issue #5B: Village Hotel Parking (Page 15) <u>PC review 5.18.2015</u> <u>CC review on 10/19/2015</u>		
Option 1: Maintain Existing Requirements		
Option 2: Specific On-Site Parking standard for Village Hotel.		
Option 3: Base Standard on a Parking and Traffic Study prepared for the hotel development project application. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of parking spaces required for the theater hotel site will be determined by a parking and traffic study prepared specifically for the hotel development project application. • The site is unique and therefore flexibility is necessary to create a parking demand management plan that works specific to theater site. 	X	X
Option 4: Allow Planning Commission and/or City Council to establish parking standards for an individual project based on performance criteria.		
Notes: <i>Aside: PC request for CC to reconsider employee parking program in the City parking facilities to decrease impact on residents during winter months. <u>CC would like to revisit the in-lieu program to include more land use types.</u></i>		
Issue #5: Parking (continued)		
Issue #5C: Parking Efficiency (Page 16) <u>PC review 5.18.2015</u> <u>CC review on 10/19/2015</u>		PENDING
Option 1: Maintain existing regulations.		
Option 2: Clarify existing code to match past practice, including:		
A: Add New Shared Parking Provision. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The updated Zoning Code will allow multiple land uses on a single parcel or development site to use shared parking facilities when operations for the land uses are not normally conducted during the same hours, or when hours of peak use differ. • Excludes residential <u>CC: Allow residential mixed use in CC (Bay Avenue and 41st Avenue)</u> 	X	X
B: Add new parking lift provisions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The updated Zoning Code will allow for elevator-like mechanical system to stack parking spaces in a vertical configuration. • Lift must be enclosed/not visible from public view. 	X	X

1240		
<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue #5D: Garages (Page 17) PC review 5.18.2015 CC review 10.19.2015		PENDING
Option 1: Maintain existing regulations.		
Option 2: Add design standards for carports. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to require at least one covered parking space for homes 1,500 square feet or more. Covered parking may be provided in a garage or carport. • Design standards for carports will be added. • Carport should be the exception with findings to support the exception • Include Carport in FAR calculation. 	X	X
Option 3: Limit covered spaces to garages only.		
Option 4: Eliminate covered parking requirement.		
Notes:		
Issue #6: Historic Preservation (Page 17) PC review 5.21.2015		PENDING
Option 1: Establish a Historic Resources Board.		
Option 2: Establish a new Historic Preservation Overlay Zone.		
Option 3: Establish new enforcement and penalty provisions.		
Option 4: Establish new maintenance and upkeep provisions.		
Planning Commission Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the 5 new provisions identified in the issues and options summary, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures to identify historic resources ○ Improve criteria to identify historic resources ○ Add procedures and review criteria for projects which involve potentially significant resources. ○ Add criteria to approve demolition of a historic resource. ○ Add incentives for historic preservation. • Do not include any of the additional options. • As the new historic preservation ordinance is drafted, have Architectural Historian, Leslie Dill, and local Historian, Frank Perry, review the draft ordinance. • <u>Follow-up: CC would like to see money budgeted for following year for historic inventory</u> 	X	X

1240

The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in underlined in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.

	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 7: Signs (Page 19)		
A. Threshold for Review <u>PC Review on 4/30/2015 and CC Review 4/30/2015 and 11/12/2015</u>		
Option 1: Maintain existing regulations.		
Option 2: Allow staff-level review with new standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Revise sign standards to include new, well-defined and well-illustrated design standards that create new maximum allowances within staff-level administrative review. Signs can be approved administratively within an over-the-counter permit.</u> • <u>Include an option for Planning Commission review for signs that go beyond the maximum administrative review allowance.</u> • <u>Ensure high quality signs within new standards.</u> 	X	X
Notes:		
B. Tailored Standards (Page 19) <u>PC Review on 4/30/2015 and CC Review 4/30/2015 and 11/12/2015</u>		
Option 1: Maintain existing regulations.		
Option 2: Create tailored standards for different commercial areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sign standards will be adjusted to address the unique character of different commercial areas. Tailored standards will include types of permitted signs, maximum sign area, sign dimensions, sign location and placement, illumination, materials, and other place appropriate standards.</u> • <u>The general desired signage character for different districts in Capitola could be as follows:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Village: Pedestrian oriented signs, village scale</u> ○ <u>Neighborhood Commercial: Neighborhood-scale signs serving pedestrians and vehicles</u> ○ <u>41st Avenue: Larger-scale, auto-oriented signs to support corridor as a regional shopping destination.</u> ○ <u>Auto Plaza Drive: Unique to the use (auto-dealers) and address visibility challenges</u> ○ <u>Industrial Zone (Kennedy Drive): More industrial design aesthetic and flexibility of type and materials.</u> 	X	X
Notes:		

<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 7: Signs (continued)		
C. Monument Signs (Page 20) PC Review on 4/30/2015 and CC Review 4/30/2015 and 11/12/2015		
Option 1: Maintain existing regulations.		
Option 2: Create a new limit for monument signs based on linear frontage along a prime commercial street.		
Option 3: Create an allowance for more than 4 tenants per monument sign.		
Option 4: Update Master Sign Plan to clarify discretion in monument signs (lot size, # of tenants, and frontage).		
New Option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preference for monument signs to be drafted into tailored standards for each commercial zone. Update to allow digital gas pricing signs. 	X	X
Issue 8: Non-Conforming Uses (Page 20) PC Review 7/20/2015 and CC Review 10/26/2015		
A. Calculation of Structural Alterations (Page 21)		
Option 1: Maintain the existing 80 percent building valuation maximum of present fair market value.		
Option 2: Maintain valuation cap but allow the Planning Commission to authorize additional alterations if specific findings can be made.		
Option 3: Remove valuation cap for structural alterations to non-conforming structures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-conforming structures may be rebuilt with the approval of a non-conforming permit issued by the Planning Commission. To approve a non-conforming permit, the Planning Commission must make a finding that the existing non-conforming structure does not have a negative impact on adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public. Alterations to non-conforming structure may not increase the degree of non-conformity. Any addition to a non-conforming structure would be required comply with all development standards of the zone. 	X	X
Option 4: Change building valuation cap to a percentage of square footage calculation.		
Option 5: Maintain the existing 80% threshold with new exception for historic resources.		
Notes: <u>Historic structures that do not comply with height, setbacks, floor area ratio, or parking standards may be reconstructed with the existing non-conformity as long as the structure is not modified or enlarged and the property exists in its entirety within the property lines of the site.</u>		X

The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in underlined in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.

	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 8: Non-Conforming Uses (Continued)		
B. Non-conforming activities and structures on improved R-1 parcels. (Page 22)		
Option 1: Maintain existing sunset clause and opportunity to apply for extension. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require upgrades to mitigate impacts. • Extensions are issued for 25 years maximum. • Applicant must agree to participate in a future assessment district to mitigate impacts of multifamily. <u>Confirm with City attorney that this condition is legal.</u> • Update code to include that the extension is publicly noticed and notice is sent to neighbor within 300 feet. 	X	X
Option 2: Modify regulations to allow non-conforming multi-family uses to remain throughout the City, but not intensify.		
Option 3: Modify regulations to allow non-conforming multi-family uses to remain in targeted areas of the City.		
Option 4: Rezone areas with existing non-conforming multi-family uses to a multi-family zone. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezone condominiums at Opal Cliff East and West to multi-family. • Rezone affordable housing development behind Coastal Life Church on Monterey Avenue to multi-family. 	X	X
Option 5: Create an incentive program to allow participating non-conforming property owners to retain their uses subject to providing specified public benefits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City to work with City Architect to create design solutions to front facades and parking for typical four-plex. • <u>Create incentives for applicants to apply for extension and improve their property prior to sunset clause.</u> • <u>Create a list of options for improvements that create more certainty within the extension process.</u> 	X	X
Notes:		

1240		
<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 9: Secondary Dwelling Units (Page 24) PC June 22, 2015 and CC October 27, 2015		
Option 1: Maintain existing code allowances/limitations for secondary dwelling units.		
Option 2: Amend the code to encourage development of additional secondary dwelling units.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate the current residency requirement and allow both the primary and secondary dwellings to be rented. • <u>Allow secondary dwelling units to be built at the reduced setbacks for accessory structures (4' from rear property line) with reduced height limit (12' maximum). Administrative permit. The City Council was split on the decreased setback for secondary structure to 4'. Request to re-evaluate within draft ordinance.</u> • Create opportunity for secondary dwelling units above a garage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must comply with all development standards. • No decreased setbacks for attached garage with second story. • Require approval by Planning Commission. <u>City Council request to reevaluate permitting process for secondary units above garage within draft ordinance.</u> 	X	X
Option 3: Amend the code to encourage development of additional secondary dwelling units in specific areas of the City only.		
Notes:		

1240

The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in underlined in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.

	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 10: Permits and Approvals (Page 24) <u>PC and CC review on 4/30/2015</u>		
Option 1: No change to existing permits.		
Option 2: Modify permits. With this option staff will look for opportunities to combine, delete, and add permits in the zoning code to better meet the city’s needs. Possible changes include the following:		
a. Create a new Administrative Permit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create administrative permit for a wide range of existing, ministerial staff-level actions. • Include: fence permits, temporary sign permits, approvals of temporary sidewalk/parking lot sales, and temporary storage. 	X	X
b. Create a new Minor Use Permit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new minor use permit will be created similar to a Conditional Use Permit except that it will be approved by Community Development Director. • Notice will be mailed to neighbors prior to final action by Community Development Director and decisions could be appealed to Planning Commission. • The Director could also choose to refer applications to Planning Commission for decision. • Include: home occupancy permit and transient occupancy permits. 	X	X
c. Create a New Substantial Conformance Process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A substantial conformance process will be developed to allow administrative approval of specified minor alterations while still requiring Planning Commission consideration of more substantive changes. 	X	X
Notes:		

1240

The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in underlined in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.

	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 11: Architecture and Site Review (Page 25) PC review 6/22/2015		
A. Authority of Architecture and Site Review Committee (Page 25)		
Option 1: Maintain existing authority of Architecture and Site Committee.		
Option 2: Modify existing role of the Architecture and Site Committee.		
Option 3: Eliminate the Architecture and Site Committee.		
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Replace/Rename</u> the Arch & Site committee to reflect function as development review committee. • Function: review applications and make preliminary recommendations to applicant prior to Planning Commission review. 	X	X
B. Timing of Design Permit Review (Page 26)		PENDING
Option 1: Maintain existing timing of Architecture and Site Review.	X	X
Option 2: Repurpose the committee to be a pre-design committee.		
Notes:		
C. Composition of Architecture and Site Committee (Page 26)		PENDING
Option 1: Maintain the existing composition of the Architecture and Site Committee.		
Option 2: Replace the committee with a City Architect.		
Option 3: Replace committee with an Architectural Peer review committee.		
Option 4: Revise committee as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All positions on committee to be either staff or contracted long term consultant on as-needed basis. • <u>City to contract Architect to review substantial projects. Threshold for “substantial” to be determined.</u> • <u>City to continue requiring review of historic modifications by contracted Architectural Historian outside of Arch and Site committee.</u> • Committee to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Architect (Contracted Consultant) <u>for substantial projects.</u> ○ Landscape Architect (Appointed) ○ <u>Historian</u> (Appointed) ○ Staff Planner, Public Works, and Building representatives. 	X	X
Notes:		

1240

<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 12: Design Permits (Page 27) PC and CC review on 4/30/2015		
A. When a Design Permit is Required – Commercial Uses (Page 27)		
Option 1: Maintain existing thresholds.		
Option 2: Require Design Permits only for Exterior Modifications. With this option, a design permit would be required to establish a new use only with an exterior modification to the structure. All other commercial design permit thresholds would remain the same.		
Option 3: Require Design Permit only for Larger Projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design permit thresholds will be created to allow minor modifications to commercial buildings without requiring review by Arch and Site and Planning Commission. 	X	X
Notes:		
B. Design Permit Approval Authority – Commercial Use (Page 27) PC and CC review on 4/30/2015		
Option 1: Maintain existing review authority.		
Option 2: Delegate limited approval authority to the Director. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Director will be given the authority to approve the following types of commercial projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Minor repairs, changes and improvement to existing structures which use similar, compatible or upgraded quality building materials. ○ Additions not visible from the front façade up to a specified square-footage threshold. ○ Expansion of one tenant space into a second tenant space in a multi-tenant building. ○ Accessory structures including garbage and recycling enclosures. 	X	X
Notes:		
C. When a Design Permit is Required – Residential Uses (Page 28) PC and CC review on 4/30/2015		
Option 1: Maintain existing thresholds.		
Option 2: Modify threshold for residential design permits, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow first story additions (unlimited) that are located on the back of an existing home and comply with all standards of the code. • Allow minor additions to the front of a building that upgrade the front façade and comply with all standards of the code. Minor additions could include enclosing recessed entrances, enclosing open front porches, and installation of bay windows. 	X	X

1240

<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
D. Design Permit Approval Authority – Residential Use (Page 29) PC and CC review on 4/30/2015		
Option 1: Maintain existing review authority.		
Option 2: Delegate limited approval authority to the Director <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish new thresholds for administrative approval by Community Development Director 	X	X
Notes:		
Issue 12: Design Permits (continued)		
E. Consideration for Design Permit Approval (Page 29) PC and CC review on 4/30/2015		
Option 1: Maintain existing architecture and site considerations.		
Option 2: Maintain the existing architecture and site considerations with additional considerations focused on design, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include massing, height, scale, articulation, neighborhood compatibility, privacy, quality exterior materials. 	X	X
Option 3: Update design considerations to focus on design rather than including ancillary issues.		
Notes:		
Issue 13: Planned Development (Page 30) PC review on 6/22/2015		PENDING
Option 1: Maintain existing regulations.		
Option 2: Reduce or eliminate minimum parcel size requirement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Eliminate minimum parcel size requirement.</u> <u>Exclude PD from Single-Family zone.</u> 		X
Option 3: Modify approval process.		
Option 4: Eliminate PD. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City is largely built out and little opportunity exists for PD. <u>Existing zoning results in more compatible development</u> 	X	
Notes:		

1240

The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in underlined in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.

Direction

PC

CC

Issue 14: Environmental and Hazard Overlays (Page 30) **PC and CC review on 4/30/2015**

Option 1: Maintain existing overlays and clarify boundaries.

Option 2: Modify existing overlays. This option would modify existing overlays as described below:

- **Archaeological/Paleontological Resources (APR).** Eliminate this overlay zone. Continue to require the preparation of an archaeological survey report and mitigation plan for any project which disturbs native soils in an area with a probability of containing archaeological resources. Continue to address issue through CEQA process.
- **Automatic Review (AR).** Remove this overlay zone as it duplicates current process.
- **Coastal Zone (CZ).** Maintain this overlay zone as required by State law.
- **Floodplain (F).** Move existing Chapter 17.50 (Floodplain District) out of the zoning code and remove the floodplain overlay boundaries from the zoning map. Floodplain regulations are administered by the Building Official, not the Community Development Director, and should be located in Title 15 (Buildings and Construction), not the zoning code. The boundaries of this overlay should not be included in the zoning map, as they are based on FIRM maps which are frequently changing, particularly with rising seas.
- **Geological Hazards (GH).** Eliminate this overlay zone and replace with citywide standards for proposed development in beach areas, bluff and cliff areas, landslides-prone areas, and steep slope areas
- **Chapter 17.95 (Environmentally Sensitive Habitats).** Map boundaries of these areas as a new overlay zone and maintain existing regulations.

Option 3: Create a new, consolidated environmental/hazards overlay. This option would merge the overlays into one new environmental/hazards overlay. The zoning code would state that proposed development within these areas could be subject to additional standards and limitations. The Coastal Zone overlay would remain as a separate overlay. This option could be combined with the creation of new citywide standards that would address geological hazards, flood hazards, sensitive habitat, and archaeological/paleontological resources.

Notes: Staff to Simplify the overlays utilizing the best approach. Likely option 2, but top concern is simplicity for applicants and administration.

Hybrid

Hybrid

The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in underlined in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.

Issue 15: Visitor-Serving Uses on Depot Hill (Page 31) PC on 5/21/2015 and CC on 10/26/2015

Option 1: Maintain existing permitted uses.

Option 2: Modify permitted use in Land Use table for Monarch Cove property in VS Zone.

- Land uses to be modified as follows:

- A. Accessory structures and accessory uses appurtenant to any conditionally allowed use;
- B. Hotels, motels, hostels, inns; bed and breakfast lodging;
- C. Food service related to lodging;
- D. Assemblages of people, such as festivals, not exceeding ten days and not involving construction of permanent facilities;
- E. Accessory structures and uses established prior to establishment of main use or structure;
- F. Habitat restoration; habitat interpretive facility;
- ~~G. Live entertainment;~~
- H. Public paths;
- ~~I. Business establishments that provide commercial places of amusement or recreation, live entertainment, or service of alcoholic beverages and that are located within two hundred feet of the boundary of a residential district;~~
- J. Weddings;
- K. Business establishments that sell or dispense alcoholic beverages for consumption upon the premises;
- ~~L. Other visitor-serving uses of a similar character, density, and intensity as those listed in this section and determined by the planning commission to be consistent and compatible with the intent of this chapter and the applicable land use plan;~~
- M. Offices and limited retail use, accessory to visitor-serving uses;
- N. One caretaker unit for the purpose of providing on-site security;
- O. Access roadway;
- P. Residential use by the owners and their family members of up to one unit per parcel on the three parcels, as long as a minimum of six guest bedrooms are available for visitor-serving use within the three parcels;
- ~~Q. Non-family residential use during the off-season months (November through April). (Ord. 886 § 3, 2005)~~
- R. Add multi-family as a CUP.

Option 3: Limit intensity of visitor accommodation uses.

Option 4: ~~Rezone to R-1.~~

- VS/R-1 on El Salto and Monarch Cove Property
- Dedicated Coastal Access path along bluff.
- Eliminate VS zoning on the El Salto property
- Eliminate Automatic Review from the parcels to the East of the El Salto property.
- The General Plan must be amended to reflect this direction.

Notes:

Direction

PC

CC

PENDING

X

X

X

X

1240

<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 16: Height (Page 32)		PENDING
A. Residential Neighborhoods (Page 32) PC review on 5/21/2015 and 7/20/2015 CC 10.19.2015		
Option 1: Maintain existing standards.		
Option 2: Eliminate 27-foot exception. This option would eliminate the 27-foot height exception by requiring all buildings to meet either a 25-foot or 27-foot height standard.		
Option 3: Allow greater variation based on existing neighborhood character. This option would allow greater variation in permitted building height based on neighborhood characteristics. There are a number of different ways to achieve this as described in Issue #1.		
Notes: During the 5/21/2015 meeting, the Planning Commission requested this item be brought back during the future neighborhood character (Issue 1) discussion. The following is the direction provided at 7/20/2015 Planning Commission meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 25 feet height limit ○ 27 feet height exception for the following circumstances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Addition to historic structures that is designed to match the roof pitch of the historic structure within the area of new addition. ● Lots greater than 6,000 sf in size ● Lots with width 60 feet wide or more. ● Lots on a steep slope. Steep slope is defined as a lot having a slope of 25% or greater. ● <u>Max plate height of structure does not exceed 22 feet.</u> 	X	X
B. Capitola Village (Page 33) PC review on 5/21/2015 CC 10/19/2015		
Option 1: Maintain existing standard. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Maintain existing height limit of 27 feet in the Central Village</u> ● <u>Include exception up to 31 feet for non-habitable space such as elevator, architectural features, and roof designs with architectural interest.</u> Current exception §17.81.070. ● <u>Show examples of architectural features in code (cupolas, turrets, chimneys, etc.)</u> 	X	X
Option 2: Expand exception provisions.		
Option 3: Increase maximum height limit to accommodate 3 stories.		
Notes:		

1240

The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in underlined in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.

	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 16: Height (continued) <u>PC review on 5/21/2015</u> <u>CC on 10.19.2015</u>		PENDING
C. Hotel (Page 33)		
Option 1: Apply CV Zone Standard to Hotel.		
Option 2: Establish Performance Qualitative Standard for Hotel Height tied to General Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Future height of hotel must be aligned with the guidance in the General Plan</u> • <u>A future hotel on the unique parcel should not be tied to specific height standards.</u> • <u>Flexibility in the code is necessary to allow articulation, stepping, etc.</u> 	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Option 3: Establish a Numerical Standard Unique to Hotel.		

1240		
<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
Issue 17: Floor Area Ratio (Page 34) <u>PC 4/30/2015</u> ; <u>CC review on 4/30/2015 and 10/19/2015</u>		PENDING
A. Decks (Page 35)		
Option 1: Maintain existing standards.		
Option 2: Increase allowance beyond 150 sf.		
Option 3: Add exception for special circumstances.		
New Option: Remove decks from FAR Calculation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledged that deck regulations do not belong in the FAR standards. Decks should be included in the updated design permit thresholds and residential development standards. • Decks on the front of a home are exempt from a design permit and may be approved administratively. • Decks on the rear of a home may be approved administratively if it complies with new development standards including location/separation standards, size limitation, height (no higher than finished floor of second story) and is accessed through bedroom. • Rooftop decks and decks that do not comply with the administrative permit development standards require a design permit with Planning Commission approval. • Remove decks on restaurants and hotels from the floor area calculation. Include decks associated with bar/restaurant toward parking calc. • <u>Clarify staircase requirement in code.</u> • <u>Lots less than 3000 sf: exception up to 250 sf for enclosed garage.</u> 	X	X
Issue 17: Floor Area Ratio (Continued) <u>PC on 4/30/2015 and CC direction on 4/30/2015 and 10/19/2015</u>		
B. Basements (Page 35)		PENDING
Option 1: Maintain existing standards.		
Option 2: Increase existing allowance beyond 250 square feet.		
Option 3: Remove basements from FAR formula. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Include area of basement in parking requirement.</u> • <u>Basements on slopes that are visible from exterior and not located below natural grade on all 4 sides count toward FAR .</u> • <u>Basements that are not visible and are located below natural grade on 4 sides should not count toward FAR.</u> 	X	X

1240

<i>The Planning Commission direction in light blue. City Council additional direction in <u>underlined</u> in dark blue. If there is an X under the CC column but no dark blue, the City Council made no modifications to the PC recommendation.</i>	Direction	
	PC	CC
Phantom Floors, Roof Eaves, and Window Projections (Bay Windows) (Page 36) <u>PC on 4/30/2015 and CC direction on 4/30/2015 and 10/19/2015</u>		
Option 1: Maintain existing standards.		
Option 2: Remove phantom floors from the FAR calculation.		
Option 3: Remove roof eaves from the FAR calculation.		
Option 4: Remove window projects from FAR calculation.		
Option 5: Remove a combination of phantom floors, roof eaves, and/or window projections from the FAR calculation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Keep phantom floors in FAR calculation</u> • <u>Add dimensions to maximum size for Bay Windows</u> 	X	X
Issue 18: City Council Appeal of Planning Commission Decision (Page 36) <u>PC review on 6/22/2015</u>		PENDING
Option 1: Maintain existing appeal process.		
Option 2: Add “call-up” procedure with 2 Council member support requirement to hear a call-up an application. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council member may initiate review of any decision or action of the Planning Commission by giving notice to the City Clerk within appeal period. • City Clerk places “call-up” vote on next regularly scheduled meeting. • During next regularly scheduled meeting, Council member provides reasoning for “call-up” of Planning Commission decision. 2 Council members must vote in support of hearing “call-up” • <u>If supported by 2 members, City Clerk schedules review of Planning Commission decision.</u> 	X	Removed from Zoning Code issues.
Option 3: Add “call-up” procedure and require majority vote by City Council to call-up an application.		