

# **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (RDCS) 2015 COMPETITION EVALUATION OF PROJECTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2017-2018 ALLOTMENT**

November 10, 2015

Page 1 of 5

## **BACKGROUND**

The Planning Commission reviewed the RDCS applications at the October 27, 2015 meeting. Changes to the project narratives and point adjustments as directed by the Planning Commission are reflected in Attachment 1.

## **Supplemental Information**

While the RDCS process does not generally allow applicants to modify their project applications following the initial submittal deadline, in some situations the Planning Commission may request additional information if they think it warranted to clarify some specific characteristic of the project. The Planning Commission requested additional information related to two projects, MC-15-12 (Jarvis-Mwest) and MC-15-14 (Monterey-UHC)

The Planning Commission requested staff to re-evaluate point opportunities for MC-15-12 (Jarvis-Mwest) within the Parks and Paths, Housing Needs and Livable Communities categories based upon the applicant's clarification of project design elements. Staff has evaluated the questions posed by the developer and the Commission and recommends an additional point adjustment of three points within the Parks and Paths category and two points within the Housing Needs category, as further explained in Attachment 1. After the requested reevaluation, staff does not however recommend an adjustment to the scoring for Livable Communities Section B.6. To qualify for points within this category, the project must meet all of the listed criteria. The applicant states that all the units have balconies/patios, but such an element is not discernible on the project plans. The applicant has committed to meet this requirement. Criteria C however has not been met; this criteria requires the use of architecture, profiles and massing that is compatible and works with the existing surrounding neighborhood. The project does not include design measures that would address this requirement. The adjacent project is 2.5-3 stories and has been highly articulated to avoid the appearance as one building, with each unit given unique architectural treatment and identity through an individual entry. That is not the case with the subject project. The proposed project could have included greater variation in massing and architectural detail, elements with reduced scale and multiple front doors to better address the architecture of the adjacent development. The plans and elevations provided in general do not demonstrate the level of building articulation called for by City policies. Staff anticipates that the applicant will need to work with staff to improve the project architecture including scale, massing, articulation and layout. Staff is not recommending the three points within this category.

The Planning Commission questioned the parking ratio provided for the UHC project. UHC has provided a detailed letter explaining the parking for the project (Attachment 2).

The project narratives have been updated and the revised scores are provided in the Part 2 Summary Table (Attachment 3).

## **Applicant Requests for Reconsideration**

Following the Planning Commission preliminary scoring of October 27, 2015, requests were made by the applicant's of MC-15-05 and MC-15-13 for reconsideration of point opportunities.

# **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (RDCS) 2015 COMPETITION EVALUATION OF PROJECTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2017-2018 ALLOTMENT**

November 10, 2015

Page 2 of 5

1. **MC-15-05 Cochrane-Borello:** The applicant has provided a letter from the Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD) requesting reconsideration of the scoring within Sections B.3.a and B.3.b within the Public Schools category (Attachment 4).

On October 6, 2015, the Board of Trustees of the Morgan Hill Unified School District voted 7-0 to approve the Donation Agreement to be entered into between the District and Lupine Investors as well as the District and the Borello family for the Peet Road Site. A final Agreement has not yet been fully executed, but is anticipated.

The District recognizes that the Agreement with Lupine Investors and the Borello Family was not completed prior to the posting of the listing of schools for the RCDS Competition Process, but are requesting the award at this time.

The MHUSD was actively involved in the process of developing the Schools category language for the RDCS Standards and Criteria for 2015, which was set prior to the competition. The criteria cannot be changed once the competition has begun. The criteria is clear that "For scoring purposes, the anticipated attendance area for an existing or planned school shall be as determined by the Board of Education and published by MHUSD prior to May 1 of the calendar year for each competition. A planned school is defined as a site designated by the MHUSD Board for a future school prior to May 1 of the calendar year the competition is held." As of May 1, this criteria had not been met. Accordingly staff recommends that the project not be awarded the requested points.

2. **MC-15-13 Lantana-Standard Pacific:** The applicant would like reconsideration of Sections B.1.b and B.3.c within the Lot Layout and Orientation category. On September 2, 2015, the City Council approved the adoption of an ordinance for the Standard Pacific Planned Development re-zone application. At the same hearing, the City Council also approved an ordinance to add Standards for Medium-Density Residential Development within the Zoning Code. Review of several applications for zoning consistency in this year's RDCS depended upon the latter Standards. Similarly, the subject project depended upon approval of the Planned Development zoning to proceed. The subject application was found consistent with both the General Plan and zoning based on the hearing held by the City Council on September 2, 2015. The applicant has noted that they were diligently working towards approval of the zoning and that they experienced delays in their entitlement process outside of their control

The Planning Commission has determined that projects within approved Planned Development zoning districts should be awarded certain points if the project was previously awarded the equivalent point in its prior and initial competition. Staff has confirmed that in 2013 and 2014, the project was awarded points within the requested sections and that the project should be awarded the requested point adjustments to be consistent with the Planning Commission determination and the City's practice of basing zoning consistency using the zoning approved during the City's initial review period. Based on the point adjustments made by the Planning Commission on October 27, 2015

## **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (RDCS) 2015 COMPETITION EVALUATION OF PROJECTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2017-2018 ALLOTMENT**

November 10, 2015

Page 3 of 5

to other projects with approved Planned Developments, and prior point awards, the requested point adjustments should be made.

### **Livable Communities - Project Excellence**

Prior to adjusting the final score for each project narrative, the Planning Commission may award points for overall project excellence within the Livable Communities Category. Two points can be awarded by a super majority of the voting members of the Commission or one point when awarded by a majority of the voting members.

The Planning Commission adjusted score from the October 27, 2015 meeting, information regarding developer performance and prior project excellence scores (if available) are summarized below. The Planning Commission adjusted score would be revised following the award of the project excellence point(s).

#### **A. Open Market**

1. **MC-15-05 Cochrane-Borello:** The applicant is requesting 39 allotments. This is a first time developer, who is not familiar with the development process and who has lost 80 allotments that were awarded for the first phase of this project. The project engineer has continued to provide complete and accurate plans. The Planning Commission project excellence score from the 2014 RDCS competition was 2. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 168.**
2. **MC-15-06 Laurel-DeRose:** The applicant is requesting 30 building allotments for FY 2017/18 and 30 building allotments for FY 2018/19, for the final phase of the project. The developer is experienced, has taken initiative to obtain City input on the project and has been responsive to the City's requests. The Planning Commission project excellence score from the 2014 RDCS competition was 0. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 174.**
3. **MC-15-13 Lantana-Standard Pacific:** The applicant is requesting 36 building allotments for FY 2017/18 and 28 building allotments for FY 2018/19. Standard Pacific is an experienced developer within the City. The developer knows the City's development process and is responsive to the City's requests. The Planning Commission project excellence score from the 2014 RDCS competition was 0. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 171 (without the request above).**
4. **MC-15-15:Butterfield-MH Butterfield:** The applicant is requesting 37 building allotments for FY 2017/2018 to complete the project. This is an experienced local developer within the City. The developer knows the City's development process and is responsive to the City's requests. The Planning Commission project excellence score from the 2013 RDCS competition was 0. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 180.**

# **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (RDCS) 2015 COMPETITION EVALUATION OF PROJECTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2017-2018 ALLOTMENT**

November 10, 2015

Page 4 of 5

5. **MC-15-16:E. Dunne-Mana:** The applicant is requesting 16 building allotments for FY 2017/18 and 16 building allotments for FY 2018/19 to complete the project. The City has some experience with the applicant on a recent project; however, the applicant is not a developer. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 175.5.**
6. **MC-15-17: San Pedro-Presidio:** The applicant is requesting 30 building allotments for FY 2017/18, 30 building allotments for FY 2018/2019 and 19 building allotment for FY 2019/20. The City has some experience with the applicant on a recent project; however, the applicant is not a developer. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 179.**

## **D. Small Projects**

7. **MC-15-10: Walnut Grove-Newland:** The applicant is requesting nine building allotments for FY 2017/18. The developer has some experience with the City. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 165.5.**
8. **MC-15-11 San Pedro-Presidio Mana:** The applicant is requesting five building allotments for FY 2017/18 to allow full build-out of the project. The City has some experience with the applicant on a recent project; however, the applicant is not a developer. The Planning Commission project excellence score from the 2004 RDCS competition was 0. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 179.5.**

## **B. Affordable Set-Aside**

9. **MC-15-14 Monterey-UHC:** The applicant is requesting 32 building allotments for FY 2017/18. The performance history with this developer has been good. They are an experienced affordable housing developer. The Planning Commission project excellence score from the 2014 RDCS competition was 0. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 162.**

## **E. Large Multi-Family**

10. **MC-15-12:Jarvis-MWest:** The applicant is requesting 166 residential building allotments for FY 2017/18 and FY 2018/19. This developer has not processed projects within the City.  
**Planning Officer preliminary score was 140.5**  
**Planning Commission adjusted score is 141.5.**

**This project does not qualify for the RDCS competition, as it does not meet the minimum score of 160 points.**

11. **MC-15-18: San Pedro-Presidio:** The applicant is requesting 80 residential building allotments for FY 2017/18 and 80 residential allotments for FY 2018/19.

# **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (RDSCS) 2015 COMPETITION EVALUATION OF PROJECTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2017-2018 ALLOTMENT**

November 10, 2015

Page 5 of 5

The City has some experience with the applicant on a recent project; however, the applicant is not a developer. **The Planning Commission adjusted score is 173.5.**

## **CONCLUSION**

Following award of Livable Communities project excellence point(s), a final score will be assigned to each application and the Planning Commission will adopt a resolution with the final scores. In accordance with Section 18.78.130 of the Morgan Hill Municipal Code, an applicant may appeal the final scoring to the City Council within 15 days after notice of final evaluations. In addition, all City Departments and the Morgan Hill Unified School District are to be notified of the final evaluations. Any appeal filed would be heard at the December 16, 2015 City Council meeting.

## **Attachments:**

1. RDSCS Scores and Comments
2. UHC- Parking Ratio letter
3. Part 2-Point Score Summary
4. Morgan Hill Unified School District Letter - October 28, 2015
5. Planning Commission Resolution