

File No.		Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
MMC-15-05		Cochrane-Borello				175.5	165	168	
		Public Schools B.3.a	Applicant is currently in confidential negotiations with the School District for the Development of a School on the adjacent parcel which is within ¾ of a miles of project. One point is requested.		Staff: The District is finalizing the negotiations with Lupine Investors for the Borello site on Peet Road-MHUSD. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded. Note: 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. <u>This site was not identified by the MHUSD prior to May 1.</u>	1	0	0	
		Public Schools B.3.b	Applicant is currently in confidential negotiations with the School District for the Development of a School on the adjacent parcel which is within ¾ of a miles of project. One point is requested.		Staff: The District is finalizing the negotiations with Lupine Investors for the Borello site on Peet Road-MHUSD. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded. Note: 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. <u>This site was not identified by the MHUSD prior to May 1.</u>	1	0	0	
		Orderly and Contiguous B.2	Project is located within 115% of the response standard for a second fire station. Request 0.5 additional points.		Staff: The Fire Department has reviewed the response time and determined that the project is not located within 115% of the response standard for a second fire station. This is the same response standard award in last years score. (In 2013 it was noted that the project was located within the response time of one fire station but for consistency purposes the project would be awarded 2 points for that year only because the applicant was not aware of the response time change). No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	4.5	4	0	
		Parks and Paths B.3		Bicycle paths - Is the applicant committing to installing bike paths within the development? These bike paths are not obvious on the site maps?	Staff: Bicycle paths installed should be on public streets outside of the development. Planning Commission 0 points awarded.	1	1	0	
		Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.a	The San Sebastian project has received all of its discretionary Design Review and PD approvals. The project complies to the entitlements received. The new criteria essentially would require complete and total redesign. Past precedent in particular essentially grandfathered projects, such as R1-4500. This project should be treated the same way. This new criteria unfairly punishes projects that have received entitlements and completed extensive design work. One point requested.		Staff: The zoning is R-1 12,000-PD. The project required deviations from the base zoning district thus requiring PD approval. The PD zone is an overlay district. The general provisions of the PD overlay district allow for variations from the standard provisions of the code. The project does not comply with the base zone district which is a requirement of RDCS, which is not a new requirement. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
		Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.b	The San Sebastian project has received all of its discretionary Design Review and PD approvals. The project complies to the entitlements received. The new criteria essentially would require complete and total redesign. Past precedent in particular essentially grandfathered projects, such as R1-4500. This project should be treated the same way. This new criteria unfairly punishes projects that have received entitlements and completed extensive design work. One point requested.		Staff: The project does not comply with the minimum side yard setbacks (base zone district), nor does it provide 20 percent in excess of the minimum required for all lots. In particular, detached garages do not comply with the 20 percent requirement. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 1 point awarded due to previous scoring and PD approval.	1	0	1	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.a	The San Sebastian project has received all of its discretionary Design Review and PD approvals. The project complies to the entitlements received. The new criteria essentially would require complete and total redesign. Past precedent in particular essentially grandfathered projects, such as R1-4500. This project should be treated the same way. This new criteria unfairly punishes projects that have received entitlements and completed extensive design work. One point requested.		Staff: The PD zone is an overlay district. The general provisions of the PD overlay district allow for variations from the standard provisions of the code. The minimum zone district setback along with a minimum five-foot front setback variation for adjoining units for single-family dwellings is required. The project does not comply with this requirement for all units within the project. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 1 point awarded due to previous scoring and PD approval.	1	0	1	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.b	The San Sebastian project has received all of its discretionary Design Review and PD approvals. The project complies to the entitlements received. The new criteria essentially would require complete and total redesign. Past precedent in particular essentially grandfathered projects, such as R1-4500. This project should be treated the same way. This new criteria unfairly punishes projects that have received entitlements and completed extensive design work. One point requested.		Staff: The PD zone is an overlay district. The general provisions of the PD overlay district allow for variations from the standard provisions of the code. The minimum zone district setback along with a minimum five-foot rear setback variation for single-family dwellings is required. The project does not comply with this requirement for all units within the project. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 1 point awarded due to previous scoring and PD approval.	1	0	1	
	Circulation Efficiency B.1.a	Project has committed to the full realignment and extension of Peet Road and Arterial street per the City of Morgan Hill's General Plan. Project conforms to criteria. Two points requested.		Staff: The criteria states that the project provides one or more stubs or other improvement internal to the project. Peet Road is an existing street that is outside the project boundary. Furthermore, the realignment work will be done utilizing Measure C funds from the project. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
	Livable Communities B.2	Criteria does not state that the project can only receive two points if it commits to a bus shelter and a reinforced street section. The project committed to two improvements. Bus Shelter and Bus Pull out area under the premise it would receive two points. Applicant agree to two improvements outlined in the criteria. Two points requested.		Staff: This project has consistently received one point within this category for the improvements proposed. The VTA letter (Aug. 2, 2012) accepts a new bus duck out, concrete bus pad, and concrete boarding area per VTA specifications at the bus stop at eastbound Main Street opposite Live Oak High School. This qualifies for one point. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	1	0	
	Livable Communities B.1	In 2008, a majority of the Planning Commission determined this project was a Superior project by a vote of 3-1. Since then the project has been redesigned to achieve a super majority vote from the Planning Commission and be awarded 2 points. Comments received from the November 11, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting have been specifically incorporated to obtain the super majority vote for a superior project. Staff awarded 2 points in Circulation Efficiency in the 2011 Prescore Application and deemed the project Superior. Staff awarded 2 Points for a Superior Project in 2013. In 2014 Staff awarded the project as the only Superior Project in the competition. The applicant is requesting 2 points.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received 7 points. The Planning Commission Award is ____ Points.		N/A		
MC-15-06	Laurel-De Rose				176	174	174	

File No.		Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
		Circulation Efficiency B.2.c	Perpendicular parking has been replaced with parallel parking (based on staff comments). In making this change, the amount of curb-adjacent sidewalk increased. Unfortunately, this change negatively affected the RDCS scoring by one point. When considering the total length of sidewalk adjacent to curb or planting strips (2,500 feet), only 650 feet is not adjacent to a 5 foot planting strip. Sidewalks adjacent to a 5 foot planting strip represent three-quarters of the available length within the project. Request 1.5 points.		Staff: Given the proposed sidewalk configuration, the project does not meet the criteria for this category. However, in consultation with the Planning Director is was decided that a point should be awarded in recognition of the continuous detached sidewalk proposed by the project along the outside of the proposed private street/drive. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	1	0	
		Livable Communities B.1	Planning Commission Point Requested		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received 7 points. The Planning Commission Award is ____ Points.		N/A		
MC-15-10	Walnut-Grove-Newland					179.5	161.5	165.5	
		Public Schools B.3.d	Unlike all the other scoring in this section, Subsection (d) does not have street or railroad crossing restrictions since this subsection relates to high school students. The path to Live Oak High School has sidewalks or walking paths/bike paths along the entire approx. one (1) mile stretch. (See attached map). The City has developed a safe pathway along the north side of Main Avenue between Condit Avenue and Live Oak High School in recent years to promote walking from our direction. The available path of travel should be considered a "safe route" for high school students either walking or biking to school. Previous years' RDCS competitions have also evaluated this section in this manner. In the 2012-2013 RDCS competition, Planning Commission confirmed that the analysis for a "safe route" for the high schools is a different analysis than the strict one for the younger schools. The text of the criteria has not been altered in the interim. Applicant believes the two (2) points should be awarded in this category.		Staff: A safe route is defined as continuous sidewalks and/or paved pedestrian pathways cross walks and traffic signals at designated street intersections between the project and a school site. Main Avenue is not fully paved and has dirt pathways for a section before the overpass over 101. This section does not specify giving points for just being within 1 1/2 miles of a high school. High school students could walk in some of the areas however that is not what Section 3 states. Perhaps the high school section for points should be under its own section specifying that the development only has to be within 1 1/2 miles only. Planning Commission 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
		Orderly and Contiguous B.4	The City zoning map shows the entire property located within the Diana Estates RPO. During the Church's processing of the entitlements on the Property, the City's Planning Commission's resolutions state the property is in an "R-1 (9000)/RPD Zoning District". Our associate was also previously told by Steve Maxey, a City Planner, that the Property was part of the Diana Estates RPO. Additionally, Walnut Grove Drive was built as part of the original RPD and provided sewer and other utility connections to allow for the future development of our Parcel and adjacent parcel to the south. Applicant should be awarded one (1) point in the category.		Staff: The property is not located within the Diana Estates PD. As Identified by the Ordinance, the rezone clearly identifies the properties included in the Diana Estates PD and the project site was not a part of the project. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Orderly and Contiguous B.5	Applicant designed the project to correct and mitigate sound and air quality issues which plagued the neighboring tract. After submittal, City Staff initially informed us that our development would not be permitted by the air quality district to be located adjacent to Hwy 101 due to air quality concerns. This fact was not correct. Applicant discussed multiple site plan alternatives with our environmental consultant during the planning process and were advised that the design incorporating a road buffer between the development and Hwy 101 was a superior design to mitigate potential air and noise quality issues, which were the only issues Staff has pointed to as being problematic with Applicant's plan. Also, Staff's response indicates that the road adjacent to Hwy 101 is a "necessity" when there was in fact an alternative, inferior design from an air and noise mitigation perspective that would have included a road in the center of the tract with backyards facing Hwy 101. This alternative design can be seen in the residential subdivision directly north of the subject property. In that development the backyards abut the highway and secondary sound walls were required to be added in the middle of the rear yards of each home. Applicant was attempting to design the most superior design for the site. Applicant should be awarded at least one (1) point in this category.		Staff: The project did not apply for a pre-application. If the project had been reviewed prior to the RDCS competition, design concepts would have been discussed. Due to noise and air quality issues with the site being located adjacent to US 101, site design is critical. Providing a frontage road along the freeway is not a superior design feature it is a necessity do to site use. This project did not comply with the base zone district and was rejected during the initial review of the RDCS application. As originally designed, Lot No.'s 8 and 9 did not comply with the required rear setbacks for the R-1 9,000 zoning designation. In addition, Lot No.'s 8 and 9 did not meet the minimum lot depth for the designation. The City Council granted the appeal and the applicant has redesigned the project. Lot No.'s 8 and 9 remain as a duet and are dominated by garage frontage, which has been discouraged by the City. Due to the size of the lot and configuration, the duet design is limited when complying with city codes. One single family home on this lot may be better suitable. This is not an above average Master Plan. Air quality issues, while not an RDCS issue, will be a concern to be addressed during the discretionary review process. Staff believes this is a site concern. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
	Housing Needs B.1	Staff's response to Applicant's answer states that "there is no floor plan for the secondary unit." Floor plans are not required for the RDCS submittals. Applicant has committed to build two (2) secondary units. The floor plan design of those units seem out of the purview of the RDCS. Applicant plotted a detached secondary unit to demonstrate that such units can be plotted on our lots (See Lot 4 as sample) but will also have attached secondary unit plan options for each of the single family floor plan types. Depending on market demand at the time of sale, the Applicant may provide (at a minimum) one detached and one attached secondary unit, two detached secondary units or two attached secondary units. Applicant has committed to build a minimum of two secondary units and the project has sufficient lot sizes (min. 9,000SF) to accommodate this commitment. Applicant should be awarded two (2) points in this category.		Staff: The requirements do not require floor plans; however, if an applicant provides floor plans, and the commitment is not justified by the additional information that has been provided, staff does not award the points. The Site Utilization plan is a requirement, and in order to award the points, the two secondary dwelling units would have needed to be identified, as the plan does require each use to be identified. This would have included primary and secondary units, attached or detached. Planning Commission: 2 points awarded.	2	0	2	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.g	City Staff did not even score this category commensurate with an "Above Average" layout. Staff mentions noise and air quality as layout issues, but an environmental consultant was consulted during the design process and recommended that the current design was vastly superior to an alternative design which had backyards abutting Hwy 101 (see neighboring development to the north of the Project). We have also subsequently discussed our plan with the environmental consultant that was recommended by City Staff (David J. Powers & Assocs.) and he concurred with Applicant that the proposed design with a road buffering the homes from Hwy. 101 was a superior design to mitigate against potential noise and air quality issues. Even if correct about the road location, Staff only pointed to the one design flaw (location of the frontage road) which should have permitted the Project to still at least obtain one (1) point under the verbiage of the express criteria standards as an "Above Average Project." Applicant should be awarded at least one (1) point in this category.		Staff: The project did not apply for a pre-application. If the project had been reviewed prior to the RDCS competition, design concepts would have been discussed. Due to noise and air quality issues with the site being located adjacent to US 101, site design is critical. Providing a frontage road along the freeway is not a superior design feature it is a necessity do to site use. This project did not comply with the base zone district and was rejected during the initial review of the RDCS application. As originally designed, Lot No.'s 8 and 9 did not comply with the required rear setbacks for the R-1 9,000 zoning designation. In addition, Lot No.'s 8 and 9 did not meet the minimum lot depth for the designation. The City Council granted the appeal and the applicant has redesigned the project. Lot No.'s 8 and 9 remain as a duet and are dominated by garage frontage, which has been discouraged by the City. Due to the size of the lot and configuration, the duet design is limited when complying with city codes. One single family home on this lot may be better suitable. This is not an above average Master Plan. Air quality issues, while not an RDCS issue, will be a concern to be addressed during the discretionary review process. Staff believes this is a site concern. Planning Commission 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.2.b	Staff response states that creating a neighborhood watch program does not count as "another security measure" since Safety & Security is a separate section in the questionnaire. In previous RDCS competitions a neighborhood watch program would count in this criteria. It does not inform the Applicant to create a "new" or "unused" security measure and many design elements score in multiple categories. It is not clear why such a security measure would be precluded in this category. The Safety & Security Section (Sec. 18.78.310) covers almost every "security measure" that a developer could possibly design, so Applicant cannot understand what the second sentence of this criteria is requesting or how this point can be secured. Applicant should be awarded one (1) additional point in this category.		Staff: If a security measure is counted in one category, it does not get counted a second time in another category. An applicant is given credit for the measure once not twice for the same commitment. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	1	0	
	Circulation and Efficiency 1.d	Staff states that a short block, that being under 250 feet, is being created along Diana Avenue between Walnut Grove and our new street adjacent to US 101. The section measures over 270 feet long- longer than what is deemed to be a "short block." Applicant should be awarded one (1) point in this category.		Staff: The distance between the centerline of Walnut Grove Drive (north of Diana Avenue) and the centerline of the new street measures approximately 125 feet. Furthermore, the distance between the centerline of Walnut Grove Drive (south of Diana Avenue) and the centerline of the new street as it intersects Diana Avenue measures approximately 190 feet. A short block is created in either case. Additionally, the location of the new street creates an awkward intersection with Diana Avenue and Walnut Grove Drive. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Landscaping, Screening and Color B.2.c	Staff states that Applicant did not propose the location of the well so should not be awarded points. Such designation of location is not part of the criteria and has never been in the past, but Applicant has plenty of room for the well in the open space located in the northern corner of the Project (approx. 1500 square feet). Applicant should be awarded one (1) point in this category.		Staff: It would be prudent to show the location of the well, landscaping, and irrigation as the open space area is narrow and has a significant amount of underground drainage retention tanks running along the open space. This would aid in the feasibility of the well location, landscaping, and irrigation, as this could affect the functionality of the raintanks. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Livable Communities B.5	This criteria category is defined as "builds to planned densities." It appears that City Staff is reading the second sentence of the criteria as only applying to Downtown Area projects, when no such restriction applies. The first sentence only applies to "Downtown Area projects" because it explicitly states such and awards separate points (two points) for those projects. The second sentence just relates to "Projects" which have their own separate point awards (three points) which are much more stringent, than the Downtown Area. This must be the interpretation since there is no other criteria that evaluates the density of projects outside the Downtown Area. The criteria category would have indicated it only applies to Downtown Area, like other sections in the RDCS questionnaire. Applicant should be awarded three (3) points in this category.		Staff: This criteria consistently applies to downtown projects only. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	3	0	0	
	Market and Price Distribution		No unit pricing information provided.	Staff: To be discussed with applicant. Information not completed with application. This does not change point score.	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Open Space B.1.f		Staff comments state the project is 44% detached. There are 5 detached of the total 9 homes, that's 55%. The remaining attached homes account for 44% of the development. One attached home does not have private usable open space. That would be 11% of the total. Should the applicant not receive at least 1 point?	Staff: The criteria states "Provides private usable open space areas for single-family attached projects (excluding decks and balconies) for 75 percent of the project (one point) for 100 percent of the project (two points). The project does not comply. (correction made to this based on revised plans)	2	2	N/A	
	Parks and Paths B.2		Concerned that the developer is not providing privately owned and maintained on-site recreational amenities	Staff: The criteria do not require the direct provision of recreational amenities.	0	0	N/A	
	Livable Communities B.1	Planning Commission Point Requested		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received __ points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
MC-15-11	San Pedro-Presidio-Mana				186.5	176.5	179.5	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Market and Price Distribution		No unit pricing information provided.	Staff: To be discussed with applicant. Information not completed with application. This does not change point score.			N/A	
	BMR		No BMR data provided.	Staff: The project narrative did indicate that the project would reserve one unit as a BMR for low income.			N/A	
	Public Schools B.3.c		The route from this development to Britton Middle School does not appear to be a safe continuous walking route.	Staff: There is a safe walking route and students are crossing arterial streets at lighted crossings.			N/A	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.a			Planning Commission: 1 point to be awarded due to consistency with PD and previous scoring.	1	0	1	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.a			Planning Commission: 1 point to be awarded due to consistency with PD and previous scoring .	1	0	1	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.b			Planning Commission: 1 point to be awarded due to consistency with PD and previous scoring.	1	0	1	
	Safety and Security B.4.		Why was only 1 point awarded, appears applicant meets the criteria for 3 points.	Staff: Staff did award the full 3 points on this question, however, due to an error or oversight, it was not reflected in the final score. The applicant is awarded 3 points.	3	3	N/A	
	Livable Communities B.1			A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received __ points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
MC-15-12	Jarvis-Mwest				165.5	141.5		
	Parks and Paths B.2		Calculation calls for the total score to be divided by 3 (>150 units), Staff calculations divided by 8, should the score not be 8, maximum points?	Staff: The criteria require the divisor to increase by 1 for each 50 units. The correct divisor is 8 for 374 units.	8		N/A	
	Parks and Paths B.3		Applicant indicates they plan to meet this criteria by providing bike lanes in and around the development. City staff notes indicate the city will determine where the 9.35 miles of bike paths will be located. Which is correct?	Staff: The City will determine where the bike lanes will be created.	1	1	N/A	
	Lot Layout and Orientation		Concerned that a development of this size may not have ample parking, and too much open and public parking visible	Staff: The project has not been awarded points for design. Parking layout is a concern of the project, including building design. The applicant has been encouraged to work with staff on design issues.			N/A	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Natural and Environmental Features B.2		Concerned that a project of this size score so low in this category and does not make more effort to be environmentally responsible.	Staff: The overall project self-scored low. There are many point opportunities that the applicant chose not to take advantage of. This is a discussion to have with the applicant.	6	5	N/A	
	Open Space A.1.e	The City Council has discussed at length the desire to repurpose all or portions of the 7.6 acre detention basin to a public park and open space use. Although final details have not been worked out, at the direction of Council, we have discussed with Staff a number of options for the project to provide access, amenities and or funding for this purpose. The current plan shows public trails connecting from Monterey and around the rim of the open space, and provides additional access points from Butterfield and down the Sutter Extension, and from the 7' multi-use path along the Sutter Connector. The project provides an additional 1.7 ac publically accessible, active park adjacent to the open space and located off the Sutter Extension. The intent of the parties clearly meets the spirit and intent of this category.		Staff: The criteria requires that the project provide accessibility to existing or proposed public parks and open space areas outside the project boundary. <u>Points will only be awarded</u> where the relevant public agency has provided written approval to allow access between the project and the aforementioned facilities. The City has not made the commitment at this time or provided the required written approval. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Orderly and Contiguous B.3	Staff informs us that the existing approved PUD on the property (most recently applications pending for a DA and Site Plan and Arch Review on the remainder of the industrial property. We request that the Staff and Planning Commission confirm that should the DA be adopted by the Council, this will constitute "land approved for development" and we will earn these 2 points in subsequent RDCS competitions amended in 2000) does not constitute land that is approved for development. However, MWest has development applications pending for a DA and Site Plan and Arch Review on the remainder of the industrial property. We request that the staff and Planning Commission confirm that should the DA be adopted by the Council, this will constitute "land approved for development" and we will earn these 2 points in subsequent RDCS competitions.		Staff: Points for future RDCS applications cannot be committed to, as criteria may change. At this time, the project is not adjacent to 100% of developed property (or approved development) to be awarded all the points within this criteria. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	5	2	0	
	Orderly and Contiguous B.5	Site plan is certainly above average and pays special attention to transitions between residential and industrial (40 ft landscape buffer along Sutter Connector), along Jarvis (2 story facades, front yards and stoops) and provides over 5.69 acres of open space within and surrounding edges of project.		Staff: The applicant has not worked with staff to address design issues, including parking layout (site is dominated by parking and is visible from public streets). Building and massing do not transition well with the adjacent neighborhood. The building designs and articulation require refinement. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Parks and Path B.2	The project is providing a vast array of amenities. Unfortunately, we misunderstood the scoring for this category and divided by 3 instead of 8. However, we also did not list all of the amenities we were providing because we thought we had more than enough. Please see the attached list of all the project amenities. Our revised score is $69/8 = 8.60$ points. Mwest commits to provide amenities resulting in a score of 64.		Staff: The overall project self-scored low. There are many point opportunities that the applicant chose not to take advantage of. Revisiting this issue at this time, however, would be unfair to other applicants. <u>As requested by the Planning Commission and the applicant, the amenities section has been revised to provide: six shade trellis areas (12 points); four picnic/barbeque areas (4 points); an exercise room (3 points); a clubhouse (2 points); a restroom area (3 points); a separately-fenced dog park (2 points); a Jacuzzi (3 points); a swimming pool (4 points); a 1/2 scale soccer field (3 points); a 1/2 basketball court/sports court (2 points); a multi-use trail along Sutter (1 point); a par-course (2 points); 2 tot lots with a minimum of three age appropriate activities (6 points); two tree groves that will be approved by the Community Development Director (4 points); and a play climbing berm (2 points). Total 53 points /8 = 6 points</u> Planning Commission: ____?__ points awarded.	8	6		
	Parks and Path B.5	We did not give ourselves points in this category because a written agreement has not yet been reached between the City and MWest. However, we intend to request points for this category once the final details have been worked out for the dedication of land and improvements for Central Park, (which may be privately owned but open to the public), and for the conversion of all or a portion of the City's 7.6 acre detention basin to a public park and open space.		Staff: The points recommended can only reflect the reality in place at the time the application was submitted. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	0	0	0	
	Parks and path B.8	The total land dedication requirement for the project is 3.29 acres for 374 units. The project commits to meet or exceed the min. required land dedication by 50%. However, as we are not sure how the City is defining setbacks, we ask that Staff reword the comment to say that the "Applicant shall commit to exceed the park land dedication requirement by 50%. This shall not include yards, court areas, and required setbacks." We have large landscaped buffer areas with enhanced trails, but at this time we are not sure how much of these areas would be viewed as part of the setback. If this is a concern, we would appreciate the opportunity to discuss. (Please see park/open space calculations provided on sheet L-1.0.)		Staff: This request is acceptable from a staff perspective. Planning Commission: The commitment will be reworded.	4	4	N/A	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Housing Needs B.5	We apologize as we did not see a requirement to include a data table. However, we stated that the project includes 1:1 covered parking, including attached garages in each building and conveniently located, detached garages. This is indicated in both the Site Plan and the building plans included in the submittal. Thus 100% of the units will have one enclosed garage. Please also see the attached data table showing all garage and parking calculations.		Staff: Applicant requested 2 points. However, without providing the data, staff was not able to determine or verify that the two points met the criteria below at the time of evaluation, based on the information provided. In addition, new information cannot be considered after initial submittal of the RDCS application. Criteria: For multi-family rental projects, a project providing fifty percent of the units with an enclosed garage will receive one point. A project providing seventy five percent of the units with an enclosed garage will receive two points. A project providing seventy five percent of the units with an enclosed garage that is directly accessible to the living unit will receive three points. <u>Staff revisited the original application to determine the number of "enclosed" garages and counted 104 enclosed spaces. In order to receive the two points requested by the applicant (at that time), Staff would have needed information to determine that 75% of the 374 total units (280 enclosed garages) was evident in the information provided, it was not at that time. However, the applicant subsequently provided an additional data table in which they clearly indicated that 289 spaces will exist in the building garages, and 86 detached garages, totaling 375 "enclosed" garages and exceeding the 2 point criteria.</u> Planning Commission: _?_____ points awarded.	2	2		
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.e	Staff had advised us that it is difficult for MF projects to score well under the current criteria, as a large percentage only apply to SF projects. We lost several points for categories that we did not realize were only for SF projects. It would be helpful to make this more clear in the narratives in the future. This particular criteria - which seems to disregard drive aisles - is nearly impossible to meet for private MF rental communities. No driveway in our project exceeds 150 ft. All internal roads loop to a main street that leads to a public right of way. We believe we have met the spirit and intent of this criteria. Please advise on what is expected of MF projects under this category.		Staff: The project has provide all drive isles within the project exceeding 150 feet. The project does not comply with the criteria. Because the project has scored low, and the applicant is unfamiliar with RDCS scoring, a preapplication would be beneficial. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.f	Please see the supplemental letter where we provide support for this criteria. The project provides a custom designed 2/3 story building along the Jarvis frontage in deference to the opposite R-3 community, which has similar 2/3 story massing We believe we have more than met the spirit and intent of this category.		Staff: Compatible neighborhood transition not provided. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.g	Please see the supplemental letter where we provide support for this criteria. The site plan is a highly livable and walkable community with useable interior parks and open space reflecting best practices in land planning and architecture. The project respects its environmental context, neighbors, and transitions smoothly to adjacent industrial use.		Staff: The project does have design flaws that need to be addressed for it to be considered an above average or superior project. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.2.b	We apologize as we may have misunderstood this criteria. Regarding neighborhood security, our Garden community includes buildings with internal corridors, so security is inherent in the project design. Only 72 (19%) of units are on the ground level and all of these have front doors visible from ROWs or private circulation areas and pedestrian walkways. Majority of units (81%) have front doors that are accessible from inside a secure building. In addition, we have active common areas in each of 3 zones within the plan area, above standard lighting and a property manager on-site. We believe we have met the intent of this criteria to earn 2 pts.		Staff: The project does not comply with criteria. In addition, new information cannot be considered after initial submittal of the RDCS application. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.a	Presumably the intent of this criteria is to provide some variety in setbacks along streetscapes, which makes the most sense for SF projects, as a 4 or 5 foot setback variation between MF buildings of this scale would not be perceptible. Where appropriate, we have varying front yard setbacks and a minimum 4 foot variation between adjacent buildings along perimeter streets. The project meets or exceeds all zone district setback requirements. Please provide clarification on the design objective of this category.		Staff: The project does not comply with the setback variation required for Multi-family projects as required by the criteria to be awarded points. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.b	The project meets or exceeds all minimum setbacks. Again, this criteria seems to make sense for SF projects, but not for MF projects of this scale (Garden Style). Nevertheless, our project meets the spirit and intent, which is to place buildings in such a way as to complement design. Please provide greater clarification as to the applicability of this criteria to MF projects.		Staff: The project does not comply with the setback variation required for Multi-family projects as required by the criteria to be awarded points. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.d	Please see the attached supplemental letter which responds to Staff's comments regarding parking. The project has unique conditions along its perimeter, and must respond contextually to those conditions. Where residential uses are opposite industrial uses, we believe that a greater separation is important to prevent conflict between uses. We have placed a min. 90 foot separation, with a 40' bermed, landscaped buffer, between residences and the Sutter Connector; garages will not be visible. The need for this separation was also raised by the business community due to noise and other potential issues. All other detached garages are interior and placed out of view of main streets and ROWs. Other than the Sutter Connector, all attached garages in the project are located between bldgs (side or rear) and not visible from public ROWs. We believe we have met the spirit and intent of this criteria.		Staff: The criteria requires that parking not be visible from the public right-of-way to receive full points. The project does not comply. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation 3.e	Please see the supplemental letter offering additional support for our compliance with this criteria. We also recommend looking at the photographs we provided of precedent architecture designed by our award winning architect, TCA. Computer models can be difficult to translate but the photos show how the various elements described in our letter work together to provide ample articulation. With the exception of the Sutter Connector, which is a unique condition given the proximity to planned industrial (and the need to protect the integrity of the residential experience), all buildings along the public ROW's (Jarvis and Monterey) face outward and garages are located internal to the project. The project provides expansive and creatively designed buffers along Monterey, Jarvis and the Sutter Connector. Buildings will have varying placement where appropriate. Please also see the attached exhibit showing articulation of building facades, which uses techniques typical of the style to achieve the desired variation and visual interest. We are happy to explore other suggestions in keeping with the style, but the project meets the spirit and intent of this criteria.		Staff: The plans provided do not demonstrate that the buildings provide visual interest, as required by the criteria. New information cannot be considered after initial submittal of the RDCS application. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.5	Our building plans are articulated with cantilevered balconies, awnings, shutters, corbels and belly bands to achieve color breaks and visual interest. Articulation is a min. of 3 horizontal feet and 30% of the extent of the story. Project meets and commits to this criteria. Please see attached exhibit.		Staff: New information cannot be considered after initial submittal of the RDCS application. The plans submitted with the RDCS application do not demonstrate that this criteria has been met. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Circulation B.1.a	The project meets the full criteria to earn 2 points because the project provides for the future extension of Sutter Blvd, and also provides for circulation adjacent to the vacant industrial land parcel to the east. The proposed Sutter Connector Street will provide access to the residential project as well as the planned industrial project. The development of the industrial park will complete the full street width improvements in the same manner that Butterfield Village is completing the Jarvis Drive full street width improvements; the industrial project will finish the street with sidewalk and landscaping. The project meets the intent of this criteria.		Staff: The project was given a point for building a portion of Sutter Boulevard. The right-of-way for Sutter Boulevard was dedicated to the City approximately 16 years ago when the land was subdivided into eight lots. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	1	0	
	Circulation B.1.c	In addition to Jarvis Drive improvements, the project will also provide frontage improvements along an arterial street as stated in the requirements. The project will complete the substandard intersection of Butterfield Blvd and Sutter Blvd. Improvements will include: full signalization, sidewalk, completing the dead end cross-walks, and completing the westbound left turn lane along Sutter Blvd. Also, full width improvements will be provided for the 440+/- LF along the Sutter Extension. We feel that we have met the intent of this criteria and should be awarded 2 points.		Staff: The project commitment in the narrative only references improving Jarvis Drive between Monterey Road and Butterfield Boulevard. Per staff comments in the narrative, "Jarvis Drive has been constructed to its ultimate width with curb & gutter and streetlights on both sides. The installation of detached sidewalk entitles the project to a point in this category." Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	1	0	
	Natural and Environmental Features B.1	The project is maintaining existing ground elevation and existing drainage patterns throughout the site. Foundation types are designed to minimize grading. Cut and fills have been kept to less than 2 feet from the existing surface to finished surface. Fills greater than 2 feet occur only at the existing overflow detention basin area to provide overland release for flood protection. Please note that the overflow detention basin is a man-made detention facility that is not in use. The overflow detention pond is an artificial man-made depression on the site and does not reflect the natural terrain of the area. The intent of this criteria is to preserve natural features to the greatest extent practicable, which the project clearly does. The average depth in the basin is about 4 ft. Grading has also been minimized in the basin, with fills averaging about 4ft. We are filling the pond to the existing natural grades and thus restoring it to its original condition. The project meets the spirit and intent of this criteria.		The project does not comply with preservation techniques as prescribed in the standards and criteria. The project will exceed the fill and excavation thresholds prescribed by the criteria. Project proposes to develop in a detention pond overflow area. By adding fill above the allowable depth, this criteria can not be met. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Natural and Environmental Features B.8		The project narrative states that all dwellings have washer and dryer connections for tenants. There are no shared laundry facilities. This does not meet the criteria, which requires all units have washer and dryers, not	Staff: These points were awarded in error. Planning Commission: Remove 3 points from the project as they do not comply with the criteria.	3	3	-3	

File No.		Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
		Livable Communities B.6	The project will meet or exceed this requirement to use porches and balconies on 25% of the units which are visible from a public ROW to promote a neighborhood feel and enhance visual interest. We also employ at least two different rooflines and two different pitches (shed, gable and hip roofs). Our design uses profiles, stepped massing and appropriate elevation character to respond to adjacent neighbors. Buildings are 4 sided with architectural relief in both horizontal and vertical massing. The project commits to meet the criteria of this category. <u>All units have balconies/patios. This can be seen on the building plan sheets and the elevation and perspective sheets. The building plan is four sided, meaning that units and balconies face in each direction, so there will always be balconies / patios in view. 100% of all units that face the right of way have balconies or patios.</u>		Staff: Unable to verify this requirement based on the plan set submitted with the RDCS application. To qualify for these points, <u>all criteria must be met</u> which include: a. Uses porches, balconies, for any area viewed from the public right-of-way or multi-unit courtyards interior to the project on at least 25% of units to promote a neighborhood feel; b. Uses at least two different roof lines and two different pitches throughout the project, i.e. gable, hipped, dormers, Mansard, etc.; c. Uses architecture and profiles and massing that are compatible and works with the existing surrounding neighborhoods. Applicable only where a project adjoins an existing neighborhood on at least one side or twenty-five percent of the project's frontage; d. Provides a consistent level of architectural relief and detailing on all four building elevations. Where two-story rear and/or side-yard building elevations occur, architectural relief shall include some third dimensional design element such as bay windows, balconies, covered porches, decorative trellis, etc. In addition, each standard trim and base color must represent no more than 15% (project size permitting) of the project. For multi-family rental projects, the paint scheme may be uniform to enhance village-architecture theme, and alley-loaded garage side may have limited architectural detailing. <u>The applicant states that all units have balconies / patios. This is not discernible on the plan set. Staff believes criteria C has not been met, as the project massing has not been designed to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. In particular, the adjacent project has 2.5-3 story elements which are highly articulate dto avoid he appearance as one building. The architectural elements vary from the use of different roof pitches, porches, eaves, brick, stucco, siding and varying window placements which reduces the building massing. The subject project has not used these elements. The applicant needs to work with staff to address design concerns with the project.</u> No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: _____ points awarded.	3	0		
		Livable Communities B.1			A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received __ points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
MC-15-13	Lantana-Standard					175	171	171	
		Parks and Paths B.2		Point should be 5 not 4. 17/3=5 points, as stated in staff comments.	Staff: 4 points is the maximum amount awarded in this category for single family projects. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	4	4	0	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.2.b		Why does the project not qualify for the extra security point. Applicant has indicated additional security features will be installed.	Staff: All homes have light at front doors and garages. These are not considered extra security measures. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	1	0	
	Public Schools B.3.d	In 2012 RDCS competition, the Planning Commission had staff award these points to projects located within 1.5 miles of a high school, determining that a safe walking path was not a prerequisite for high schools. Since then, the language within the criteria has not been changed. Note the project was awarded these points in 2013 and 2014. The applicant request 2 points.		Staff: A safe route is defined as continuous sidewalks and/or paved pedestrian pathways cross walks and traffic signals at designated street intersections between the project and a school site. The criteria does not specify giving points for just being within 1 1/2 miles of a high school. High school students could walk in some of the areas however that is not what Section 3 states. Perhaps the high school section for points should be under its own section specifying that the development only has to be within 1 1/2 miles only. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.b	<u>Applicant requested consideration of this point opportunity.</u>		Staff: <u>In 2013 and 2014, the project was awarded points within the requested section. Based on the point adjustments made by the Planning Commission on October 27, 2015 to other projects with approved Planned Developments, and prior point awards, the requested point adjustments should be made.</u> Planning Commission: ____ points awarded.				
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.c	Although some lots within the project do not meet minimum widths expressed in the standards, the balance of the lots do allow the project to meet the width variation criterion. The project provides at least three different acceptable standard lot widths and at least a four foot difference in the width of each standard lot. The applicant request 1 point <u>Applicant request reconsideration.</u>		The criteria states that the <u>proposed project complies with the minimum lot standards.</u> The general provisions of the PD overlay district allow for variations from the standard provisions of the code, which this project has obtained. The project does not comply with the criteria for all lots within the project. No point adjustment is recommended. <u>In 2013 and 2014, the project was awarded points within the requested section. Based on the point adjustments made by the Planning Commission on October 27, 2015 to other projects with approved Planned Developments, and prior point awards, the requested point adjustments should be made.</u> Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Livable Communities B.1	Request Planning Commission consider this project "superior" when awarding points for overall project excellence. With the assistance from the Commission and staff, the project has undergone a major transformation since the 2014 RDCS competition.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received ____ points. The Planning Commission Award is ____ Points.		N/A		

File No.		Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
MC-15-14		Monterey-UHC					176	162	162
		Market and Price Distribution		No unit rental information provided	Staff: To be discussed with applicant. Information not completed with application.	N/A	N/A	N/A	
				The project is underparked. The plans note that parking will be provided off-site or an in-leiu fee will be paid. How is this to be provided?	<p>UHC's 39 unit Affordable Housing Project is providing 79 parking spaces (2:1) ratio. 99 spaces were to be required; thus, the project is short 20 spaces. However, at this time, it is presumed it is to be remedied. The City will need to update our Zoning Ordinance to make it consistent with AB744, signed by the Governor last month, which amended Section 65915 of the CA Gov't Code. 65915 (p)(1) states that city's shall not require a vehicular parking ratio, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking, of a development meeting certain criteria, that exceeds the following ratios:</p> <p>(A) Zero to one bedroom: one onsite parking space (B) Two to three bedrooms: two onsite parking spaces (C) Four and more bedrooms: two and one-half parking spaces.</p> <p>AB744 reduced the parking ratios for certain circumstances to not exceed 0.5 spaces per bedroom for developments that include the maximum percentage of low- or very low income units and have unobstructed access to a major transit stop. There are different ratios for different types of rental units near major transit (for seniors or special needs housing). The new provisions of 65915 apply. The applicant will submit a request/proposal for a concession as needed. This project incorporates a special needs population (6 units for adult foster youth) and meets the criteria as a 100% affordable development, (17.95% Extremely low income, 61.55% Very Low Income, and 20.50% low income).</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	
		Livable Communities B.7		Applicants appear to meet the criteria per staff comments, but no points awarded.	Staff: The text does indicate that the point should be awarded; however, the point awarded was not reflected in the score. Point will be awarded.	1	1	N/A	
		Livable Communities B.1	Planning Commission Point Requested		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received 10 points. The Planning Commission Award is 0 Points.		N/A		
MC-15-15		Butterfield-MH Butterfield					194.5	177	180
		Parks and Paths B.2		Applicant indicates the installation of a swimming pool - is pool construction restricted at this point due to drought conditions? There are no indications of a picnic area, volleyball or basketball court in the application drawings submitted?	Staff: The points awarded reflect the commitments made in the first phase of the project. Their planned construction is off of the plans submitted for this second phase. Points were not awarded for a swimming pool. In any event, pool construction is currently allowed.	4	4	N/A	

File No.	Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.a	The project deviated from the base zone district. It is our contention, because the RPD Zoning had already been completely adopted at the time of this application, that the RPD zoning became the "base zoning" for Valencia for the purpose of scoring. Since this fully approved project could not depart from the PD zoning it should therefore be awarded 1 point.		Staff: The zoning is R-2 3,000-PD. The project required deviations from the base zoning district thus requiring PD approval. The PD zone is an overlay district. The general provisions of the PD overlay district allow for variations from the standard provisions of the code. The criteria states that the project will not require any deviations from the lot size and dimensions and setback standards of the base zoning district (excluding BMR units) The project does not comply. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.b	The project deviated from the base zone district. It is our contention, because the RPD Zoning had already been completely adopted at the time of this application, that the RPD zoning became the "base zoning" for Valencia for the purpose of scoring. Since this fully approved project could not depart from the PD zoning it should therefore be awarded 1 point.		Staff: The project does not comply with the minimum side yard setbacks (base zone district), nor does it provide 20 percent in excess of the minimum required for all lots. The criteria states that the project will not require any deviations from the lot size and dimensions and setback standards of the base zoning district (excluding BMR units) The project does not comply. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 1 point awarded due to previous project scoring and PD approval.	1	0	1	
	Circulation Efficiency B.1.a	In the 2013 M/C scoring, the project scored only one point in this section because staff stated "the plans do not show a stub street to Parcel 2." The plans were changed, and the stub street was included, Parcel 2 has been approved and allocated and the project should now be awarded the full two points.		Staff: The project received one point in this category since it's providing a single (minor) street stub to the adjacent parcel. The point that was awarded in this category as part of the 2013 competition was for no double frontages and street layout/configuration. This portion of the criteria was eliminated from the category in 2014. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	1	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.a	Applicant requested consideration of these point opportunities.		Planning Commission: 1 point awarded due to previous project scoring and PD approval.	1	0	1	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.b	Applicant requested consideration of these point opportunities.		Planning Commission: 1 point awarded due to previous project scoring and PD approval.	1	0	1	
	Circulation Efficiency B.1.d	The scoring, we believe was a mistake. The criteria specifically states that "within a project, an entry aisle less than two hundred fifty feet from the entry is acceptable."		Staff: The distance between the centerline of Butterfield Blvd. and proposed interior street is approximately 210 feet. The distance would need to be 252 feet or greater in order to receive the point in the category. The project did not receive the point in 2013 for the same reason. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Livable Communities B.1	Valencia is a unique project that was designed to provide a large community area, conventional two car garages, with driveway parking and private backyards which are more in keeping with the existing character of Morgan Hill.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The applicant requested 10 points and has received __ points. The Planning Commission Award is ____ Points.	2	N/A		
MC-15-16	E. Dunne- Mana				187.5	175.5	175.5	
	Parks and Paths B.2		Staff summary indicates a score of 6, but calculation shows only 4 points.	Staff: 4 points is the maximum in this category for single-family projects.	7	4	N/A	

File No.		Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
		Livable Communities		VTA commitment concerns with future bus route.	Planning Commission: One point was removed from category as the Commission determined that the VTA letter did not commit to a future bus route.	2	1	-1	
		Lot Layout and Orientation B.1..h	Applicant has provided clarification of repeat factor and would like consideration of points within this category.		Planning Commission: 1 point awarded	1	0	1	
		Livable Communities B.1			A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received ____ points. The Planning Commission Award is ____ Points.		N/A	0	
MC-15-17	San Pedro-Presidio (For Sale)					184	179	179	
		Public Schools		Barrett Elementary is 1.7 miles drive or walk from this location. How is distance meant to be measured?	Staff: Section B2 states a 1/2 radius, not walking/driving distance.			N/A	
		Parks and Paths		Does the Morgan Hill Outdoor Sports Center qualify as a City Park for application purposes? This is a managed and paid facility?	Staff: No			N/A	
		Public Schools		Can staff provide clarity on the discrepancy in interpretation of the high school safe walking route criteria, applicant says City removed the pathway criteria.	Staff: Section B specifies a safe continuous walking route and does not exclude the high school. Main Avenue is not fully paved and has dirt pathways for a section before the overpass over 101. I agree that high school students should be able to walk/bike safely however the points awarded are still under section B. In the future, perhaps the high school section should be separated and points awarded for only being 1.5 miles from a high school.			N/A	
		Parks and Paths B.5.		Is there a park planned or approved as described by the developer? City response indicates no.	Staff: No Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	4	0	0	
		Housing Types B.3.b		Each townhome includes at least 3 bedrooms-project is described as 79 townhome development but not all are 3 bedroom?	Staff: The applicant received the 3 points they requested in Housing Types 3b. There are 61, three bedroom units, and 18, four bedroom units, therefore meeting the criteria for three points. " A project which provides dwelling units with a mix of one, two, three, and four bedroom units or dwelling units with three or more bedrooms only within the development, will receive three points. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	3	3	0	

File No.		Narrative Category and Section No.	Applicant	Planning Commissioner Questions/Comments	Staff Response to comments	Requested Score	PO Initial Score	PC Adjusted Score	Final Score
		Livable Communities B.1	Planning Commission Point Requested.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received ____ points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
MC-15-18	San Pedro Presidio					181.5	173.5	173.5	
		Parks and Paths B.5.		Applicant has an approved MOU for a park next to the development, per the conditions on the application this is sufficient for 4 points. No points awarded by staff?	Staff: The criteria require the development to provide a public park in order to obtain credit for these points. This development has not proposed to create a public park and these points are inapplicable. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	4	0	0	
		Livable Communities B.1	Planning Commission Point Requested		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received ____ points. The Planning Commission Award is ____ Points.		N/A		