

2016 RDCS APPLICATIONS -SCORES AND COMMENTS

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
RDCS2016-0008	Old Monterey-Vo					158.5	153.5	153.5	
		Livable Communities B.1	Planning Commission Point Requested.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received 5 points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
RDCS2016-0009	E. Dunne-Mana					189	180	180	
		Livable Communities B.1	Planning Commission Point Requested.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received 4 points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
RDCS2016-0010	Monterey-Dynasty					169	154.5	163.5	
		Public Schools B.2	Paradise Valley Elementary School is within 1/2 mile radius of the project. The applicant was awarded 1 full point for 2008 RDCS competition. This is a multi-year project and applicant should be qualified to be awarded the full item of 2 points.		Staff: The District recognized that Paradise Valley Elementary School is within 1/2 mile of the project site but as of May 1, 2016 the school was at capacity. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: The Planning Commission noted that this criteria was new and not available in 2010. 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
		Open Space B.2.b		Planning Commission stated that the use of Chart b (consistent with other multi-family projects) should be used for this project which would adjust the points for the project to 7.		3	1	7	
		Parks and Paths B.8	Applicant was awarded 4 full points for 2010 RDCS competition. Open space/common areas provided by applicant is about 2.206 acres which is greater than 2010 RDCS application 1.13 acre requirement (50% more).		Staff: A new exhibit has been provided but the acreage shown only provides for 2.2 acres. The criteria states the setbacks and courtyards are not to be included. The area needs to function as a park. Staff is not sure how the project was scored in 2010 but does not meet the 2016 criteria. No point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	4	0	0	
		Circulation Efficiency B.1.c	Applicant has committed and completed full width street public improvement on east and west sides of Monterey Road, an arterial, across project frontages, including curbs and gutters, landscaping, re-paving of street and markings according to City's standard. In 2010 RDCS, the City awarded the project full 2 points, and applicant should be awarded full 2 points.		Staff: A point adjustment is recommended based on improvements that have been completed. These improvements were not identified in the narrative. Planning Commission: 2 points awarded.	2	2	2	

2016 RDCS APPLICATIONS -SCORES AND COMMENTS

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.b	Applicant's project site improvement design from north side of Santori Lane loop to west side of project, connects through south side of Valencia Avenue and does not create a dead end street in the project. On the south side of Valencia Avenue and Rome Avenue, there are two future street extensions to neighboring lot.		Staff: This is new criteria that was not part of the previous project. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
		Circulation Efficiency B.3.a	Applicant committed to convert two street lights for the proposed allotments. Applicant is willing to pay for the cost of equal to or greater than \$750/unit. This rule should be applicable to smaller lot size projects.		Staff: This criteria does not apply to the project. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
		Circulation Efficiency B.4	Applicant has been awarded 2 full points for this item in 2010 RDCS which applicant committed \$2,200/unit for 2 points. In 2016 RDCS, applicant has committed the same as 2010 application but with typo of \$1,100/unit for 2 units same was 2010 application. Applicant is willing to commit to the \$2,200/unit for 2 points on this item.		Staff: The applicant committed to the 2010 criteria. The applicant has indicated that they made an error. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 2 points awarded.	2	1	2	
		Natural Environmental Features B.1	Applicant has been awarded 1 full point for this item in 2010 RDCS. Based on site improvement grading plan, there is only small portion of land, at historical creek ditch where project has over 3 feet fill depth. Project is in 100 year flood zone. Over all, there is only a little over 2 feet on whole project as elevation needed to be flood proofed.		Staff: The narrative states that fills are 4 foot maximum due to the elevation needed to flood proof from the 100 year storm. The criteria states that a 3 foot maximum for flood proofing is allowed. In 2010, the applicant also stated a 4 foot maximum, however, when scoring the staff comment did include a 3 foot maximum. This may have been an error at that time. This does not meet the stated criteria. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	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 10 points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
RDCS2016-0011	Llagas-Silvas					154	150.5	150.5	
		Water	One half point could be awarded for gridding water mains as the proposed water main extension to the north property line is not needed to service the project and will provide for future gridding.		Staff: The Public Works Department determined that the project only proposes the possibility of future water gridding. A total of 2.0 points for water can only be awarded if the project will actually grid water with the project. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded	2	1.5	0	
		Streets and Parks	One or half a point could also be awarded for Streets & Parks as per the criteria. These three lots can be served by existing parks and street systems. If Sabini Drive needs to be widened it is a relatively minor local improvement and can be a condition of approval.		Staff: The Public Works Department determined that the project would require substantial improvements to the street system to meet the additional demands beyond those provided by the developer. The project was awarded 1.0 point for streets, as major street improvements and street dedication would be required for Sabini Drive. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded	1.5	1	0	

2016 RDCS APPLICATIONS -SCORES AND COMMENTS

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
		Police	One half point could also be awarded for police circulation for much the same reason as future water gridding. The extra roadway provided for future looping circulation is not needed to serve the project.		Staff: The Police Department has reviewed the criteria for police patrol access and has recommended 0.5 points. A point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0.5 points awarded	0.5	0.5	0.5	
		Livable Communities B.1	Planning Commission Point Requested.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received 5 points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
RDCS2016-0012	Walnut Grove-Newland					173.5	163	163	
		Livable Communities B.1	Planning Commission Point Requested.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received 4 points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
RDCS2016-0013	Cochrane-Cal Atlantic					185.5	177.5	179.5	
		Public Schools B.3.d	There is public right of way on the west side of Mission View Drive and Live Oak High School is within 1.5 miles from the Cochrane Rd Project. The CA has offered to construct temporary paving on the west side which would provide a safe route along a paved sidewalk to Live Oak High School. Staff has indicated that there is not an approved right of way path not included in narrative. In actuality our narrative included the offer, we have demonstrated the pathway and are happy to work with Public Works staff to achieve approval. This approval would be no different from the improvement plan approval needed for internal streets and allocations included in the remainder of the RDCS Narrative. We would respectfully request the reassignment of these two (2) points.		Staff: There is not an approved right of way path included in the Narrative. No point adjustment recommended by staff. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	
		Orderly and Contiguous B.4	This project has been through five previous RDCS competitions, successfully achieving allocations each year under highly competitive odds. Land development is actively underway for all approved lots (83 lots or 62% of the project) and grading has been completed for the entire project (100% of the project 135 lots). The 2013 RDCS completion was for two projects (Roland 28 allocations and Barbara 13 allocations - 41 total allocations for the 2015-16 yr), combined three (3) years later when ownership was consolidated. CA has pulled 21 building permits by September 15 (over 1/2) of the combined two first phases and all units are under construction. While there were no "previous" phases, clearly the two phases combined implies a previous phase. For this reason we would respectfully request that the reassignment of the two (2) points requested.		Staff: The project does not meet the stated requirement to qualify for the point. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: The Planning Commission believed that the project met the criteria as a continuing project, although phases were not part of the development. 41 allotments have been received and 21 building permits have been issued. 2 points awarded.	2	0	2	

2016 RDCS APPLICATIONS -SCORES AND COMMENTS

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 objective of this section is to achieve a variety of setbacks which complement the overall design of the project. The project meets the 5' foot front yard setbacks as required through the use of various design planes, plan variation (12 unique plans), and street undulation demonstrated in the Site Plan MC 4-6. This project was partially approved for twelve (let than 10%) 4,500 square foot duet lots, while these twelve lots may not always meet the total 5 foot criteria they are typically within 5 feet of that criteria and still provide significant variation. For this reason we would respectfully request the reassignment of the one (1) point requested. The same is true for rear yard setbacks and for this reason we would respectfully request the reassignment of the one (1) point requested.		Staff: The project does not meet the stated requirement to qualify for the point. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.b	The same is true for rear yard setbacks and for this reason we would respectfully request the reassignment of the one (1) point requested.		Staff: The project does not meet the stated requirement to qualify for the point. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Circulation Efficiency B.1.d	The nature of this site is long and narrow. Originally the project was approved under separate ownerships as two projects roughly 350 feet x 2,500 feet. Each project comprised of separate product type. Once CA gained ownership of both projects there was a requirement to combine the projects while still retaining the original product separation. CA worked with Staff and Planning Commission to gain approval of the current configuration while still meeting previous RDCS obligations. To the extent practical short blocks were avoided given the narrow nature of the site. There are five blocks which are less than 250 feet. Three are project the entries (White Moon Drive, Black Hawk Drive, and Morning Star Drive) which are an allowed exception, and two (Golden Eagle Drive and Moring Star Drive) are for extensions into future development parcel, so ultimately will not be short blocks when fully built out. For this reason we would respectfully request the reassignment of the one (1) point requested.		Staff: Consistent scoring with last year. No point adjustment recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	1	0	0	
	Livable Communities B.1	Applicant respectfully requests the superior project allocation. In the 2015 RDCS completion the project was awarded one point based on the redesign of the two original projects while still maintaining all previous RDCS commitments, retaining product segmentation, retaining a large central park area and adding a Central Green/walking corridor. During the Initial Planning Commission review and approval, Planning Commission requested that the Central Green/walking corridor have view fencing to provide an "eyes on" safety factor which the applicant agreed to. While this detail was incorporated, it was not specifically mentioned in the 2015 narrative. This year's 2016 narrative includes this reference in several locations.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received 8 points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		

2016 RDCS APPLICATIONS -SCORES AND COMMENTS

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
RDCS2016-0014	Laurel-DeRose					179	176.5	176.5	
		Safety and Security B.1.h		There is a point error in this category and 1 point should be added.		2	1	2	
		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		
RDCS2016-00015	Cochrane-Borello					184.5	175.5	178.5	
		Public Schools B.3.a	After communicating with the MHUSD and confirming that the Project lies within the prescribed distance of a "planned" school (see excerpt directly above, and attached RDCS Narrative Addendum C), MHUSD offered that the project is not point-eligible because the school district does not own the Peet Road site. Applicant submits that the criterion specifically references a "planned" school, and that parcel ownership is not a condition of a point award.		Staff: 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. The email from the District dated July 28, 2016 states the Peet Road site is a planned elementary school site. Planning Commission: 1 point awarded.	1	0	1	
		Public Schools B.3.b	After communicating with the MHUSD and confirming that the Project lies within the prescribed distance of a "planned" school (see excerpt directly above, and attached RDCS Narrative Addendum C), MHUSD offered that the project is not point-eligible because the school district does not own the Peet Road site. Applicant submits that the criterion specifically references a "planned" school, and that parcel ownership is not a condition of a point award.		Staff: 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. The email from the District dated July 28, 2016 states the Peet Road site is a planned elementary school site. Planning Commission: 1 point awarded.	1	0	1	
		Orderly and Contiguous B.3	The Applicant submitted Addendums F1 and F2 with the RDCS Narrative. Each Addendum calculated the "developed" area by applying the description provided in the criterion. Addendum F2 delineates the next phase of San Sebastian's development, relative to adjacent "developed" areas. The entire perimeter of the future phase (4,900 lineal feet) is "developed", based on the disposition of off-site adjacencies and San Sebastian's Tract Map approvals. In this scenario, the project should be awarded 5 points for 100% adjacency.		Staff: For scoring purposes, the adjacent developed land is scored based on the entire master planned development, not based on phases of the development, this being the first phase to move forward. No Point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: Adjust 1,100 feet-in accordance with F1-1 additional point awarded.	4	3	4	
		Circulation B.2.b	Prior to RDCS application submittal, the Applicant recognized that the project will not receive enough allocations in the 2016 RDCS competition to achieve full buildout. As such, the Applicant requested an allocation of up to 30 units, and submitted Addendum J to identify street improvements that would be associated with a 30-unit allocation award. Cul-de-sacs within the limits of this 30-unit application area do not exceed 400-feet in length. The applicant is requesting 1 point for avoiding cul-de-sacs greeter than 400 feet within this phase.		Staff: The project will create multiple cul-de-sacs including two that are greater than 400 feet in length. No Point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	0	0	

2016 RDCS APPLICATIONS -SCORES AND COMMENTS

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	In 2008, a majority of the Planning Commission detennined 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 (2-point award). Comments recieved 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 Lot Layout 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.		A maximum of 10 points can be awarded within Livable Communities. The project has received 8 points. The Planning Commission Award is ____ Points.		N/A		
RDCS2016-0016	Jarvis-Mwest					182	181	182	
		Lot Layout and Orientation B.1.g		The project is Average. A point should be removed as it has several design flaws, which include parking design and park/open space not conveniently located. A motion was made and failed. No point adjustment needed.		1	1	1	
		Lot Layout and Orientation B.2.a		The park/open space is not conveniently located. The Commission voted to remove 1 point.		1	1	-1	
		Orderly and Contiguous B.5		Master Plan and Development Agreement not received. A motion was made and failed. No point adjustment needed.		2	2	2	
		Public Schools B.3.d		The project should have received 2 points. Error in calculation.		1	1	2	
		Circulation Efficiency B.4.a		The Commission questioned the statement regarding Double dipping in the project narrative. A motion was made to not award 2 points within the criteria; however, the motion failed.		2	2	2	
		Parks and Paths B.2		Meets criteria with existing criteria but applicant would like alternative amenities. There was concern expressed regarding the use of alternative amenities. Plan is good as proposed and staff can work with the applicant regarding alternative amenities..		8	8	8	
		Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.e	Allotted 1 point instead of 2 because, from the description provided, parking was visible from street at the corner of Jarvis and Main Street. This was a comment made during the Prelim, so we relocated a few parking stalls to a different part of the site to make sure parking was behind the building, not directly visible from the R.O.W. Although the awarding of an additional point, will not change our overall score, we would request the additional point still be added to the category.		Staff: The project does not complete meet this criteria and staff awarded one point based on the design. No Point adjustment is recommended. Planning Commission: 0 points awarded.	2	1	0	

2016 RDCS APPLICATIONS -SCORES AND COMMENTS

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 10 points. The Planning Commission Award is __ Points.		N/A		
RDCS2016-0017	Murphy-Presidio (For Sale)					184	180	180	
		Lot Layout and Orientation B.3.a		It was requested that a point be removed for lot variation. Does not meet requirement. The Planning Commission had requested the change during the hearing process and had requested the point be made up, if a change was made. The motion did not pass. No point adjustment made.		1	1	1	
		Livable Communities B.1	See letter for request of Superior point		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		
RDCS2016-0018	Condit-Presidio (Rental)					182.5	178	178	
		Livable Communities B.1	See letter for request of Superior point		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		