Legislation Details (With Text)

File #:	17-106	**Version:**	1	**Name:**	
Type:	Staff Report			**Status:**	Presentation
File created:	2/15/2017			**In control:**	Planning Commission
On agenda:	2/21/2017			**Final action:**	
Title:	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (RDCS) DRAFT COMPETITION MANUAL				
Sponsors:					
Indexes:					
Code sections:					
Attachments:	1. Outcome Assesment Objectives1_4, 2. Competition Manual_02_17_17_Objectives1-4, 3. Opportunities Objectives 5-9				

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
2/21/2017	1	Planning Commission		

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT
MEETING DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2017

PREPARED BY: John W. Baty, Principal Planner/Development Services
APPROVED BY: Leslie Little, Assistant City Manager/Development Services

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (RDCS) DRAFT COMPETITION MANUAL

RECOMMENDATION(S):
Review, discuss, and provide feedback on the Draft RDCS Competition Manual testing results

CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act):
Project, Description of CEQA requirements

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Morgan Hill 2035 Project, which included the Residential Development Control System (RDCS) Update, was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and certified by the Morgan Hill City Council on July 27, 2016. (SCH #2015022074)

PROJECT SUMMARY:
This is the 13th workshop in a series of workshops with the Planning Commission regarding the development of an RDCS Competition Manual to accompany the City's updated Residential Development Control System (RDCS), which becomes effective March 1, 2017.

The Planning Commission reviewed sections of the Draft Competition Manual at their prior workshops held on October 11, 18, November 1, 15, 22, 29, December 6, 13, 2016, January 10, 17, 24, and February 7, 2017.

At the tenth workshop held on January 17th, the Commission discussed and provided feedback on a Competition Manual Testing Template that would help determine whether or not different types of projects in a variety of locations could feasibly obtain a minimum score and to ascertain whether the costs to obtain allotments are generally consistent with costs under the existing system.

At the last workshop the Planning Commission reviewed and discussed a summary of findings and recommendations based on the scoring results from the 15 different test projects submitted by volunteers from the development community.

The Planning Commission identified three key findings from the results of the initial test:
1) projects are not achieving the minimum score without making contributions;
2) smaller infill projects have a particularly hard time achieving the minimum score without making contributions; and
3) the cost of purchased points is too high when compared to what projects are contributing under Measure C.

With the Commission agreed upon objective that a project should have the opportunity to at least score the minimum score without making contributions, the Commission began reviewing the scoring criteria in the Draft Competition Manual with the goal of increasing the number of available non-contribution points.

The Commission recommended a number of modifications to the scoring criteria for the first four Objectives. For the remaining five Objectives staff followed the Commission's direction and has a number of suggestions for increasing the number of available non-contribution points. For Objectives where there are few or no opportunities for non-contribution points, including Objectives 5: Parks and Open Space, 7: Transportation, and 8: Municipal Services, staff has prepared a list (attached) of potential new criteria for the Planning Commission to consider.

The Planning Commission recommended the following for increasing non-contribution point opportunities in the first four Objectives:

Objective 1 Schools

- Reduce the maximum score from 17 to 12; move points to Objective TBD
- Modify Criteria 1-B School Proximity to 0.75 miles to elementary and 1.5 miles to middle or high school, and increase points.

Objective 2 Location

- Increase points for Criteria 2-A through 2-F

Objective 3 Affordable Housing

- Possibly increase maximum score and adjust point spreads for Criteria 3-A Affordable Housing Fund Contribution and Criteria 3-B Development of Affordable Units

Objective 4 Housing Diversity

- Possibly reduce maximum score
- Increase points for Criteria 4-B through 4-D
- Open Criteria 4-D Small Units to single-family attached products (e.g., townhomes, duplex/duets)
- Add new Diversity of Housing Stock criteria for product types that are under-represented in Morgan Hill

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Outcome Assessment Changes to Objectives 1-4
2. Revised Redline Competition Manual for Objectives 1-4
3. Opportunities to Increase Non-Contribution Points Objectives 5-9
4. Re-testing Results Table (to be provided as a supplement)