
From: Evan Adams <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 4:13 AM
To: Schultz, Avalon <ASchultz@sanleandro.org>
Subject: Re: Multi-Family Development Standards

Hi Avalon,

As you know my primary concerns are around parking, specifically unbundled parking, and changes to the daylight plane rule.

Unbundled parking

1. Page 16 includes "public transit (as defined by and consistent with the State definition) ...". Can you provide me with a link to the State's definition. I was not able to find it.
2. The table on page 6 has a row labelled 'Allow Parking Spaces to be "Unbundled"' with an X in the "Included in Draft Code Amendments?" column. I took that to mean that unbundled parking would not be allowed, but discovered that interpretation was wrong. On page 104, I found a footnote in the table that says "'* Unbundled vehicle parking is neither prohibited nor required". The table on page 140 makes things a bit more clear.

I think the table on page 6 should be clarified. My understanding is that it's referring to this on page 16: "The allowance of unbundled flex parking of .25 to .5 spaces/unit at the developer's option in the DA District is proposed to be removed".

So it's removing a specific provision that currently exists and the item on page 6 does not address the general question of unbundled parking.

3. The table on page 104 is about "certain properties near BART" and says "'* Unbundled vehicle parking is neither prohibited nor required". It sounds like that's a state law requirement, is that correct?
4. Given #3, what are the parking requirements for the properties that are not near BART. Is unbundled parking prohibited, required, or something else?

Daylight plane changes

1. The change to the SA district to apply the daylight plane rule on when adjacent to RS and RD properties is sensible.
2. Page A-49 includes:
For DA and SA districts, structures shall not intercept a one-to-one (1:1) or 45 degree daylight plane inclined inward from a point 15 feet above existing grade at an RS or RD District boundary line to a point 35 feet above existing grade at 20 feet from the RS or RD District boundary line. (Please refer to illustration "Required Daylight Plane at Adjoining Districts—DA and SA Districts.")

I was unable to find the illustration it said to refer to.

3. The daylight plane drawing on page 17 is very useful. I'm pleased to see it showing a typical single-family home. It would be very useful to also include a drawing of the current rules so readers can visually compare them. The drawing appears to show a 15-ft setback. My reading is that the setbacks have a minimum of 10-ft and a maximum of 15-ft, so I conclude that 10-ft will be the most common. With that I conclude that 10-ft setbacks will be much more common, so a drawing with a 10-ft setback might be more useful.
4. Regarding the daylight plane changes, I think the termination point of 20-ft is reasonable and I dislike raising the starting point to 15-ft. The goal of raising the starting point to 15-ft is clearly to allow two stories as close to the R property as possible, while the existing rule requires the second story to be setback. The existing rule also results in continued setbacks as the build gets taller. Combining the two changes results in much more building mass being very close to an R property, effectively nullifying the notion of a transition. A look at the drawing on page 15 demonstrates the point. It shows a 4-story building with just one transition setback of 5 feet, that's hardly a transition at all.

Evan

From: Jim Holton [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 8:07 AM
To: Schultz, Avalon <ASchultz@sanleandro.org>
Subject: San Leandro Multi-Family Development Standards - Draft Comments

ATTENTION: This email is from an external source, outside of the City. While attachments and links are scanned by our Advanced Threat Protection service, we still recommend you use caution when opening or clicking them. Unless you recognize the sender and have an expectation that the content is safe, it is best to ignore this email and report it to the Helpdesk. Sincerely, Your IT Team

Hi Avalon, I am sending this from my Gmail account as I am on the road. My normal email address is [REDACTED]. Here are my comments. They may be a little unedited, but I think you'll get the idea. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or want any clarifications. And, thanks for the opportunity to participate. Here they are:

Proposed DA and SA building standards - Comments on draft

1. Daylight plane height termination for DA/SA to RS/RM should not be changed from the current 8 feet to 15 feet. This appears to be a give away to developers at the expense of the home owners. It will not materially affect the number of additional units that it could produce and will have a negative impact on residential property values. The current daylight plane rule has been the accepted standard for transitions for quite awhile. If circumstances exist that would make an increase in height desirable for the community, it should go through the Zoning Board.
2. Bike Parking. If San Leandro is ever to become a bike friendly city, we must prioritize the convenience of bike riding. The requirements for bike parking are too light to encourage bike usage. Requirements should not be based on current bike usage, but rather future desired bike usage. Plan for the future, not the past.
3. Bike Lanes need to be address so that building is done in a way to make them safe and effective. It is interesting to see that the visualization on page 13 does not show a bike lane. On page 6 bike lanes are listed as being addressed Section 4.04.336.C.1. This section does not address bike lanes. Building elements must be designed to ensure a bike lane can be present, including any associated impacts on traffic and safety.
4. Reference to "Bay Friendly Landscape Guidelines" by StopWaste.org in section 4.16.116.A.2 should be removed. This document is an educational document and not one that is set up for regulatory usage.
5. References to documents in section 4.16.116.D.3 should be removed. Although they may currently be nice references, they have no regulatory authority. The terminology "may be used" is confusing. Are they the only documents that can be used or can other documents be used. They are also not adequately referenced.

6 I like and support the requirement for parking lot trees. In fact, I would like to see more requirements regarding the preservation of the urban forest, such as not removing any tree of a certain age unless they present a hazard to persons.

7. Wall Breaks, Three Colors, Ground Floor Transparency regarding building design seem like a good idea but could backfire. Although these design items appear objective they are really subjective into what constitutes good architecture. If these criteria are in place, the Best Building, perhaps the best architected in downtown San Leandro, would not meet these requirements. Neither would a building of high quality marble or glass facade, unless they went through the Zoning Board. As styles change, every project will go through the Zoning Board.

8. Open Space. The inclusion of porches as open space is really just chipping away at the open space requirements. Open space should be spaces that reduce cramped feelings and porches do not do this. This is a way around providing open space.

9 Garage is described as "massive" on page A 75. Massive is a subjective term.

10. Section 5.08.116 Mail notification times and methods are not adequate to inform the nearby community of decision dates. The requirement that notices be "mailed" 10 days prior to the meeting does not mean an affected party will receive the notification. Currently mail is slow. So a notice mailed on a Friday for a Monday meeting in ten days may not reach the affected parties until a Wednesday. If the affected party is out of town, they will not know the meeting will take place in time to prepare. I suggest the verbiage be changed to "excluding weekends and holidays" or that the dates be changed to align with the notifications in section 5.06.D.3 (Administrative Exceptions) and that the abutting properties be changed to properties within 500 feet so that the community can be meaningfully involved.

11. Section 5.08.128 Conditions of Approval uses a phrase with the word "reasonable" which is subjective. It should be replaced with "must".

12 Section 5 12 124 uses "substantial and "to provide visual interest" which are subjective

Regards, Jim

Parking in Multifamily Standards

1 message

John Minot

Tue, Oct 19, 2021 at 6:00 PM

To: "Schultz, Avalon" <aschultz@sanleandro.org>, Martha Miller, Patty Breslin

Avalon and Martha,

Thanks for your time yesterday discussing the Multifamily Development Standards. I've sent you some of my technical comments, but now I want to write about parking standards more broadly, and preview a proposal I am enlisting community support for for at the next stage of the standards' advancement.

I believe that the standards could and should go a lot further to advance actually building multifamily housing as part of a walkable, sustainable city. Specifically, while I appreciate that some changes were made to reduce parking requirements near transit, these changes were fairly minor and preserved some of the manifestly least-necessary requirements, those for developments a quarter mile from major transit stops.

Even going back to their very beginning, the off-street parking standards that most cities now have were never empirically justified on a planning or engineering basis - they emerged vernacularly, and then self-perpetuated, as part of a hazy vision of a car-based utopia which was never a good idea, even before we knew about climate change.

Right now, it is difficult to live without a car in San Leandro, and this is the direct result of a built environment that privileges car use. The only way to change our system to promote transit-oriented development is by allowing housing near transit to come with significantly less parking.

The minimum these standards preserve of 1 space per unit (or more) is out of keeping with not only current TOD recommendations from sources like [BART](#) but also with the direction the city is now pursuing in the Bay Fair TOD area. The following table would be more appropriate to the task at hand while still faithful to the scope of changes in this current project (confining itself to multifamily-zoned areas)

Zones	DA, SA, and RM (all multifamily zones subject to standards)	
Distance from major transit stop	Less than 0.5 miles:	At least 0.5 miles, but less than 1 mile:
Minimum off-street parking required	No minimum	0.5 per unit
Maximum allowed	1 space per unit	1.5 per unit

Lowering off-street parking requirements will result in more housing at lower costs, decrease car ownership, congestion, and city emissions, and foster the development of the walkable city we want.

The city's Climate Action Plan, passed unanimously in July 2021, said explicitly that eliminating off-street parking requirements was a key strategy toward promoting a range of transportation options in the city of 2035. I hope we will practice what we preach and take this moderate step toward reducing emissions and furthering affordable housing in our city.

Best,
John

From: Erin Ouborg [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 11:35 PM
To: Schultz, Avalon <ASchultz@sanleandro.org>
Subject: Re: Mul -Family Development Standards Public Review Draft and Office Hours Sign-Up

My public comments below:

General Comment - In all images that contain people, all visible people are white. Please consider more diverse representations in your image selections given San Leandro is the most diverse city in the Bay Area

Page 8 - You have a typo on the image text "Ground level doors...", missing the "t" in the word highlight

Page A-69 - Space Requirements #4 Required Amenities in which at least four are to be selected from the list. Please remove (b) Electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. This is no longer an "amenity" with the executive order N-79-20 which requires 100% zero-emission sale of new passenger cars and trucks by 2035. Current code already mandates all new construction to be EV ready or 240-volt Level 2 charging stations. And a 2022 update will mandate EV stations in new, non-residential developments. I am certain that a mandate for residential will be included in the very near future. If they are required to install the infrastructure already then it is not much of an added cost to require a percentage of parking stalls in new residential developments to be EV stalls. The cost of electric vehicles is decreasing with more options on the market making them more obtainable. We are not far from mandating all new construction to provide EV stations.

Page 10 and A-71 - Please consider adding language to common spaces and publicly accessible open space standards to direct a developer to select amenities based on the demographics of the most recent US census for the area in which the project is located. We should be encouraging multi-cultural spaces that best fit the future tenants/owners needs. I urge you to remove "tennis courts" and replace them with "basketball courts" or more generically "athletic courts and fields". Tennis courts promote an image of a certain social class and status, especially for private residential projects. Common and public spaces are the City's most important opportunity to promote Culture-Focused Placemaking, which is what we should strive for.

Page A-73 - under (4) Location, Publicly Accessible Open Space. Please consider removing requirement (a). Plenty of large scale residential projects include public spaces on rooftops or at elevated levels with publically accessible elevators and paths of travel. We shouldn't limit public green space to the ground level if the developer is willing to pay for it being located on a rooftop.

Thank you,

Erin Ouborg
[REDACTED]
[958 San Jose Street](#)