

The draft update to the Citywide Design Guidelines was distributed to the City's Industry Working Group (IWG) for review and comment. The IWG is a group of development industry professionals that meet with City staff on a regular basis to provide input on the development process including new development standards and guidelines. Comments and questions received from members of the IWG are summarized below and will be considered as the draft is updated.

## **IWG Comments**

- P4 Organization - If City Design Guidelines will apply where previously adopted specific plans/SPAs are silent, will that create an irregular pattern of regulation? Will the City provide a table or other guidance on what applies where?
- P17, bullet 3 - Discourage gated entries - Don't agree with this policy. In today's world of safety and security concerns, and active adult developments, gated entries are a supported segment of the housing market. Suggest language such as, "... Gated entries are acceptable on a limited basis . . ."
- P19, bullet 4 - How many 'open cul-de-sac connections' have been closed off with neighborhood concerns? Not always a good idea.
- P20, bullet 5 - NO. Open fencing next to parks is a bad thing. This has been vetted previously. Open fencing along open space areas and trails is a passive use and is acceptable to have open fencing. Parks are VERY active areas and while 'eyes on' from lots to park seems like a good idea, the reverse is also true. Many park user eyes into residential back yards and rear windows (living areas and bedrooms) is not good security for those homes. Having to close all window coverings at night to keep prying eyes from a park is not good design. Homes next to parks deserve some rights to privacy in their back yard and interior space. Open fencing; greenways & open space = YES; parks = NO.
- Page 20, 3.0(D), 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point - "Prohibited" and "shall" Language seems restrictive given the special considerations in the following bullet point. Just an observation.
- P21, bullet 1 - worth clarifying that tapers of landscape corridors at intersection widenings is acceptable.
- P22 separated walk - Graphic probably needs to add driveway out to street.
- P22, bullet 1 - Two trees in the RD-6 and RD-7 zone (which allows lots down to 40' wide) is too tight. Suggest having 2 trees for RD-5 and below. No "R8" zone in Elk Grove Code.
- P23, bullet 5 - This could apply to MDR tentative subdivision maps. How can a TM show 'trash storage locations' without architectural designs?
- P23, bullet 6 - Ditto, how can a 'trash storage plan' be done with tentative map review when building envelopes or architectural design is TBD with future home design review?
- Page 26 3.0 Single Family Residential Development - Not a fan of the illustration at bottom of page. Requirement to have a single story plan between every 2-story plan is extreme. There should be allowances to have 2-story plans with second story elements that do not cover the entire width of the house next to a traditional full width 2-story plan. We should

be allowed to have two traditional full width 2-story plans in a row. Requiring 1/3 of your lots to be a single story plan does not meet up with consumer demands.

- Page 28 3.0 Single Family Residential Development - "horizontal staggering" undefined. Articulation on homes (vertically or horizontally) create a natural "stagger." But, we can keep providing a 1'-2' variation between the closest elements to the street. That's enough, right?
- P 31 Architectural Styles - Section is nice information but is already known to any qualified design architect. Not sure if this adds any real content other than eye candy.
- P 48, Garage Placement - bad, bad, bad.
  - Requiring no livable portion behind garage in large lots like RD-1 thru RD-4 is unnecessary due to the larger lots and should be removed from the DG's. Only apply to RD-5 and above.
  - Garage frontage along street ( $B/A=\%$ ) does not work in many cases using a standard 20' 2-car garage. For example, 45' wide RD-7 lot has a 35' wide footprint and 20' garage. That is 57%. So no 2-car garages on 45' wide or smaller lots. Does not work, table needs to be revised.
  - Too many other comments here. This section needs more review.
- Page 48, 3.0(D1), Table 3.2 - Looking for clarification on how the garage frontage is measured for Street side garages and side-on garages. I don't believe the calculation should include the depth of a garage side of the structure on a side-on garage as that side of the garage can be designed in the appearance of living area. But how would the garage width limit be calculated? Same for street side calculations.
- Page 51 Section D.II Additional guidelines for three- or more- car garage design 6th bullet point - "two (2)" is not defined. Is this a 2' distance? If so, this should be defined further. There is an illustration on the next page regarding this, but it does not clearly define what the 2' is measured from. I would ask for this ambiguity to be cleared up. Also, this bullet point says garage door should be recessed one foot from door frame. Isn't that a lot?
- P53 Garages - confirm that the cantilevered requirements do not apply to detached garages. Should be obvious but didn't find a statement.
- General comment - special consideration for solar access in the discussion on roof designs is not found. Pitches and roof articulation can limit the ability to comply with solar requirements.