

List for future priority consideration

In the course of the combined PC and ASCC work to produce Zoning Code that supports our Housing Element, we identified many possible topics for future attention. They vary widely in scope but generally would require prioritization at a town level to warrant staff and council support. Obviously these items would need to be consolidated/ranked with other town priorities (including backlog items in areas such as Safety/Fire) and consider available staffing levels.

1. Discretionary Review

- a. Create a process option whereby applicants could apply to the ASCC for discretionary review/approval (vs ministerial process and objective standards) in order to receive benefits (tbd as part of discussion). This would need to integrate with code such that it would not require a variance. We would need to consider how this might integrate (or not) with the 5 meeting rule.

2. Objective standards

- a. We have various ordinances (ex. Lighting, fencing, reflectivity) that are a mix of objective and subjective standards. Should we be separating out the objective standards?
- b. Should objective standards work be applied to other zones?
- c. Some of the new objective standards that we are implementing to support our HE seem more appropriate for larger developments. Should we do a follow-up review of these standards in order to simplify and provide greater flexibility (ex. for one-, two-, and three-story buildings consider architectural facades, massing, building entries, roof lines, etc.)?
- d. Is there more work to be done to ensure “natural” aesthetics gets turned into objective design standards.

3. Code concerns and updates

- a. Reflectivity, Grading, Heritage Tree/Tree Removal code were specifically mentioned as perhaps needing updating. Reflectivity to allow greater energy efficiency. Grading and Tree with respect to ministerial approval.
- b. General code update potential to consider
 - i. New standards
 - ii. Simplification and reorganization for clarity
 - iii. Add more drawings for clarity across all zones
 - iv. Typos/Errors cleanup - Ex. subsection A of 18.12.040 refers to 18.40 (signs) should probably say 18.42
 - v. Need to ensure regulations are in line with other agencies (fire, sewer, pge, cal water, etc.)

- vi. Affordable – Capital ‘A’ vs lower case ‘a’ distinction Do we need to watch our definitions and usage of this term. Does it sometimes mean very specific things in housing law?
 - c. Building separation – We will need to see how the how the separation for massing new code in new zoning integrates with expected new fire code and state ADU code.
 - d. Street Parking – Definite concerns by residents vs state requirements. What degrees of flexibility do we have?
 - e. Reevaluate old code – Ex. 85% rule for main vs accessory structures for, one light at doors vs lumen max, 5% bonus for 1 story buildings since this encourages more grading
 - f. Biking regulations – Ex. Suggestions regarding long term storage, concerns about ebike battery fire risks’
- 4. Building Affordability
 - a. Do we need a review of standards in general in order to address affordability?
 - b. Could or should there be different objective standards for affordable housing? Does Density Bonus law cover this already by allowing waivers and concessions?
 - c. Should we create Modular Home standards
 - d. Possible list of waivers/concession that are preferable to the town for discussion with developers
- 5. Zoning map
 - a. Is Corte Madera School shown correctly as housing zone?
 - b. Frog Pond/Road Remnant zoning
 - c. Are there other issues with the map that need correcting?