DENSITY BONUS CRITERIA

Current criteria

1. Consistency in design (5%):
    a. Consistent and overall subdivision design theme
    b. Unified architectural building styles
    c. Consistency in building materials, colors, height, type and quality
    d. Other subdivision design features and amenities designed to add long term attractiveness and quality
2. Convenience in layout, variety of lot sizes, and unique subdivision features (10%)
    a. Creative or extraordinary design layout
    b. Variations in lot sizes
    c. Incorporates unique features and amenities for the benefit of subdivision and community not typically required or provided in other subdivisions

Guiding principles

Here are my personal opinions about how to think about density bonus criteria:

1. Our sole focus should be creating a benefit for the broader community. Since it is the community granting a density bonus, it is the community that should benefit.
2. We should not worry about creating a benefit for the subdivision. That's the developer's job.
3. Most of the density bonus criteria above are too vague to be meaningful or create a benefit for the subdivision only, so they should be eliminated.
4. Either we already have sufficient requirements about building design, materials, and colors, or we should improve these requirements if they are not adequate.

Discussion

Here are the items discussed at the last meeting with comments made then plus some additional thoughts and new items.

1. Single story – with a maximum height limit of ___ (18', 20'?), with no upper level bonus room. Keeping the height below 20' preserves views for the community and enhances privacy for neighboring subdivisions.
2. 3-12 pitch or less – eliminate - see #3

3. Hip roof – Hip roof with a 3-12 pitch or less. Specifying a hip roof minimizes bulk compared to a gable. What about flat roof – with the same height limit or a lower height limit, i.e. if the limit for a 3-12 hip roof is 20' then 18' for a flat roof?
4. 20' maximum height of building – eliminate this item and replace with #1 and #3 above
5. Southwestern or Mediterranean architecture – Why require? Maybe because the more consistent the design of homes are in the community the more cohesive the community becomes? I'm not certain this is that much of a benefit to the community.
6. Earth tone colors – don't we require that for all construction already? If we don't, shouldn't we? I think we should, so this would not need to be a consideration.
7. Energy efficient materials – the less energy each of us uses, the better off we all are – but this should be defined better, so it is not subjective.
8. Rural streets, etc. (should this be where we incorporate the rural subdivision instead of a separate overlay if located W of 600 W?) – no comment
9. ___% of lots at least 1,000 sq.ft. larger than required minimum – this would benefit the community if these lots are around the perimeter and especially adjacent to a neighboring subdivision. But instead of requiring a specific sq.ft. increase, use a percentage increase, i.e. 10% larger than the required minimum.
10. Entrance feature – this benefits the new subdivision more than the community, so ignore.
11. Water efficiency – like energy efficiency, we all benefit – but needs to be defined.
12. Create more open space:
    a. along the public streets – this enhances views and a sense of openness for the broader community – but it should be open space outside the development's perimeter wall
    b. greater setbacks up against adjoining subdivisions – this enhances privacy, views, light and air for adjoining subdivisions
    c. A priority should be "b" above instead of "a" – adjoining subdivisions are impacted the most by new development.
13. Grade: Provide that the level of the lots adjoining another subdivision be at or below the grade of the adjoining lots in the existing subdivision. (Note: In some cases, this may be done anyway due to topography, but it is a consideration worth giving credit for.)

Sorry I won't be at the meeting to discuss this. Have fun.

Mike