

**CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE
DESIGN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
OBJECTIVE DESIGN STANDARDS
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM 9/27/23 MEETING**

COMMENT	RESPONSE TO COMMENT
Parking Structures	
Allow rooftop and vertical landscaping/foilage; not opposed to street access (current draft includes requirement for structures located at rear or interior) but should incorporate mesh screens or climbing landscape if allowed at street access, and especially if proposed subterranean/semi-subterranean.	Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 4
Allow more flexibility than a full parking stall of landscape (p. 5); such as diamonds. This is more flexible than the current Design Guidelines.	Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment and to encourage greater flexibility. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 5
Add requirement to space out the trees so they are not grouped together.	Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 4, 7, 8
Clarification	
Should be clear that “stand-alone residential” does not mean single family--clarify that SFR does not apply, providing use tables at next meeting for reference.	Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 1
Landscaping (pg. 7) “ii” instead of “ii”.	This has been edited/revised. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 7
Open Space	
Percentages of open space are very strict, or impossible—requires more research.	Private and common open space requirements replaced with one standard for Open Space and Pedestrian Areas. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 3

Entrances	
Entrances should not always be required at rear of buildings or open towards parking areas, this should be reserved for main buildings, but not units. Allow for entries near alleys (pg. 11).	These requirements have been removed to encourage greater flexibility. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 12
51% of units oriented towards public street seems unreasonable. Any percentage seems too restrictive as a requirement.	These requirements have been removed to encourage greater flexibility. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 12
Types of projects (Major vs. Minor):	
May need to provide different standards for smaller projects vs. larger projects; e.g., 2-4 units vs. 5+ units, 1-10 units vs. 10+ units, 50 or more, etc.	City to confirm.
Adding different requirements for projects proposed at a larger scale.	City to confirm.
Architectural Elements	
Corbels and rafter tails (and their spacing) aren't mentioned;	Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. A Roof Elements section has been added to SCR and Mission. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 15, 20
Use trade references for stucco texture; perhaps require means and methods, be very specific (i.e. pool trowel, not spray on);	Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. Smooth or pool trowel finish, or painted/built-up brown coat. No spray on, mixed, textured allowed. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 17, 22
Floor heights: Only ground floor should be 10% higher, not every floor;	Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. "Followed by second and third" has been removed. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 15, 20

<p>Insets may be too restrictive for residential.</p>	<p>Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. Window insets proposed at 4 inches min. Door insets proposed at 6 inches min.</p> <p>SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 18, 23</p>
<p>Roof material, make objective so not up for interpretation.</p>	<p>Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment.</p> <p>SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 15, 20</p>
<p>Asked about whether parking standards and designs would be incorporated into the Architectural Elements code section.</p>	<p>City to confirm.</p>
<p>Not allowing mixed textured/smooth stucco to avoid inconsistent appearance.</p>	<p>Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. Smooth or pool trowel finish, or painted/built-up brown coat. No spray on, mixed, textured allowed.</p> <p>SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 17, 22</p>
<p>Line of sight from balconies and windows in terms of OCFA requirements.</p>	<p>Need input from the City on how this is implemented on non-ministerial projects. One way to approach this is to have OCFA give project “sign-off” before the application is submitted, or route it to them for review of compliance with codes and policies.</p>
<p>Street lighting: remove specific type of lighting, refer to “type” or City document that calls for specific lighting/poles—Staff to research this.</p>	<p>Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. Reference to San Diego series removed. Single or double lamp fixture type remains. Reference now made to City standard.</p> <p>SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 7</p>
<p>Colors: tiles, doors, etc. describe where the three colors are required (walls, trim, etc.).</p>	<p>Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment.</p> <p>SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 17, 22</p>
<p>Inset for doors and windows (12”) may be okay for some projects but other could be less</p>	<p>Requirements revised to allow/incorporate this comment. Window insets proposed at 4 inches min. Door insets proposed at 6 inches min.</p>

	SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 18, 23
Questioned why the standards mention off-site improvements.	Staff noted that current projects commonly require off-site improvements like installation of sidewalks; specific direction is typically given in COAs but now must be outlined in the ODS.
Remove Atomic Ranch reference.	This has been removed. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 24
Public Comments	
Sidewalk policy on p. 7: needs to be a requirement for historic tile in certain areas.	Reference has been updated. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 6
P.8: streets used to have one tree type; e.g., Esplanade had sycamores, etc.	Reference has been updated to species native to Coastal California. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 8
Questioned the 3 rd floor setback standard (p. 9)	This standard is from the Design Guidelines.
P. 11: what is meant by “primarily transparent” for commercial buildings	This has been removed. (ii) already addresses this: 90% clear. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 13
P. 13: supportive of flexibility on color	These requirements have been removed to encourage greater flexibility. SEE REV. ODS PAGE: 17, 22