



Get a Slice of the Apple.

**TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY  
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA**

**WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2017**

**Workshop Meeting 6:00 p.m.**

***Town Council Chambers***  
**14955 Dale Evans Parkway**

\*\*\*\*\*

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Mark Shoup, Chairman  
B. R. "Bob" Tinsley, Vice-Chairman  
Jason Lamoreaux, Commissioner  
Doug Qualls, Commissioner  
Bruce Kallen, Commissioner

**PLANNING DIVISION OFFICE: (760) 240-7000 Ext. 7200**  
**[www.AVPlanning.org](http://www.AVPlanning.org)**

***Monday - Thursday 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.***  
***Alternating Fridays 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.***



Get a Slice of the Apple.

**TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY  
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA  
WORKSHOP MEETING  
WEDNESDAY August 2, 2017 – 6:00 P.M.**

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IS INVITED.** Planning Commission meetings are held in the Town Council Chambers located at 14955 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, California. If you wish to be heard on any item on the agenda during the Commission’s consideration of that item, or earlier if determined by the Commission, please so indicate by filling out a "REQUEST TO SPEAK" form at the Commission meeting. Place the request in the Speaker Request Box on the table near the Secretary, or hand it to the Secretary at the Commission meeting. (G.C. 54954.3 {a}).

Materials related to an item on this agenda, submitted to the Commission after distribution of the agenda packet, are available for public inspection in the Town Clerk’s Office at 14955 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, CA during normal business hours. Such documents are also available on the Town of Apple Valley website at [www.applevalley.org](http://www.applevalley.org) subject to staff’s ability to post the documents before the meeting.

*The Town of Apple Valley recognizes its obligation to provide equal access to those individuals with disabilities. Please contact the Town Clerk’s Office, at (760) 240-7000, two working days prior to the scheduled meeting for any requests for reasonable accommodations.*

**WORKSHOP MEETING**

The Workshop meeting is open to the public and will begin at 6:00 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**ROLL CALL**

Commissioners: Lamoreaux\_\_\_\_\_ ; Kallen \_\_\_\_\_ ; Qualls \_\_\_\_\_  
Vice-Chairman Tinsley\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ Chairman  
Shoup\_\_\_\_\_

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Anyone wishing to address an item not on the agenda, or an item that is not scheduled for a public hearing at this meeting, may do so at this time. California State Law does not allow the Commission to act on items not on the agenda,

except in very limited circumstances. Your concerns may be referred to staff or placed on a future agenda.

1. The Planning Commission will receive comments and discuss the Town of Apple Valley's Development Code standards and requirements relative to Multi-Family Residential (R-M) Zoning District development standards

## **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

## **PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

## **STAFF COMMENTS**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The Planning Commission will adjourn to its next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on August 16, 2017.



# TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY MEMORANDUM

Get a Slice of the Apple.

**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Carol Miller, Assistant Director of Community Development  
**SUBJECT:** Multi-Family Residential (R-M) Zoning District development standards  
**DATE:** August 2, 2017 - WORKSHOP

## BACKGROUND

At its meeting of May 30, 2017, the Town Council directed that the Planning Commission review the Development Code Multi-family residential standards.

In the last ten (10) years there have been market driven changes to the multi-family housing industry. These changes involve unit size, parking, energy sustainability, drought/water efficiency issues, open space with amenities and an overall need for additional housing options, including apartment and townhomes.

The last comprehensive update to the Multi-Family Residential standards was adopted in 2006. The process began in September 2005, when the Town Council discussed the issue and directed the Planning Commission to review the Multi-Family Residential Development standards with one or more workshops, open to the public and local architects to gather input. This ultimately led to three (3) Planning Commission workshops beginning in October 2005. The workshops addressed project density, open space (common and private), setbacks, amenities, building height, separation of buildings, unit sizes, lot coverage and review process.

Staff is taking a similar approach as done in the past. Staff has reached out to local designers, builders, and realtors to provide input on possible changes to the Multi-Family Residential standards. Staff will be scheduling a tour of a few apartment complexes for the Commission before the second workshop. Following the second workshop the proposed modified standards would then be discussed by the Planning Commission with a recommendation to the Council.

## CODE HIGHLIGHTS

All standards and criteria have an impact, to varying degrees, upon the ability of a property owner to develop their land. Listed below are the four (4) standards that would, generally, have the most significant impact upon potential development (in relative descending order of potential impact), and which would, conversely, have the most potential to encourage or influence development if these standards were changed (a summary of all applicable R-M standards is also attached to the end of this report).

Parking Requirements:

Studio:	1 covered space per unit and 1 open space per unit
One and Two Bedrooms:	2 enclosed spaces per unit and 0.50 uncovered guest spaces per unit.
Three /more Bedrooms:	2 enclosed spaces per unit, one uncovered space per unit and 0.50 uncovered guest spaces per unit.

As shown below, the Multi-family projects within the Mountain Vista neighborhood area have less parking requirements. These requirements are:

Studio:	1 covered space per unit
One and Two Bedrooms:	1 enclosed spaces per unit and 1 uncovered guest spaces per unit.
Three /more Bedrooms:	2 enclosed spaces per unit, one uncovered space per unit.

Open Space:

Five units and above = 150 square feet private space, plus 30% of total lot area. (Open space minimum width is fifteen (15) feet and may not include required front or street setbacks)

Amenities:

0-3 Units	450 Square feet private open space
4-10 Units	1 Amenity
11-50 Units	2 Amenities
51-100 Units	3 Amenities (including at least 1 community focal point)
101 plus Units	4 Amenities

Community focal points is defined as: "Projects containing more than twenty (20) units require installation of at least one (1) community focal point per project. The community focal point shall be designed to function as a central meeting place for use by project residents and shall consist of a plaza, courtyard, or other type of landmark feature. The focal points shall be protected from the extreme elements characteristic of the desert environment, such as wind and high and low temperatures. These areas shall include shading, seating, and decorative features consistent with the style and design of the units, or may be enclosed to function as a recreation room or cabana. If enclosed, the structure shall be architecturally embellished to signify a focal point. The focal point shall be centrally located and accessible to all residents."

Based on the amenity list verses definition of "community focal points", staff finds a discrepancy. The list identifies the requirement of a community focal point within 51-100 unit, whereas the text portion indicates at 20 or more units. Also, the list indicates that at least one amenity is required at 4 or more units; however, the text portion of the Code stipulates that projects with up to 4 units are only required 450 s.f of private open space.

Minimum Unit Sizes:

Studio:	600 Square feet
One bedroom:	800 Square feet
Two bedroom:	1,000 Square feet
Three and more:	1,200 Square feet

## ANALYSIS

It is obvious that any and all standards that affect the construction of a project also affect the economic decision to build or not build upon a particular property. In addition to the physical constraints associated with a property that may affect the development of that site (for example, corner lot versus an interior lot, sloped areas, rock outcroppings, recorded easements, drainage or flood control issues, etc.), choices by the property owner for the nature or type of development also dramatically affect the economics of whether it is cost effective to build at any point in time. Property owner choices that affect whether a project will “pencil-out” are features such as the proposed unit size, one or two-story construction, size and type of amenities such as a pool, tennis court, playground/tot lot, number of garage parking spaces, architectural design of the proposed building(s) and general site configuration.

The impacts of each of these possible changes can be significant. Reduced required parking may have the effect that once all the on-site parking spaces are occupied, vehicles must then park on the street, thus impacting traffic circulation and street appeal by giving the neighborhood the appearance of being crowded or cluttered with cars. Reduced open space, could have the effect of allowing developments that may appear inconsistent with surrounding low density developments and, possibly, give the impression of over-crowding a property.

Although all requirements add to the expense of the construction of any new units, they also add to or enhance the aesthetics of the community, protect the visual image of the streetscape, allow for compatibility and conformity to surrounding development and generally are intended to preserve and enhance existing, surrounding property values.

## SUMMARY

The August 2nd workshop is to be a totally open forum allowing any interested individual the opportunity to address the Commission on whether, and how, any of the R-M related development standards may be changed. Any such discussion, however, should be conducted keeping in mind a full array of housing types within the Community in conformance to the Goals and Policies of the adopted Housing Element of the General Plan, while still maintaining community identity, heritage and high design/development standards. Although staff generally prefers to provide the Commission with initial draft language and specifics to assist the Commission in framing and conducting its discussion of the issue at hand, staff would recommend an open discussion with those in attendance as the basic format for the meeting.

The Commission may wish to address the standards noted previously in this report individually to ascertain whether it would be appropriated, and the potential impacts, to change these standards, or for the purposes of the first workshop is to just takes comments from the public. The Commission may want to reframe from too much in depth discussion until there is a full Commission present and after the tour of apartment complexes. Nevertheless, in considering any such changes, it must be remembered that once new standards are in place, any property owner may use those standards to build. So, although talented, creative local designers and developers may attend the meeting and assure the Commission that changes to the Town’s standards will still result in the construction of high quality projects, there are individuals that will build to the absolute minimums allowed by Code to achieve maximum density at minimum cost. Any modifications considered by the Commission should protect and preserve adjoining and surrounding properties and the residential quality of the community as a whole.

## RECOMMENDATION

Following receipt of public input and discussion by the Commission, it is recommended that the Planning Commission provide guidance to staff on the issues noted. Staff will be scheduling a tour of a few apartment complexes for the Commission before the second workshop. Following the second workshop the proposed modified standards would then be discussed by the Planning Commission with a recommendation to the Council.