

**HAND-DELIVERED**

DD. SUP. 05JAN28PM12:28

## County of Santa Clara

Environmental Resources Agency  
Planning Office

County Government Center, East Wing, 7th Floor  
70 West Hedding Street  
San Jose, California 95110-1705  
(408) 299-5770 FAX (408) 288-9198  
www.sccplanning.org



January 25, 2005

To: Board of Supervisors  
County Executive

B/S Chair ☒

BD of Supv. ☒

Clerk ☒

From: Michael M. Lopez, Interim Planning Director *Qui Ona for mm*

RE: Referral Response Regarding Monster Homes of December 14, 2004  
(Off Agenda)

This memo is in response to a referral of December 14, 2004 from the Board of Supervisors regarding the subject of "monster homes." The referral originated with a request by Supervisor Liz Kniss of District 5, described in the attached transmittal.

The organization of this memorandum follows the series of questions listed in the referral transmittal:

1. Definitional Issues
2. Building permit data from 1995 to 2004
3. Surrounding Issues
4. Actions taken by County in the last ten years addressing "monster homes"
5. Comparison table of each city's home size restrictions within the County

In addition, the memo provides a brief overview of the existing high priority work plan assignments and other pending projects assigned to the Planning Office, to assist the Board in assessing the prioritization of this referral and potential for additional work regarding the subject matter.

### 1. Definitional Issues of "Monster Homes"

The term 'monster home' has no precise or universally recognized definition. It is a colloquial term often used to describe single family residences built within existing neighborhoods that are perceived to be significantly larger than existing homes in the neighborhood or that critics believe have an inappropriate design for a particular parcel, neighborhood, or community. It is most often used in a pejorative sense to criticize the architectural style, mass, height, or other physical characteristics of the individual homes in question. The term may also be used at times to refer to residences built in new neighborhoods or subdivisions or in reference to the general phenomena of infill redevelopment of existing residential lots. The ongoing replacement of older, smaller homes with new larger homes is a nationwide phenomenon. Few cities have not had some experience with it.

Any definition of "monster home" that might be proposed is inherently somewhat subjective, based on the particular circumstances, tastes, and preferences of those involved. A search performed of online dictionaries available on the Internet found no entries under the term 'monster home.'

Beyond the issues of size and scale, critics of "monster homes" often object to the following aspects or features of the homes:

- boxy, unimaginative massing and design suggestive of minimizing expense;
- unbalanced proportions or inept use of architectural features or motifs;
- any two-story homes in traditionally one-story neighborhoods;
- choice of specific architectural styles, such as Mediterranean or English Tudor, in areas where the preponderance of homes are of a different style; and
- use of particular design elements, such as facades dominated by garage doors, oversized entryways and porches, colors, and window styles.

No definition of the term 'monster home' has been considered or adopted as part of a County policy or ordinance. However, all zoning codes contain provisions that effectively regulate or limit the size of residences in some way, such as height limits, setbacks, and limits on the number of stories. Beyond these basic types of standards, cities and counties may use a variety of regulations to limit house size, including:

- floor area ratio (FAR), that limits size in relation to the area of the lot;
- floor area limits, expressed in terms of an absolute maximum size;
- lot coverage limits, restricting the percentage or amount of the lot that can be covered by buildings; and,
- siting regulations.

Setbacks, height limits, and limits on the number of stories apply in all County zoning districts. The specific standards vary by district and lot size combining district, per Chapter 3.10 of the Zoning Ordinance. There are also specific standards for flag lots of less than 20,000 square feet. For further information, refer to the attached handout "Development Standards for Residential Uses by Zoning District" for an overview of residential development regulations (Attachment A). Additional explanation is provided under part three of this memo.

## **2. Building Permit Data for Single Family Residences, 1995 – 2004**

The referral requested information regarding the number of homes built in County pockets in the last ten years that would qualify as "monster homes." Lacking a pre-defined basis of what would qualify as a "monster home," staff is obtaining and compiling data for all building permits issued during 1995 to 2004 for new single family residences in urban pockets to provide further information and basis for discussion by the Board of Supervisors. The permit data is forthcoming in a tabular addendum.

## **3. Other Issues Relating to "Monster Homes"**

The referral requested that staff address related or surrounding issues on the topic of "monster homes." These might include existing County General Plan goals, strategies, and policies, social trends and evolving lifestyles, privacy issues, property values and property rights, and many others.

### 3.1 General Plan-Related Issues

Existing, longstanding urban development policies of the General Plan require that each urban pocket ultimately be annexed into its surrounding city, i.e., the city in whose Urban Service Area the pocket is located (Part 4 of the General Plan, Urban Unincorporated Area Issues and Policies).

The fundamental strategies and policies governing urban pockets or islands are to:

- #1: Promote eventual annexation;
- #2: Ensure conformity of development with cities' general plans; and,
- #3: Provide services as efficiently and equitably as possible.

The General Plan supports the eventual annexation of all the urban pockets except those areas of Stanford lands governed by intergovernmental agreements. It supports the development of unincorporated lands within those pockets that conforms to the type of use and general density of development permitted under the applicable city general plan. It also recommends that specific development standards be considered for general compatibility with city development standards.

### 3.2 Design Issues

Design characteristics of new construction are often a major factor in discussions of "monster homes." In some cases, critics of larger replacement homes object more to what they consider the lack of proper design or architectural character than the sheer size of the home. Often the criticisms are combined.

The subject of architectural character or design further relates to the types of review processes local governments may use to regulate new residential development. Depending on the jurisdiction, such processes can vary greatly in terms of application requirements, the cost to the applicant, the amount of time necessary to obtain approvals, administrative costs to the jurisdiction, the use of formally appointed review boards or commissions, the level of detail subject to architectural review and approval, the development and use of formal guidelines as a basis for discretionary review, staffing implications, types of appeal processes, controversy potential, and impacts on the general cost of housing, among other variables.

### 3.3 Maintenance of Housing Stock

'Housing stock' is a term used to refer to the entirety of housing within a jurisdiction. Replacement and maintenance of aging or decrepit housing stock is a necessary aspect of the evolution of urban areas and is generally desirable from the standpoint of the public health, safety and welfare. The emerging challenge faced by all cities is one of balancing the replacement of housing stock with the goals of conserving neighborhood character, encouraging quality design and construction, and maintaining proper relationships to the land and natural environments.

### 3.4 Social Trends in House Size

House size trends reflect changing lifestyles, individual prosperity, and economic cycles. The average house size for working class families of the 1940s to 1950s was considerably smaller than today's. Contemporary homes have more bedrooms, and much larger kitchen and dining spaces. Recreation rooms, bonus or family rooms, home offices, and home theaters are also more common, as are larger closets and general storage space. Master bedroom suites are now the norm, rather than the exception. Two and three car garages reflect trends in increased vehicle ownership per household.

In general, where the market and regulations permit, owners and developers of custom or speculative homes often seek to maximize the overall size of a house to accommodate as many design features and rooms as modern day families may desire. That is not to ignore the fact that in some areas of the country, there is a growing amount of interest and professional literature concerning small house design, emphasizing economy and efficiency of design.

### 3.5 Historical Significance

The replacement of older homes with newer, larger or "monster homes" may also involve properties with historical significance. The properties often targeted for the construction of large replacement homes are those with older, smaller homes whose floor plans and construction aren't well suited to expansion or alteration. However, in other cases, highly significant historical homes of excellent design and construction may be lost as a result. Cities and counties must evaluate the potential historical value of older homes proposed for demolition under provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

### 3.6 Privacy Issues/Daylight Impacts

The construction of large replacement homes that maximize the building footprint or envelope (minimum setbacks and maximum height) are often criticized for directly diminishing the privacy of neighboring properties. Critics often cite the example of second story windows that provide a direct view of backyards, pools and spas. Other concerns include the loss of daylight to neighboring homes and yards. Proponents of those larger homes argue that as long as everyone has the same rights to develop, personal preferences should take priority.

### 3.7 Property Rights

By statute and judicial rulings, local governments have the right to regulate land use, residential development, and aesthetics. Nevertheless, any discussion of potential home size regulations typically causes significant controversy over property rights issues. Some individuals take extreme positions on the subject and strenuously object to any additional regulation of house size, on the basis that personal interests and preferences should supersede public interests. Some express concerns about the extent of neighbor involvement in determining specific aspects of design, while others believe that community standards and expectations must play a role in balancing individual and community interests, such as conserving neighborhood character.

#### **4. Actions taken by County in the last ten years addressing "monster homes"**

The County has enacted a number of house size regulations in the recent past—some within the last ten years—that address certain issues regarding "monster homes." For example, the floor area ratio (FAR) regulations for the "-n1" Los Altos urban pockets originated in 1992, and the "-n2" Burbank FAR originated in 1994. The Los Altos "-n1" zoning district established a 35% FAR for lots of 10,000 square feet or less, with floor area capped at 5,700 square feet. The "-n1" regulations were modified in 1997 to address the issue of underlying lots. The Burbank "-n2" district contains a 50% FAR and was based on recommendations of the Burbank Community Council.

Neighborhood Preservation zoning districts establishing FAR restrictions for certain Cupertino pockets were enacted in 1998 and 1999 ("-n3" and "-n4"). These were related to programmatic efforts between the city and County to promote annexation, and the pockets to which these standards applied, Rancho Rinconada and Garden Gate, have been subsequently annexed into the City of Cupertino. Those regulations established a 45% FAR and certain setbacks for second stories.

For flag lots less than 20,000 square feet in all urban residential zoning districts, the Board of Supervisors adopted standards in 2001 that restricted height to one story and 21 feet.

The County also imposed house size limits on residences in the "-d2" Design Review district for the Milpitas hillsides, in 1999. For lots less than 10 acres, floor area is limited to 6,000 square feet. For lots 10 acres or greater, the limit is 8,000 square feet of floor area. Part of the "-d2" district applies to unincorporated lands inside the current Urban Service Area (USA) of Milpitas, and part applies to lands outside the USA.

In the process of establishing the "-d1" Design Review Zoning District for the west valley hillsides during 1996-1997, there was extensive discussion regarding the possibility of establishing a maximum house size, but due to the level of controversy, the Board of Supervisors elected not to include such a standard in the regulations.

#### **5. Comparison table of each city's home size restrictions within Santa Clara County**

The referral requested a table comparing each city's home size restrictions to the County's. The attached table entitled "House Size Restriction Profile for Cities in Santa Clara County" lists height restrictions, limits on number of stories, lot coverage, and floor area ratios or limits based on lot size (Attachment C).

The standards of the cities vary greatly in terms of complexity. Some cities' standards are straightforward and easily comprehended at first glance. However, others' standards and formulas can be so complex that they cannot be summarized adequately in tabular format. To convey the complexities inherent in some regulations, extensive footnotes are included to elaborate on regulations that have been simplified for inclusion in the table.

Heights/Stories: The majority of cities have a single fixed height standard and limit on the number of stories. Several allow some flexibility on height, depending on other factors. One city allows marginally greater heights with marginal increases in setbacks.

Lot Coverage: Lot coverage standards are generally in the 35 to 45% range, but it is important to note that the majority of cities that impose lot coverage regulations proportionately reduce lot coverage as lot size increases.

Floor Area Ratios (FAR)/Limits: FARs are generally 35 to 50% for typical urban lot patterns, which exhibit lot sizes from approximately 5,000 to 10,000 square feet. FAR typically decreases as lot size increases. Some cities discourage floor area above a certain percentage by imposing a discretionary review requirement. Some use FAR to encourage one story design instead of two story design.

The vast majority of urban residential zoning districts within unincorporated islands are subject to a 35 ft. height limit, 2 stories, no lot coverage limits except for those that apply to accessory buildings, and no floor area ratio. Combining districts for "-n1," "-n2," and "-d2" impose floor area ratios or limits.

## 6. Existing Work Plan Priorities

The following table lists those work plan items identified as "legislative initiatives" in the adopted work plan for the Planning Office. It indicates those that were existing projects at the time the work plan was adopted in 2002 and those new initiatives approved as having highest priority for the Planning Office.

<b>EXISTING PROJECTS (as of 2002)</b>			
10-01	Geologic Ordinance/Hazard Maps	Completed	
10-02	Rezoning for Consistency w/ General Plan	Completed	
10-03	Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Revision (and replace official zoning maps with GIS Zoning maps)	Completed	Periodic need for review/corrections, minor improvements
10-04	Housing Element Update	Completed	
10-05	Historic Preservation Ordinance	In progress	
<b>EXTERNALLY GENERATED PROJECTS</b>			
10-06	Lot Line Adjustment Ordinance Revisions	Completed	Annual reporting requirement
10-07	Habitat Conservation Plan	In progress	(See note)
10-08	Wind Energy Conservation Systems Ordinance/Regulations	Completed	
10-09	Milpitas USA Retraction and General Plan Amendments/Rezoning	On hold; Early 2005 restart	
<b>DEFERRED PROJECTS</b>			
10-10	Administrative Hearing Ordinance	Withdrawn	

10-11	Sale of Alcohol in Neighborhood Areas	Completed	
10-12	Letters of Convenience and Necessity	Completed	
<b>STANFORD COMMUNITY PLAN/GUP IMPLEMENTATION</b>			
10-13	Stanford OS/F Zoning District	Completed	
10-14	Stanford SCA, Special Conservation Area Zoning District	On hold	Prerequisite study necessary
<b>NEW PROJECTS-HIGH PRIORITY</b>			
10-15	Large Group Assembly Facilities Study (LGAF)	Completed	Also addressed in CVSP and Morgan Hill ULL studies
10-18	Williamson Act Policies and Ordinances Review	In progress	
10-20	Riparian Protection Policy and Ordinance Study	In progress	Combined with Water Collaborative
10-19	Viewsheds and Greenbelt Study	In progress	Overlaps with CVSP and Morgan Hill ULL studies

Note: Item 10-07, Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), was originally identified as being part of the Planning Office's work plan when the work plan was adopted. Since that time, the primary responsibility for County government participation has been shifted to the Office of the County Executive, although Planning Office staff continue to be involved on a regular basis.

From this overview the following major initiatives remain in process:

- 10-05, Historic Preservation Ordinance
- 10-09, Milpitas USA Retraction and General Plan Amendments/Rezoning
- 10-14, Stanford SCA, Special Conservation Area Zoning District
- 10-18, Williamson Act Policies and Ordinances Review
- 10-20, Riparian Protection Policy and Ordinance Study/Water Collaborative
- 10-19, Viewsheds and Greenbelt Study

Each of these projects has multiple dimensions and various aspects of implementation, including the development of ordinance standards, procedures, and regulations. Each requires or will require a significant amount of Planning Office project staff and/or managerial staff involvement. All are in addition to ongoing mandatory functions of the Planning Office, major projects and EIR-related work, and those completed work plan items that continue to require considerable ongoing follow-up work, such as the reporting requirements concerning lot line adjustments, and various corrections/clarifications to the revised Zoning Ordinance.

## Conclusions

Note: The response to this referral could not be fully completed within the mandatory 45 day referral response time period. Staff will produce a follow-up memorandum as an addendum to this memo that will contain the building permit research requested,



any descriptive or explanatory information needed in relation to that research, and further address the following:

- identification of possible trends derived from building permit data;
- staff resource and operational impacts of potentially developing additional zoning regulations to achieve greater compatibility of standards with city standards (such as the issue of adding significant complexity to zoning regulations, possible proliferation of “-n” combining districts for each city or portions thereof, costs of implementation, and controversy potential, etc.)
- impact of any new legislative initiative to existing work plan and the ability of Planning Office and other County offices to deal effectively with multiple complex and controversial issues at the same time (e.g.: Williamson Act policies and practices)
- relationship to urban development policies and more specifically, pocket annexation goals and policies of the General Plan. Discuss LAFCO efforts to promote annexations pursuant to SB 1266, which allows cities to annex pockets of up to 150 acres without possibility of protest or elections. Articulate the need to employ the most strategic and cost-effective ways to facilitate island annexation in light of limited resources).

Given the potential complexity and controversy associated with any new legislative initiative regarding regulation of house size within urban pockets—including extensive community outreach and involvement in the hearing processes—the Board of Supervisors will need to carefully consider the impact upon existing work plan priorities. If the Board of Supervisors directs staff to commence work on a new legislative initiative regarding house size regulations for urban pockets, that work effort would displace or defer indefinitely at least one and probably several existing high priority work plan items for the foreseeable future.

Attachments:

- A. Development Standards for Residential uses by Zoning District – County of Santa Clara (public service counter handout)
- B. Table – Building Permit Data for New Single Family Residences, 1995-2004, within Urban Pockets [NOT AVAILABLE]
- C. Table – House Size Restriction Profile for Cities in Santa Clara County
- D. December 14, 2004 Referral

CC: Jane Decker, Deputy County Executive  
W. T. Chow, Director, Environmental Resources Agency  
Phyllis Perez, Clerk of the Board



**COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA - PLANNING OFFICE**  
70 W. Hedding St., San Jose, CA 95110  
(408) 299-5770 www.sccplanning.org

**Development Standards for Residential Uses by Zoning District**

(Accessory buildings and structures, see Section 4.20.020.)

Zoning District	Setbacks (in ft.)			Building Height (In ft.)		Lot Size for Subdivision (In net sq. ft., under 1 acre) (In gross acres, 1 acre or more)
	Front	Side*	Rear	Height	Stories	
<b>Urban Base Districts</b>						
R1, R1E, R2, & A1 (in USA)	25	5	25	35	2	5000 s.f.
R3	20	10	15	45	4	NA (City GP)
RHS	30	20	25	35	3	1 to 10 ac. (See 2.30.040)
R1S (Stanford)	25	5	25	35	2	8 du/ac, max. (See 2.30.030)
R1S - Multi-Family	ASA	ASA	ASA	ASA	ASA	
R3S (Stanford)	ASA	ASA	ASA	ASA	ASA	15 du/ac, max. (See 2.30.030)
<b>Lot Size Combining Districts (Ch. 3.10)</b>						
-6	25	6	25	NA	NA	6000 s.f.
-8	25	8	25	NA	NA	8000 s.f.
-10	25	10	25	NA	NA	10,000 s.f.
-20	30	15	25	NA	NA	20,000 s.f.
-1 ac.	30	20	25	NA	NA	1 acre, gross
-2.5 ac.	30	30	30	NA	NA	2.5 acres
-5 ac.	30	30	30	NA	NA	5 acres
-10 ac.	30	30	30	NA	NA	10 acres
-20 ac.	30	30	30	NA	NA	20 acres
-40 ac.	30	30	30	NA	NA	40 acres
-1s, -1.75s, -2.5s, -5s, -5/20s, -20s	30	30	30	NA	NA	Formula (See 3.10.040)
<b>Rural &amp; Special Purpose Districts</b>						
A, A1	30	30	30	35	2	By Combining District
RR	30	30	30	35	2	5 - 20 ac. (See 2.20.040)
AR	30	30	30	35	3	160 ac.** (See 2.20.040)
HS	30	30	30	35	3	160 ac.** (See 2.20.040)
RS	30	30	30	35	2	20 ac. (See 2.50.030)
OS/F (Stanford)	ASA	ASA	ASA	ASA	ASA	160 ac. (See 2.50.030)

**NOTES:**

\* 10' exterior side for corner lots, minimum, if standard is less than 10'

\*\* Density/min. lot size in AR and HS may also be determined by "20s" slope-density formula. See section noted.

*See Reverse for Special Provisions and Exceptions*

July 2004

ATTACHMENT A

**COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA - PLANNING OFFICE**  
70 W. Hedding St., San Jose, CA 95110  
(408) 299-5770 www.sccplanning.org

**Special Setback Exceptions, Section 4.20.110 (C)(1):**

- Minimum side yard for substandard lots of one (1) acre or less:

Lot area	Min. side yard (ft.)
3,750 - 5,000	5
5,001 - 6,000	6
6,001 - 8,000	8
8,001 - 10,000	10
10,001 - 20,000	15
20,001 - 1 ac. Net	20

- Side setback reduction for lots larger than one (1) acre net and less than 150 ft. in width:  
20% of lot width (Section 4.20.110(C)(2))
- Rear setback reduction for any lot:  
20% of lot depth (Section 4.20.110(C)(3))
- Setbacks established by a recorded subdivision map, including building lines and envelopes, supersede setbacks of the Zoning Ordinance if more restrictive (Section 4.20.110(C)(4)).

**Certain architectural features, such as awnings, bay windows, eaves, chimneys, etc.:**

May extend 30 inches into a required setback. See Section 4.20.110(A)(1).

**Entrance decks, stairs** that are uncovered and unenclosed may extend to a very limited extent into a required yard setback, as set forth in Section 4.20.110(A)(2).

**Other Combining Districts:** "-n", "-d", "-sr" and "-h" combining zoning districts may contain height or other special development regulations that supersede those of any other district. See Article 3.

**HS Specified Substandard Subdivisions.** For lots less than one acre in certain named HS subdivisions, refer to the provisions of Section 2.20.070(A), Rural Base Zoning Districts.

**Height exceptions for architectural features, such as chimneys, railings, solar panels, etc.:**

See 4.20.110(B) for additional height allowances, depending on structure.

**Flag lots of less than 20,000 s.f. in urban residential zoning districts,**  
21 feet maximum height, one story allowed (Section 2.30.030(B)).

**Minimum size for substandard lots** in order to allow use as a residential building site, assuming all other applicable standards are met, is 3,750 s.f. (Section 4.20.040)

For a complete compilation of supplemental development standards, refer to Chapter 4.20 of the Zoning Ordinance.

July 2004

## House Size Restriction Profile for Cities in Santa Clara County

### Definitions:

Although definitions for the following terms vary slightly with each city, generally the following apply:

**Height:** The Vertical distance from the grade to the highest point of the building.

**Floor Area:** The entire area of all floors, measured from the outer face of exterior walls. Basements are generally excluded from floor area

**Floor Area Ratio (FAR):** The ratio of gross floor area to the net lot area.

**Lot Coverage:** The horizontal area covered by all buildings on any lot as computed from the outside dimensions of each building, expressed as a percentage of the lot area.

Campbell	35	2.5	40	45 generally, Up to 50 with approval of a Site & Architectural Review Permit
Cupertino	28	Not Specified	45	45, second story is limited to 45% of first story
Gilroy	35	2	None	None
Los Altos	27	2	35 (1 story <= 20') 30 (2 stories or 1 story > 20').	35 (net site area <= 11,000 sq. ft.) < 35. <sup>1</sup> (net site area > 11,000 sq. ft.)
Los Altos Hills	27 generally <sup>2</sup>	Not Specified	None	Complex computation based on lot area and average slope. <sup>3</sup>
Los Gatos	30	Not Specified	40	35 to 15 <sup>4</sup> (excluding garages) for lots ranging from 5000 to 30000 sq. feet, 10 to 3 <sup>5</sup> for garages for lots ranging from 5000 to 30000 sq. feet < 35 <sup>6</sup> for all structures (excluding garages up to 400 sq feet) on lots < 5000 square feet
Milpitas	30	Not Specified	None <sup>7</sup>	None
Monte Sereno	25 - 30 (overall maximum <sup>8</sup> )	2	20 to 40 <sup>9,10</sup> (as lot size decreases)	Maximum Area (gross) <sup>11</sup> 3,300 to 6,600 sq. ft. for single story 3,000 sq. ft. to 6,000 sq. ft for two story

Morgan Hill	30 <sup>12</sup>	2.5	15 to 50 <sup>13</sup> (as lot size decreases)	None
Mountain View	24 (1 story) 28 (2 stories)	2	None	45 to 40 (Base FAR) <sup>14</sup> Base FAR +(10% of Base FAR) for additions - require discretionary review
Palo Alto	30 <sup>15</sup>	Not Specified	= Maximum FAR (1 story) 35 (2 or more stories)	45 for lots ≤ 5000 < 45 for lots > 5000 <sup>16</sup>
San Jose	35	2.5	None	> 45 requires discretionary review <sup>17</sup>
Santa Clara	25	2	40	None
Saratoga	26	2	35 to 60 <sup>18</sup> (as lot size decreases)	Complex computation, which yields allowable floor area <sup>19</sup> of 2,400 sq. ft to 8000 sq. ft. for lots ranging from 5,000 sq. ft. to 200,000 sq. ft. <sup>20</sup>
Sunnyvale	30	2	45 (1 story) 40 (2 story)	FAR > 45 or Gross Floor Area > 4,050 sq. ft. requires Planning Commission Review
County	35 <sup>21</sup>	2, 3 <sup>22</sup>	None	Only by combining district <sup>23</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Floor Area is calculated by the formula  $3,850 + \{.10 \times (\text{net lot area} - 11,000)\}$ .

<sup>2</sup> 32' for primary dwellings subject to special requirements

<sup>3</sup> Maximum Floor Area (MFA) = LUF X 6000 where average slope (S) ≤ 10%; MFA = LUF X {6,000 - 50(S-10)} where S > 10% and < 30%; MFA = LUF X 5,000 where S ≥ 30%. LUF in the preceding formulae stands for Lot Unit Factor. The LUF = net area of the lot or parcel for lots where the average slope is less than ten (10%) percent; for lots or parcels with average slopes between ten (10%) percent and fifty-five (55%) percent, then:  $LUF = An [1 - .02143 (S - 10)]$  where: (i) An = net area of the parcel or lot (ii) S = average slope of the net area of the parcel or lot in percent.

<sup>4</sup> The FAR values are calculated by using the formula:  $0.35 - \{(A-5)/25 \times .20\}$  where A is the net lot area in thousands of square feet (for example, 7,500 square feet is written as 7.5).

<sup>5</sup> The FAR values are calculated by using the formula:  $0.10 - \{(A-5)/25 \times .07\}$ , where A is the net lot area in thousands of square feet (for example, 7,500 square feet is written as 7.5).

<sup>6</sup> The Far values are calculated using the formula:  $0.40 - \{(A-2)/3 \times .05\}$ , where A is the net lot area in thousands of square feet (for example, 7,500 square feet is written as 7.5)

<sup>7</sup> The exception is one PUD, where lot coverage is 40

<sup>8</sup> Different maximum height limits are specified for single and two story structures which in turn vary by different single family residential zones; maximum height for single story structures at required first floor setback is 14' which can be increased by 1 foot

for each additional 1 foot of distance that portion of the building is from the required setback line to a maximum of 21'. The maximum height for two story structures at required second floor setback is 21' which can be increased by 1 foot for each additional 1 foot of distance that portion of the building is from the required setback line to a maximum of 25' in R-1-8 zone, to a maximum of 27' in R-1-20 zone, and can be increased by 1 foot for each additional 2 feet of distance that portion of the building is from the required setback line to a maximum of 30' in R-1-44 zone

<sup>9</sup> Maximum lot coverage varies in different single family residential zones; R-1-8: 40%, R-1-20: 30%, R-1-44: 20%

<sup>10</sup> Maximum cannot exceed 20,000 sq. ft. (for oversized lots)

<sup>11</sup> Different Floor Areas (gross) are specified for single and two story main dwelling structures, which in turn vary by different single family residential zones. In R-1-8 zone: Maximum size = 3,300 sq. ft. for single story and 3,000 sq. ft. for two story. The size can be increased by .15 sq. ft. for each 1 sq. ft. the net lot size exceeds 10,000 sq. ft. or minimum lot size required by slope density formula; In R-1-20 zone: Maximum size = 4,950 sq. ft. for single story and 4,500 sq. ft. for two story. The size can be increased by .050 sq. ft. for each 1 sq. ft. the net lot size exceeds 24,000 sq. ft. or minimum lot size required by slope density formula; in R-1-44 zone: Maximum size = 6,600 sq. ft. for single story and 6,000 sq. ft. for two story. The size can be increased by .075 sq. ft. for each 1 sq. ft. the net lot size exceeds 44,000 sq. ft. or minimum lot size required by slope density formula

<sup>12</sup> In three single family zoning districts the maximum overall height of the dwelling is  $\leq 17'$

<sup>13</sup> Maximum lot coverage varies in different single family zoning districts; R-1 7,000 & R-1 9,000: 50%, RE-1 12,000 & RE-1 20,000: 40%, RE-40,000: 30%, RE-100,000: 25%, and RE-10: 15%.

<sup>14</sup> FAR = 45% for lots  $\leq 5,000$  sq. ft.; 44% for lots 6,000 sq. ft.; 43% for lots 7,000 sq. ft.; 42% for lots 8,000 sq. ft.; 41% for lots 9,000 sq. ft.; 40% for lots  $\geq 10,000$  sq. ft.; For other lot sizes FAR =  $0.50 - (0.0001 \times \text{Lot Area})$

<sup>15</sup> 33' if the roof pitch is 12:12 or greater.

<sup>16</sup> Floor Area is calculated by the formula:  $2,250 + \{0.30 \times (\text{lot area} - 5000)\}$  for lots  $> 5000$

<sup>17</sup> There are three levels of discretionary review: Level I- Administrative review by Planning Directors, if a set of seven criteria are met. Level II – Public hearing with the planning Director if the criteria are not met. Level III – Planning Commission hearing if the decision at Level II is appealed.

<sup>18</sup> Maximum lot coverage varies in different single family zoning districts; R-1-10,000: 60%; R-1-12,500: 55%; R-1-15,000: 50%; R-1-20,000: 45%, R-1-40,000: 35%.

<sup>19</sup> The allowable floor area is based upon the net site area and slope of the lot and the height of the structure to be constructed,

<sup>20</sup> 8,000 sq. ft. is the maximum allowable square footage for lots  $> 200,000$  sq. ft.; maximum allowable square footage for lots  $< 5,000$  sq. ft. is determined by Planning Commission.

<sup>21</sup> Height = 27' in 'n1' neighborhood combining district

<sup>22</sup> 3 stories allowed in RHS district in hillside areas.

<sup>23</sup> FAR = 35% in 'n1' neighborhood combining district, and 50% in 'n2' neighborhood combining district.