

The following table was prepared in response to Planning Commissioner and Sakioka Company, Inc. comments provided at the September 14, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.

The pages numbers in the "Location" column refers to pages in the September 14 Planning Commission Draft Resolution, available online: <https://costamesa.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=15843820&GUID=00AB7D09-A073-4CE0-B908-68D9C0346C9E>

The Final Program Environmental Impact Report referenced in comment no. 32 is available online: <https://www.costamesaca.gov/government/departments-and-divisions/community-development/planning/environmental-notice-and-reports>

Gray background indicates the direction provided by the Planning Commission in the September 28, 2026 motion. The motion also called for providing this table, including comments that were not in the motion, to the City Council.

No.	Location	Comment	Staff Analysis/Recommendation
Zoning Code			
1	Ch. 1, Art. 2, Definitions Sept. 14 Resolution page 26 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 310	Replace the definition of rowhouse with "See Townhouse."	Staff to revise per the comment.
2	Ch. IX, Art. 4, Density Bonuses and Other Incentives Sept. 14 Resolution page 26 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 352	Density Bonus and Other Incentives Purpose 13-152.1 after senior citizens add "and other groups"	Section 13-152.1 establishes the purpose of the Density Bonus and Other Incentives Ordinance, which includes providing affordable housing options to many groups of people and may be edited as follows: "[...] affordable housing opportunities and availability of housing for moderate, low-, and very low-income households, and senior citizens, and other groups as identified in State Density Bonus Law. [...]"
3	Density Bonus Fees Sept. 14 Resolution page 27 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 354	Fee payment Change (c)(vii) into (3) to apply to all density bonus applications	Staff concurs and recommends that instead of mentioning fee payment under Requests for Waivers, it is relocated to become Section 13-152.5(a)(3) which would be clearly applicable to all density bonus applications.
4	Density Bonus Eligibility Sept. 14 Resolution page 71 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 355	When describing types of housing that would be eligible for a density bonus, revise 13-152.5(b)(1)(a) and 13- after senior housing to add "and housing for other groups"	Section 13-152.5(b)(1)(a) may be edited as follows: "a. The housing development provides the affordable units, or senior housing, or housing for other groups, required by State Density Bonus Law to be eligible for the density bonus and any incentives, parking [...]"
5	Density Bonus Affordable Housing Agreement Sept. 14 Resolution page 72 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 356	When describing an affordable housing agreement in 152.5(b)(4)(a) after senior housing add "and housing for other groups" and 152.5(b)(4)(a) add "be" between shall and in	Section 13-152.5(b)(4)(a) may be edited as follows: "a. The affordable housing agreement and/or senior housing agreement shall be in a form approved by the City Attorney, to be executed by the City Manager, to [...]" For consistency: Section 13-152.5(b)(4) may be edited as follows: "(4) If any density bonus, incentive, parking reduction, or waiver is approved pursuant to this article, the applicant shall enter into an affordable housing agreement or senior housing agreement with the City described below." Section 13-152.5(b)(4)(c) may be edited as follows: "[...] The affordable housing agreement, or senior housing agreement, shall be binding on all future owners and successors in interest."
Mixed-Use Overlay District			
6	Ch. V, Art. 11, Mixed-Use Overlay District MUOD Permitted Uses Sept. 14 Resolution page 86 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 371	Table 13-83.11.6. establishes the permitted uses and uses subject to a Conditional Use Permit (C), Minor Conditional Use Permit (MC), or Special Use Permit (S) in the MUOD. In (a)(1), add subparagraph (A): "Notwithstanding paragraph (1), if the underlying base zoning district establishes a less stringent permit requirement for a use, that permit requirement shall be used." <i>Note added 9/30/26: Planning Commission direction was to allow commercial uses to be permitted in the MUOD as shown in the base zoning district for commercial zones; not industrial zones.</i>	Staff does not recommend this revision. For uses with permissions that vary between commercial or industrial zones, the more restrictive permission is proposed for applicants that opt into utilizing the MUOD. This approach reflects Neighborhoods Where We All Belong (NWWAB) community input regarding the compatibility of mixed-use developments with adjacent and onsite uses. For example, an "Active Entertainment" use is permitted (P) in commercial zones because it is compatible with commercial uses but requires a minor conditional permit (MCUP) in industrial zones because it differs from typical industrial uses and may represent a land use incompatibility. In the MUOD, where residential and other uses are expected to be mixed together, an "Active Entertainment" use would require a MCUP. A MCUP is a staff level review by the Zoning Administrator that provides the opportunity to establish customized conditions of approval to ensure compatibility.

No.	Location	Comment	Staff Analysis/Recommendation
7	MUOD Prohibited Uses Sept. 14 Resolution page 86 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 371	MUOD Prohibited Uses. Uses not listed in Table 13-83.11.6. are not permitted. In (a)(2) Prohibited Uses, add subparagraph (A): “Notwithstanding paragraph (2), if the underlying base zoning district permits a use not specified in Table 13-83.11.6, that use shall be permitted per the base zoning district, unless the use is only permitted in the MG, MP, or PDI zones.” Hopefully the language is clear, open to edits, but the goal is if it's an industrial use it still would be prohibited. If it's only allowed in MG or MP, but not PDI, it should still be prohibited.	Staff does not recommend this revision. Participants in the NWWAB community outreach effort expressed a desire for compatibility between uses and within mixed-use developments. The permitted uses table in the MUOD was designed with residential and mixed-use compatibility in mind. Furthermore, MUOD Section 13-83.11.6 (2) Prohibited Uses, states that “Uses not listed in Table 13-83.11.6. are not permitted.” The proposed revision would remove that limitation. It would allow uses not listed in the MUOD permitted uses table to be allowed according to the base zoning, which was not created with residential and mixed-use compatibility in mind. Over time, there may be an interest in amending the MUOD permitted uses table to accommodate additional or new uses. The Zoning Code, including the MUOD, can be amended in the future. For example, staff prepares periodic “code cleanups” that amend the Zoning Code.
8	Development Standards for MUOD Projects Sept. 14 Resolution page 92 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 376	Including “unless otherwise noted” in the Development Standards for MUOD Projects applicability standard is unclear regarding what other standards may apply. (a)(1), at the end of the section add “in such zoning provision.”	Section 13-83.11.7(a)(1) may be edited as follows: “[...] unless alternative development standards have been established through a master plan in a Planned Development zone.”
9	Development Standards for MUOD Projects Sept. 14 Resolution page 92 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 376	Direct staff to work with the City Attorney on a fix regarding specific plans	Staff reviewed this as a request to clarify how a property owner would be able to entitle a development project on a site that is within a specific plan and the MUOD. Where a property has multiple overlays (e.g. MUOD and Specific Plan) above the base zoning district, a property owner could opt into either overlay for development of their property. However, applicants developing a Housing Element Site where a Specific Plan and MUOD overlay exist, would need to develop at least 50% of the site as residential and at a minimum density of 20 du/acre. Utilizing either overlay (MUOD or Specific Plan), a Housing Element site must be allowed to build to the density and capacity, as identified in the Housing Element sites Inventory. For sites within Planned Development zones, a property owner could apply to establish a master plan to allow more customized standards in relation to a unique property and project. Staff will continue to work with property owners of Specific Plan and Housing Element sites to explore the potential entitlement procedures for their specific projects, which could include concessions or waivers under State Density Bonus Law (SDBL), master plans in the Planned Development zones for customization, major or minor modifications or variances pursuant to Chapter III of the Zoning Code, etc. <i>Note added 9/30/26: The Planning Commission motion directed staff to continue working with property owners and applicants without proposing MUOD text revisions.</i>
10	MUOD Off-Street Parking Sept. 14 Resolution page 94 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 378	Table 13-83.11.7--Under Off-Street Parking, in the Additional Provisions If Applicable column, split into two cells, with the first for dwelling units adding “Article 3”, and the bottom cell remaining the same	Staff recommends modifying this column to read "CMMC Title 13, Chapter VI, Article 3 (Off-Street Parking Development Standards" for residential uses, and "CMMC Title 13, Chapter VI, Article 2 (Off-Street Parking Non-Residential Districts) and Article 3 (Off-Street Parking Development Standards) for nonresidential uses below. This clarifies that the off-street residential parking ratios would not apply to MUOD projects.

No.	Location	Comment	Staff Analysis/Recommendation
11	MUOD Open Space Standards Sept. 14 Resolution page 94 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 378	Table 13-83.11.7--On page 378, under Open Space Standards, add new Footnote on “lot” that reads: “For lots greater than four acres, a lot shall be measured excluding streets and rights-of-way”	Staff does not recommend this revision for the following reasons: 1) As proposed, the revised standard would apply to sites greater than 4 acres, which will presumably be large projects that present the most significant opportunities for providing critical open space. For reference, 67 parcels out of 1,058 total MUOD parcels are 4 acres or greater in size, but they account for 45% of the MUOD's total land area. 2) The City Council continues to acknowledge open space deficiencies citywide and emphasize the importance of creating new opportunities for open space, particularly in large projects. In fact, the City Council increased the required open space in the Fairview Developmental Center Specific Plan from 14 acres to 25 acres at their September 15, 2026, meeting. 3) By changing how “lot area” is defined to refer to generic streets and not specific public dedications, the space for private streets would not count toward the lot area. It can be argued that the removal of all streets (both public and private) from the lot area calculation could incentivize an applicant to develop more private streets as a means of providing less open space. The City Council and community members, through the NWWAB community visioning process, have expressed an interest in opportunities to create more open space. The proposed change to the standard would be in conflict this effort.
12	Sakioka Public Comment MUOD Storage Standards Sept. 14 Resolution page 94 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 378	Table 13-83.11.7--Exterior Storage. Our first recommendation is to exempt all multifamily buildings on Housing Element Sites from this requirement. If the standard remains, the following revision is proposed: Each dwelling unit shall be provided with 200 cubic feet of fully enclosed, securable, personal storage area exterior to the unit. The storage area shall measure at least 7 feet in one horizontal direction, provided a multi-family project on a Housing Element Site shall only be required to provide 50 cubic feet of such external storage area for each dwelling unit that shall measure at least 6 feet in one horizontal direction. The storage area may be provided in a garage, carport, or other exterior or covered common area but shall be located so as not to obstruct the required clear dimensions.	Staff does not recommend this revision. This standard helps accommodate larger households (storage of strollers, bicycles, etc.) without establishing a minimum bedroom requirement and implements Housing Element program 2E (Encourage Development of Housing Options for Large-Family Households). Additionally, Staff discussed the storage standard with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) staff. HCD did not see this as a governmental constraint to housing development. For reference, here are nearby cities storage area requirements: Santa Ana: 250 cu.ft., Brea, Buena Park, and Fountain Valley: 200 cu.ft., Orange and Garden Grove: 120 cu.ft., Anaheim and Seal Beach: 100 cu.ft., La Habra: 75 cu.ft., and Huntington Beach: 50 cu.ft. Note that an application under a master plan process could establish an alternative standard or an application under State Density Bonus Law can obtain concessions or waivers from standards.

No.	Location	Comment	Staff Analysis/Recommendation
13	Sakioka Public Comment General Site Improvements Sept. 14 Resolution page 95 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 379	The applicable table (13-83.11.7) states without qualification that "MUOD projects are subject to the applicable general site improvement standards in CMMC Title 13, Article 9". But some of the general standards may conflict with the MUOD. It should be clear that the ODS prevails.	Staff does not recommend this revision. In preparing this amendment to the Zoning Code (including the MUOD), staff reviewed the Zoning Code and all other proposed document revisions (e.g. General Plan, Specific Plans, ODS) for potential conflicts. Amendments to the Zoning Code proposed September 14, 2026 include those for internal consistency. Staff does not recommend the proposed revision stating that the ODS would prevail over the Zoning Code. The ODS supplements the standards provided in the Zoning Code by articulating design standards; it does not provide exhaustive development standards. Where development standards already exist in the Zoning Code, the ODS refers back to the applicable section. An example of this is the ODS refers to CMMC Title 13, Article 9 for site improvements that are not established in the ODS. In the future, if a specific conflict is identified, Planning staff can include in their periodically proposed revisions to the Zoning Code referred to colloquially as "code cleanups." Additionally, a Zoning Administrator determination is another potential approach (or a temporary approach) to resolving an unforeseen conflict. The ODS can be updated by resolution.
14	Sakioka Public Comment Supersession of Overlay Sept. 14 Resolution page 99 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 383	The supersession text in subsection 13-83.11.10.(e)(l)(i) should apply to all Housing Element Sites (not just Lower Income Housing Element Sites).	Staff does not recommend this change. If revised as proposed, ALL Housing Element sites will need to comply with regulations that are specific to Lower Income Housing Element sites. We recommend not revising as proposed so that future non-Lower Income Housing Element sites maintain development flexibility through the current and future Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycles.
15	Sakioka Public Comment Applicability of the MUOD Sept. 14 Resolution page 100 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 384	i. Subsection (h) - Development Standards: (1) Applicability. MUOD projects on properties identified in the City's currently adopted Housing Element Sites Inventory shall be subject to the requirements of Table 13-83.11.7 with the exceptions and additional standards in Subsection (h), unless alternative standards are established through a master plan in a Planned Development zone. ii. Section (i) - Design Standards: (1) All MUOD projects, inclusive of projects on properties identified in the City's currently adopted Housing Element Sites Inventory, shall be subject to the applicable City of Costa Mesa Multifamily residential and Mixed-Use Objective Design Standards and shall serve as the sole design criteria for ministerial review, consistent with Gov. Code §65583.2 and 65589.5, unless alternative standards are established through a master plan in a Planned Development zone.	Staff concurs with this proposed revision.
16	Ch. V, Art. 9 General Site Improvement Standards Sept. 14 Resolution page 178 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 462	13-76.1, replace "more restrictive regulation" with "Objective Design Standards"	Staff does not recommend this revision. In preparing this amendment to the Zoning Code (including the MUOD), staff reviewed the Zoning Code and all other proposed document revisions (e.g. General Plan, Specific Plans, ODS) for potential conflicts. Amendments to the Zoning Code proposed September 14, 2026, include those for internal consistency. Staff does not recommend the proposed revision stating that the ODS would prevail over the Zoning Code. The ODS supplements the standards provided in the Zoning Code by articulating design standards; it does not provide exhaustive development standards. Where development standards already exist in the Zoning Code, the ODS refers back to the applicable section. An example of this is the ODS refers to CMMC Title 13, Article 9 for site improvements that are not established in the ODS. In the future, if a specific conflict is identified, Planning staff can include in their periodic proposed revisions to the Zoning Code referred to colloquially as "code cleanups." Additionally, a Zoning Administrator determination is

No.	Location	Comment	Staff Analysis/Recommendation
			another potential approach (or a temporary approach) to resolving an unforeseen conflict. The ODS can be updated by resolution.
17	Ch. VI, Art. 2 Off-Street Parking Standards, Non-Residential Districts Sept. 14 Resolution page 186 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 470	13-87 replace “more restrictive regulation” with “Objective Design Standards”	Staff does not recommend this revision. In preparing this amendment to the Zoning Code (including the MUOD), staff reviewed the Zoning Code and all other proposed document revisions (e.g. General Plan, Specific Plans, ODS) for potential conflicts. Amendments to the Zoning Code proposed September 14, 2026, include those for internal consistency. Staff does not recommend the proposed revision stating that the ODS would prevail over the Zoning Code. The ODS supplements the standards provided in the Zoning Code by articulating design standards; it does not provide exhaustive development standards. Where development standards already exist in the Zoning Code, the ODS refers back to the applicable section. An example of this is the ODS refers to CMMC Title 13, Article 9 for site improvements that are not established in the ODS. In the future, if a specific conflict is identified, Planning staff can include in their periodic proposed revisions to the Zoning Code referred to colloquially as “code cleanups.” Additionally, a Zoning Administrator determination is another potential approach (or a temporary approach) to resolving an unforeseen conflict. The ODS can be updated by resolution.
18	Ch. VII, Landscaping Standards Sept. 14 Resolution page 197 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 481	13-108.1 replace “more restrictive regulation” with “Objective Design Standards”	Staff does not recommend this revision. In preparing this amendment to the Zoning Code (including the MUOD), staff reviewed the Zoning Code and all other proposed document revisions (e.g. General Plan, Specific Plans, ODS) for potential conflicts. Amendments to the Zoning Code proposed today include those for internal consistency. Staff does not recommend the proposed revision stating that the ODS would prevail over the Zoning Code. The ODS supplements the standards provided in the Zoning Code by articulating design standards; it does not provide exhaustive development standards. Where development standards already exist in the Zoning Code, the ODS refers back to the applicable section. An example of this is the ODS refers to CMMC Title 13, Article 9 for site improvements that are not established in the ODS. In the future, if a specific conflict is identified, Planning staff can include in their periodic proposed revisions to the Zoning Code referred to colloquially as “code cleanups.” Additionally, a Zoning Administrator determination is another potential approach (or a temporary approach) to resolving an unforeseen conflict. The ODS can be updated by resolution.
19	Chapter XIII Noise Control Sept. 14 Resolution page 213 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 497	13-280(e)"In high-rise residential developments in the North Costa Mesa Specific Plan area in recognition of proximity to freeways and the airport., ~~the exterior noise standards shown in subsection (a) shall only apply to the common outdoor recreational amenity areas located on the ground level. Recreational amenity areas located above the ground level and private balconies and patios shall be exempt from this standard."~~	Staff does not recommend this revision. The CMMC 13-280(e) text was adopted (CO-06-05) for consistency with an amendment to the North Costa Mesa Specific Plan (SP-06-02) and General Plan Noise Element (GP-06-02) to facilitate high density residential development within the North Costa Mesa Specific Plan area. September 11, 2006 Planning Commission Agenda Report: http://ftp.costamesaca.gov/costamesaca/planningcommission/agenda/2006/2006-09-11/091106NCMHRFinalEIR1052.pdf

No.	Location	Comment	Staff Analysis/Recommendation
General Plan			
20	Land Use Element Sept. 14 Resolution page 235 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 519	Under Land Use Plan, add “if applicable,” before “the trip budget limitations”	Staff to revise per the comment.
21	Sept. 14 Resolution page 244 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 528	High Density Residential--If necessary, staff shall make corrections to “Sakioka Lot 2” and “Area 8” if corrections to “Lot 1” or “Area 7” are needed	This is a typo in the adopted General Plan Land Use Element. Staff to revise: "Sakioka Lot 21, is a 41-acre parcel located in the Town Center area of the City adjacent to Anton Boulevard (Area 7 of the North Costa Mesa Specific Plan), is an identified opportunity site within the sites inventory of the Housing Element and is within the Mixed Use Overlay."
22	Sept. 14 Resolution page 254 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 538	Figure LU-6: Sakioka Lot 2--If necessary, delete Figure LU-6	Staff does not recommend this revision, due to the footnote included in the 2025 Land Use Element Update, which provides consistency with the Housing Element. “Building intensity shall not exceed maximum allowable development set forth by the trip budget in the North Costa Mesa Specific Plan, unless modifications are needed to accommodate the site capacity identified within the sites inventory of the Housing Element.”
23	Sept. 14 Resolution page 257 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 541	Sakioka Lot 2 description--If necessary, delete “See Figure LU-6: Sakioka Lot 2.”	See the row above.
24	Sakioka Comment Noise Element Sept. 14 Resolution page 349 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 633	Edit a note to Table N-2 “Note: These represent the basic standards applicable for time periods exceeding 15 minutes each hour. Higher levels may be generated for specified shorter time periods, and areas in the North Costa Mesa Specific Plan proximate to freeways or the airport.”	Staff does not recommend this revision. Table N-2 in the Noise Element simply provides an overview or snapshot of the City's Noise Ordinance from the CMMC. It is not meant to be exhaustive of the specificity of the regulation established in the CMMC. The table's note already denotes that "higher levels may be generated for specific shorter time periods." This is a sufficient catchall phrase to account for the various exemptions to the Noise Ordinance (of which include exemptions for properties outside the North Costa Mesa Specific Plan), which can be found in the CMMC. Staff recommends not to amend the General Plan Noise Element with specifics from the Zoning Code.
Specific Plans			
25	Newport Boulevard Specific Plan Sept. 14 Resolution page 450 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 734	Under MUOD, add “development standards,” after “and capacities”	Staff does not recommend these changes for the following reasons: 1) This exact language was thoroughly vetted by HCD in order to achieve a compliant Housing Element. 2) Section 13.83.11.10(e) (Supersession of Overlay) of the MUOD only applies to Lower Income Housing Element sites. To comply with state law, projects on Lower Income Housing Element sites must comply requirements as decided in New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach. In the next RHNA cycle (beginning in 2029), there may be Housing Element sites that are not assigned any lower income unit development potential (moderate income sites for example). In the future, the If we add "development standards" to this clause, we may be unnecessarily limiting the development potential of Lower Income Housing Element sites.
26	Sept. 14 Resolution page 450 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 734	Add “standards or” before the line 3rd from bottom and add “and provisions” after standards on the last line.	Staff does not recommend this change as the terms "standards" and "provisions" may be understood interchangeably.
27	Sakioka Comment North Costa Mesa Specific Plan Sept. 14 Resolution page 499 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 783	The supersession text should apply to all Housing Element Sites (not just Lower Income Housing Element Sites)	Staff does not recommend these changes for the following reasons: 1) This exact language was thoroughly vetted by HCD in order to achieve a compliant Housing Element. 2) If revised as proposed, ALL Housing Element sites would need to comply specific standards for Lower Income Housing Element sites even if state law says they don't have to. In the next RHNA cycle (beginning in 2029), there may be Housing Element sites that are not assigned any lower income unit development potential (moderate income sites for example). We recommend not revising as proposed so that future Housing Element sites without lower income capacity maintain development flexibility.

No.	Location	Comment	Staff Analysis/Recommendation
Multifamily Residential and Mixed-Use Objective Design Standards			
28	Relationship to Other City Plans, Policies, and Codes Sept. 14 Resolution page 731 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 1015	4(b) delete “the more restrictive regulation shall prevail” and add “these Standards shall prevail. Notwithstanding the foregoing, to the extent an applicable Specific Plan allows for more permissive standards, projects may utilize such standards in the Specific Plan”	Staff recommends the following revision to the ODS to address this input: A. Introduction 4. Relationship to Other City Plans, Policies, Codes b) Costa Mesa Municipal Code These Standards regulate site and building design for multifamily residential and mixed-use development projects and are in addition to those regulations established in the City’s Municipal Code, specifically Title 13 (the Planning, Zoning, and Development Code, hereafter referred to as the “Zoning Code”) and Title 5 (the Building and Structures Code). These Standards are meant to complement and not supersede the Municipal Code. ~~In the event of a conflict between these Standards and the Municipal Code, the more restrictive regulation shall prevail.~~
29	Maximum Facade Length and Facade Modulation Sept. 14 Resolution page 733 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 1017	Building Design Objective Design Standards, maximum facade length and facade modulation--Have a full rewrite by deleting (b) Facade Length and (c) Facade Modulation in their entirety and replacing it with: b) Facade Length 1. Maximum Facade Length. Street-facing facades shall be visually divided into sections such that no individual section exceeds 75 feet. Each section shall be separated by at least one of the following features: A) A facade break, either as a projection or recess in the entirety of the facade, shall measure at least five two feet deep perpendicular to the facade and at least 10 feet long parallel to the facade, as illustrated in Figure 2. B) Variation in apparent building height, of at least five feet between sections, such as with parapets or roofline variation, or at a ground floor entry as shown in Figure 8. C) A change in facade materials or color between sections. A material or color change used to satisfy subdivision (d) Facade Hierarchy shall not qualify to meet this requirement. D) A vertical architectural element, such as a pilaster, engaged column, column, or vertical fin, projecting a minimum of 6 inches from the facade, extending from the ground or second floor and above. E) Variations in fenestration size and pattern.	Staff does not recommend this specific change as written. - The intent behind the max. 150 ft. Facade Length standard was less about acknowledging diversity of facade designs and styles, and focused on minimizing the perceived length of what would otherwise be long and potentially monotonous buildings. A physical break in the facade helps to provide physical and visual relief whereby a building entry, an open space, or other special moment could occur. An additional intent statement could be added to this effect. Staff could consider moving this standard to Section 1. Building Mass and Form. - Proposed max. 75 ft. facade length. The proposed reduction from a 150 to 75 ft. max. building facade may be too limiting for a typical multifamily or mixed-use building given that dwelling units widths typically range between 25 ft. (studio/1-bedroom) and 35 ft. (2+ bedroom). The original 150 ft. max. standard was meant to accommodate to a variety of dwelling units while also providing enough length for flexibility. Note that many cities in the region with ODS regulate facade length in segments greater than 100 ft., where 150 ft. is typical (Anaheim: 160 ft., Orange: 100 ft., Irvine: 60-100 ft., Newport Beach: 150-200 ft., Santa Monica: 150 ft., Pasadena: 150 ft., Glendale: 120 ft.). As such, staff recommends maintaining the proposed 150 ft. standard. - Proposed Min. 2ft. by 10 ft. facade break. While staff recognizes concerns about a 5 ft. x 10 ft. break potentially reducing the buildable floor area for residential uses, the impact is minimal because the break is required less often (every 150 ft. versus every 75 ft.). The break is meant to provide physical and visual relief whereby a building entry, an open space, or other special moment could occur. While 2 ft. may be too shallow to achieve such a result, 4 ft. could be a reasonable minimum. Likewise, a reduction from 10 to 8 ft. could be a reasonable minimum. - Variation in apparent building height and change in facade material/color between façade segments. Staff considered similar standards in earlier versions of the ODS, but did not incorporate such requirements for several reasons. Changes to parapet height do not reduce the scale for the pedestrian experience and might result in a purely decorative aesthetic that presents unnecessarily higher costs without adding much value to placemaking. Also, a prescriptive variation in building height would be counter to Costa Mesa's built aesthetic, which already has a variety of architectural styles throughout the City that would be inconsistent with imposed design for future buildings. Note that the absence of such requirements does not preclude projects from varying building height. - A pilaster, column, or fin extending from the ground or second floor through multiple stories creates a strong vertical line. On a three or more-story building, that could make the building appear taller and more imposing, rather than helping break down its perceived mass. - Variations in fenestration size and pattern. This may present cost and constructability challenges (e.g., varying window sizes or varying stud spacing) and may result in a purely decorative aesthetic without adding much value to placemaking.

No.	Location	Comment	Staff Analysis/Recommendation
			Given the above analysis, if the Planning Commission reaches consensus that this section should be revised, the following specific recommendations could be considered: Incorporate the intent of the Commissioner's proposed edits as noted below, by keeping modified versions of b) Facade Length and c) Facade Modulation/Articulation but deleting d) Façade Hierarchy. b) Facade Length 1. Maximum Façade Length. Public street-facing facades shall provide at least one facade break such that no facade length, measured as the horizontal distance across a continuous building facade, exceeds 150 feet. A facade break, either as a projection or recess in the entirety of the facade, shall measure at least 4 feet deep perpendicular to the facade and at least 8 feet long parallel to the facade, as illustrated in Figure 2. Facade breaks are not required for townhouses or above-grade parking structures. c) Facade Modulation or Articulation 1. Minimum Facade Modulation or Articulation. Public street-facing facades shall incorporate one of the following design features. Facades separated by a required facade break in accordance with Subsection b) shall be considered separate facades. Facade modulation and articulation are not required for townhouses. a. Facade Modulation. Use of recesses or projections of the façade for at least a minimum of 25 percent of the facade area, measured by a minimum of 2 feet in depth and a maximum of 10 feet in depth. b. Facade Articulation. Use of one of the following design features for every maximum 75 feet length of facade. c. A change in apparent building height of at least 4 feet, such as variations in parapet height or roofline. d. A change in facade materials or colors. e. Use of pilasters or engaged columns projecting a minimum of 6 inches from the facade.
30	Facade Hierarchy Sept. 14 Resolution page 734 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 1018	Within the Building Design Objective Design Standards section of the MUOD, there is (1) Building Mass and Form, and options for design features that will differentiate sections of the building facade. add "D) Variations in fenestration size or pattern"	Staff does not recommend this change. The ODS proposed a change in facade material or color between the ground floor and upper floors, recesses or projections for a minimum of two feet in depth measured perpendicular from the ground floor, and use of perpendicular projections. The proposed addition of variations on fenestration (window/door opening) size or pattern may present cost and constructability challenges (e.g., varying window sizes or varying stud spacing) and may result in a purely decorative aesthetic without adding much value to placemaking. If the Planning Commission prefers to use the alternative standards above, the Facade Hierarchy standard would be removed.

No.	Location	Comment	Staff Analysis/Recommendation
31	Applicability of Site Design ODS Sept. 14 Resolution page 739 Sept. 14 printed agenda packet page 1023	In 1, Applicability of Other Related Standards, replace “the more restrictive regulation” shall prevail with “these Standards” shall prevail.	C. Site Design Objective Design Standards 1. Applicability of Other Related Standards The applicable development standards set forth in the following sections of Title 13 of the CMMC shall apply, with the additions and exceptions established in these Standards. ~~In the event of a conflict between these Standards and the Municipal Code, the more restrictive regulation shall prevail.~~ • Article 9 (General Site Improvement Standards) of Chapter V (Development Standards), specifically: - Section 13-73 (Trash enclosures). - Section 13-74 (Elevation and screening requirements). - Section 13-75 (Fences and walls). • Chapter VI (Off-Street Parking Standards), specifically: - Article 3 (Development Standards) • Chapter VII (Landscaping Standards)
Program Environmental Impact Report			
32	Sakioka Comment Green House Gas Emissions Mitigation Measure MM-4.8-3 Final PEIR pages 170 and 194	MM-4. 8-3 Electric Vehicle Ready New Construction. Prior to the issuance of building permits, applicants for future development projects subject to the MUOD within the Planning Area shall provide evidence to the City that the design plans include electric vehicle charging infrastructure that meets or exceeds the California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen) ~~2025 voluntary mandatory standards (Tier 1 or Tier 2)~~ <u>in effect at the time of project approval</u> is incorporated into the development and that adequate charging equipment, capacity, and design features are provided to support effective long-term operation.	Staff does not recommend this revision. Under the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (14 CCR § 15126.4), mitigation measures are specific actions required of a project to reduce or avoid a significant environmental impact beyond standard regulations. An existing mandatory standard is not a mitigation measure. This comment was received during the Draft EIR comment period and responded to in the Final EIR.