

#	Name /Organization/ Agency/ Meeting	Date	Source	Comment	Related Standard	Type	Theme	Staff Response
1	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Are buildings illustrated examples of design City staff considers good, and/or would comply with ODS?		Question	Examples	For this workshop, we aimed to find images of recent local projects that illustrate specific standards. Often, the images depict more than just one element described by a particular standard. These images may or may not be used in the final illustration of the standards. Projects will be evaluated based on the written standards. The images serve as visual aids and do not imply that the standards require everything shown in them. The City has retained a graphics Consultant to help us illustrate the standards in the future.
2	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	How do ODS improve the quality of the buildings?		Question	General	ODS establish a baseline of design requirements and help avoid some undesirable practices. The standards aim to improve the quality of the built environment without imposing excessive demands on developers that could increase housing construction costs. It's a balance, and today we are seeking input on how well we are achieving it.
3	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Who are the "Stakeholders" you just referred to?		Question	Engagement	Throughout the project timeline (about two years to date), we have invited a wide range of participants to various engagement opportunities, including stakeholder interviews, focus groups, advisory group meetings, and public workshops. So far, there have been ten such opportunities for engagement. The diverse participants included local architects and designers, developers, affordable housing advocates, accessibility advocates, non-profits, historic preservation advocates, various local neighborhood groups, interested residents of Oakland and others. Overall, over a hundred of people have participated in the project and we solicited many more. We have posted meeting summaries and video recordings of some of the meetings on our website.
4	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	does the process allow for more green and sustainable building projects or projects that fully support uniform building codes		Question	Sustainability	The standards try to address this. For example, it is important to use sustainable and durable materials on the ground floor to increase the lifespan of buildings. We also have standards that prohibit unsustainable and harmful materials, promote planting of trees, support active transportation and recreation and others. However, ODS aim to avoid creating requirements that are prohibitively expensive to implement or that increase the cost of housing. The standards do not modify any existing building Codes. Still have Green Building ordinance requirements.
5	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	in a future draft revision can you add references as to what's mandated already?		Suggestion	General	ODS are intended to replace the subjective design guidelines currently in place, such as those found in the Corridor Design Guidelines. ODS do not replicate or conflict with the requirements in the Planning or Building Code. We have worked hard to avoid any such conflicts. Every standard is up for public review. Sometimes, ODS mention requirements from other agencies, such as OakDOT's encroachment standards.
6	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	What problem is the tacked-on rule solving beyond increasing costs for balconies?		Question	Balconies	Balconies integrated into the building design create a cohesive appearance, while "tacked on" balconies can make a building look overly busy and imposing. Although "tacked on" balconies can sometimes be effective, the ODS aims to prevent particularly egregious examples. This standard helps safeguard against such cases. Unique design proposals can still undergo discretionary design review for a wide range of buildings that are not required to comply with ODS by state or local laws.
7	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	All examples so far are newish buildings. Will there be any oldish/historic examples?		Question	Examples	These ODS are primarily intended for the construction of new 4-8 story buildings. However, some ODS also cover additions to existing buildings. The ODS draft includes multiple "transition" standards that aim to integrate new buildings into the existing context. Developers are not precluded by ODS from creating traditional architecture.
8	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Agree, elevating building ornament options seems appropriate given it would fit well with Oakland's existing older building stock.		Suggestion	Ornament Options	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
9	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	How does one demonstrate that the designs are not feasible?		Question	General	More guidance will be shared in the application materials. Applicants must show in plans and drawings, and include notes in the submittal package, to explain if a requirement is physically not feasible in a particular case.
10	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Massing Breaks: In example 1, one façade shows shading devices--can't those be substituted for breaks?		Question	Massing Break	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
11	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Where did the 100' to 300' lengths come from? 300' is a long façade! Most planning codes that I have had to design to require more differentiation than 5' in 300'.		Question	Massing Break	We have heard multiple times from the community that excessive massing breaks make buildings look busy, increase construction costs, and do not improve the buildings. However, small, infrequent massing breaks help reduce the overall volume of buildings and relate them to the existing context. Therefore, ODS only require one massing break for buildings longer than 100 feet. This requirement is intended for larger, block-sized buildings. The numbers were determined by evaluating typical project sizes, looking at examples from other cities, and utilizing our internal expertise and that of our consultants.
12	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	does changing design also count as a break?		Question	Massing Break	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
13	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Looking at these standards and all these numbers that you are throwing at us seem to be subjective in an of themselves. We haven't really addressed the context of this building and where it might be going. What is the texture and where is the surrounding area, you guys have chosen for example subjectively that a façade break is the way to go. On the one hand that is a subjective standard and choosing the one standard its objective. We are forced by funding requirements; we must perform to a higher energy standard		Statement	General	The numbers used in ODS are objective, determined by evaluating typical projects, examining best practices from other cities, and drawing on our internal expertise as well as that of our consultants. Due to the nature of the standards, ODS cannot address every possible context and setting. Discretionary design review is better suited for this purpose. However, the state requires ODS for certain categories of projects.

14	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	You don't need breaks when you have well articulated façade. Provide an option to use articulation in lieu of those massing breaks. Have a clearly articulated top and bottom, now all of that might be challenging to express objectively but it can be done. Look at materials, detailing, ornamentation and various other factors that you see in traditional buildings instead of the massing breaks.	Suggestion	Massing Break	The revised ODS public hearing draft significantly reduces the requirements for massing breaks. The threshold for massing breaks has been increased from 100 to 150 feet of building frontage. No massing break is required for buildings less than 150 feet in length. For building frontages 150 feet or longer, only one minor massing break is required for every 150 feet of frontage. Additionally, the extent of the break has been reduced to exclude the ground floor building portion (see standard 2.1.3). To provide even more flexibility, the options for Middle Section articulation have been expanded (see standard 3.2.1). The current massing break and volume reduction requirements are the lowest and easiest to meet among all other examples we have referenced, including examples suggested to Planning staff by public such as the North Berkeley Station. However, Planning staff strongly believes that implementing at least one minor massing break is important for larger buildings (over 150 feet in length) to help reduce their imposing scale, especially in lower-density areas. Such massing breaks do not preclude additional ornamentation, use of high-quality materials or other design tools that architects and developers are free to apply to make great buildings.
15	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	Take a look at North Berkeley Bart ODS standards for the reasons in terms of of cost ensure another option is provided for the massing standard.	Resource/Suggestion	Massing Break	Planning staff has considered the standards in the North Berkeley Station ODS, among many other examples from peer cities. The North Berkeley Station standards far exceed those suggested by the current draft ODS. They include highly unpopular and expensive measures such as upper-floor setbacks, additional setbacks, maximum facade lengths, and both major and minor breaks like recesses and projections through the entire height of a building at intervals as short as 40 feet. While the example does provide an exception from the massing breaks, the alternative options list for that exception in no way guarantees design that would visually reduce building mass and bulk. Adopting the same approach would leave Oakland without tools to ensure the visual mass reduction for especially large buildings (block sized). However, Planning staff has further reduced the massing requirements and added multiple additional options that allow for even more flexibility and creativity. For more details, please see the staff response to comment #15 and the revised hearing draft ODS.
16	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	Does the richness of the façade require this constant articulation of massing. We end up with a lot of simple blank boxes, trying to avoid that, but there are other ways of making a big, long grand façade that are quite attractive. My perception of with what's going on, there's excessive articulation of what's going on; they don't always have to be in the forefront with a lot of business that doesn't challenge the designers.		Massing Break	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
17	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	More broadly one of the things I take issue with is imposing additional requirements on construction within corridors. Those are the locations the city is relying on to meet those housing goals. This kind of additional requirement should be scrutinized quite heavily.	Statement	Corridors	Development along the corridors has always been a priority for the city. It has been guided by somewhat different guidelines compared to development off the corridors. Therefore, it is important that the ODS also distinguishes development along corridors. What we propose are not additional requirements, but slightly different requirements for buildings located along the corridors. Often these requirements are more permissive and friendly to buildings with active ground floors with no setbacks.
18	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	Can you explain what an expound is? Way that was worded, to reduce building costs for developers in corridors, given marginalized disparities way that was worded, to reduce building costs for developers in corridors, given marginalized disparities in said corridors, sounds like "build substandard housing where poor POC reside. Irrigation itself should be self-sustainable water harvesting vs. Relying on an already taxed water authority that relied on water rights it has no right to.	Question	Corridors	The comment is not clear. ODS do not promote "substandard housing" anywhere in the city. ODS apply equally citywide and ensure a baseline of design standards to certain projects in all City areas. Irrigation is required for planting by standards 1.7.2 and 2.2.3 to ensure that plants' survival after installation.
19	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	The major commercial corridors identified in the draft standards are generally higher-resourced areas, and I'm not suggesting that standards should be lowered for these areas, just that they shouldn't be subjected to additional, arbitrary standards over and above those for other parts of the city.	Suggestion	Corridors	The map of the corridors featured in the draft standards covers socioeconomically diverse areas of Oakland, including significant portions of East Oakland, areas in Downtown Oakland, and Lake Merritt, which also includes Chinatown.
20	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	What is the goal of the building corners standard?	Question	Blank Walls	Buildings that emphasize their corners help frame the busy street intersections, add character, and often serve as nodes or landmarks due to their high visibility. Staff believes that building corners are important to support with a few standards, most of which only apply to corners of major streets (not all corners).
21	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	A beautifully textured wall of natural material could often be as good as any public art.	Suggestion	Blank Walls	The ODS aim to prevent undesirable examples of blank walls. While some high-quality materials applied skillfully can enhance the appearance of a blank wall, there are still cases where even well-designed blank walls negatively impact public spaces and become a subject of vandalism like tagging. This standard is in place to prevent such outcomes. For a response to a similar question, please see #7. Further, it is very difficult to successfully provide an objective design standard for a beautifully textured wall.
22	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	you can't exactly mandate that the mural is good. So, we might be signing up for something we didn't intend.	Statement	Blank Walls	ODS have their limits and often cannot fully control the final results. A resulting mural (when selected as an option for blank walls) may not appeal to everyone. However, leaving a large blank wall is even more undesirable and may attract tagging and graffiti.
23	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024 Community Workshop	There are many examples in Oakland of long blank walls where there was an attempt to add planting material to soften the facade. Many of them do not work, the planting never grew or never covered up a significant majority of the offending blank walls. How do the objectives enforce a robust planting plan that works?	Question	Blank Walls	For example, Standard 2.2.3 requires irrigation to support planting establishment. Section 1.7 of the standards have additional standards for street trees, irrigation, minimum soil volumes and other standards. The city has additional (non-ODS) requirements under the purview of OaklandDOT and the Tree Division of Public Works that specify things like minimum dimensions for tree planters.

24	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Simply installing an irrigation system for wall planting doesn't do any good without maintenance.		Statement	Blank Walls	ODS apply prior to the issuance of the planning permit. By their nature, ODS cannot control what happens after the permit is issued. Maintenance quality cannot be required or verified by ODS. The City has Conditions for Approvals and Performance Standards that are not a part of ODS.
25	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	I like the "menu of options" approach in most of these standards. I do think "rhythmic pattern" is hard to make objective. "Rhythmic Pattern" is used in Option 2 in ground-floor base requirement.		Suggestion	Ground Floor	The phrase "rhythmic pattern" implies a regular cadence or rhythm that can be assessed objectively. This term is used in other ODS examples we referenced.
26	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	I would like to see options using historical buildings versus modern buildings. This seems to not work well especially in architecturally distinct neighborhoods with for example: Spanish, Art Deco, Beaux Arts, Victorian, Craftsman styles.		Statement	Ground Floor	ODS do not prescribe any particular style or period for buildings. They apply to qualifying new 4-8 story buildings and some additions citywide. However, the inclusion of context-specific standards in the ODS draft ensures that new buildings relate to the existing context by incorporating certain common elements, without copying any existing styles.
27	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Encourage such design standards with modernizing, gentrifying, Eurocentric, designs that are not aesthetically pleasing to the residents.		Statement	General	Please see response #27 above.
28	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	. I don't see any language that encourages people to make designs that incorporate the history of the community and respecting the heritage. I would personally like to see language that supports and encourages people to take that into an account. Design styles that incorporate historic buildings adds to the value of a community.		Suggestion	Ground Floor	Please see response #27 above. ODS include context standards at the beginning of almost every section. These important category of standards require new developments to maintain basic consistency with existing historic neighborhoods, without being too prescriptive or requiring significant additional costs.
29	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	For Standard 3.6.3 Should we just not require stoops and ground floor elevation at all for better accessibility?		Question	Residential Ground Floor Access	According to standard 3.6.3, elevation of the residential ground floor entry is de-prioritized and discouraged to promote at-grade accessibility. Elevation is only considered for cases where at-grade entry is physically unfeasible, such as on sites with extreme slopes and multiple individual entries. Planning staff believes that maintaining this option will enhance the flexibility of the standards overall for building designers, while still encouraging higher accessibility in the vast majority of developments. A removal of this option would lead to more rigid standards and may make preclude creation of housing.
30	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	I understand that to some extent the standards can be made design-neutral, but I'm struggling to think of historic Oakland structures that incorporate, for example massing breaks- that's something primarily seen in very modern 4/1 blocks. This is also visible in the standards' general failure to examine ornamentation as an option.		Statement	Massing Breaks	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16. ODS in general, and the massing break standard 2.1.3 in particular, in no way prevent the creation of traditional architectural styles.
31	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Preserving neighborhood character can be a way for folks to slow or derail projects. Generally, by well-to-do folks. But ignoring this issue seems to suggest that the rest of the people have no pinions about their neighborhoods character This is a very tricky topic.		Statement	Character	"Neighborhood character" has often been used to stop or delay new housing developments. However, recent state laws require cities to adopt ODS to eliminate using subjective criteria to block housing creation. These ODS include multiple objective standards designed to relate new buildings to the existing context without hindering housing development or making it prohibitively expensive.
32	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	50 feet is relatively frequent, maybe too frequent	4.5.4.	Suggestion	Roofline Articulation	Standard 4.5.4 has been modified to add more flexibility and reduce the need for roofline articulation. Specifically, an exception to roof breaks has been introduced, allowing for a consistent cornice to articulate the roofline without breaks. Additionally, a note has been added to clarify that roof articulation methods can be synchronized with massing break requirements to achieve a cohesive building design and minimize the overall number of breaks.
33	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	This is mandated messiness, there's a pent roof at the top its all uniform. If the design has good materials, you don't need these articulated rooflines. Makes the building call excessive attention to itself.	4.5.3 and 4.5.4	Statement	Roofline Articulation	Please see response to a similar question in #33 above.
34	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	What about incorporating rooftop gardens?		Question	Open Space	This is partially addressed in the open space section under standard 1.5.7. However, ODS does not mandate rooftop gardens specifically. Staff believes that rooftop gardens should be an optional feature for designers and developers, rather than a requirement for every roof. Additionally, it is important to remember that the amount of private and shared usable open space, including rooftop areas, is guided by the Planning Code.
35	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	That standards as drafted define context area, but there are going to be profound questions about implementation and adjudication- evaluating a packet of context photos and making those judgements seems to stretch the workload well beyond what should fall under ministerial approval.		Statement	Context	Context standards are crucial for this effort, ensuring that new developments integrate into the existing context. This approach is already familiar to the Planning staff, even as a part of the ministerial review process.
36	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Window context standards are helpful		Statement	Window Context	Context standards are crucial for this effort, ensuring that new developments integrate into the existing context.
37	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	Understand the standard defines that, also seems to say look around at the surrounding context, which assumes the context is coherent. We see many different window shapes, what is one to do with that standard.		Question	Window Context	The windows context standard 4.7.1 only applies if there is a coherent context (60% of more existing windows) or the standard does not apply.
38	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	what was changed based on feedback that was provided in the first round, could possibly present that back to people in the future.		Question	Engagement	In general, we have significantly reduced the number of standards you see now, cutting them roughly in half. We also made a concerted effort to remove any standards that might affect the "busyness" of the buildings, as mentioned several times by the public. We have built in much more flexibility and reduced the rigidity of the standards, particularly regarding the massing. The aim is to avoid having all buildings look the same and to allow for creativity, while making sure that ODS protect the City from egregious examples. Also, past meeting summaries are posted on the projects website. We will share our responses from this round of engagement.

39	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	In the context area it would be seen that should be considered, the context would be a good starting point for the 8 story buildings. Particular details on existing buildings. There is some, the window column illustration you had toward the end which was helpful. Will send written comments that will elaborate further.		Suggestion	Context	We will review the written comments submitted by the deadline.
40	Workshop Attendee	5/22/2024	Community Workshop	This was a lot to digest and is a good start. Just a last comment, the Baxter is a prime example of needing deeper planting spaces. At least 30' wide. Those narrow diversity. Recommend the planter standard be a minimum 30'-36'.		Suggestion	Planting	This comment refers to a planting area within the public right-of-way shown on an image during the workshop. The ODS do not control the sizes of planting areas in the public right-of-way. Additionally, the ODS do not specify the width of planters or planting areas at building frontages inside the property line because such a requirement would be too rigid. The required front setbacks vary greatly by zone and are controlled by the Planning Code. For example, some zones, such as Corridors, have zero setbacks. In such cases, requiring a 30-inch wide planter could reduce the buildable area and significantly increase construction costs. Instead, the ODS include Ground Floor Transition standards, as specified in standards 3.6.1, 3.6.3, and 3.6.4. If a ground entry setback option is selected, a planting area with a minimum width of 18 inches is required. A proposal can include a wider planting area depending on the other transition elements provided. The ODS do not prescribe a maximum width here. Increasing the planting area width to a minimum of 30 inches might create a conflict or even preclude the feasibility of other important transition elements, such as ADA ramps, when those are required outside of the ODS.
41	myrnawalton	05/21/2024 - 8:55am	Konveio	The CCA lot for example, has no residential areas nearby. Yet it is a residential proposal. What would be the context area in this case?	General - Immediate Context Area. Applicability	Question	Context	The public review draft ODS defines the Immediate Context Area and the Existing Context, and their application on pages 4-6. Note on p.6 further clarifies that only residential and mixed use lots are counted towards the context for this set of ODS. Context in this case would be any 4-8 story residential and mixed use buildings.
42	Thomas Lollini - STUDIOLOLLINI	05/20/2024 - 1:37am	Konveio	The site plan for ALL submittals SHALL include the footprint of adjacent structures within 50 feet of the subject property's property lines, and include sidewalk layouts, street trees and other relevant streetscape information. (E.g. bike racks, bus stops, curb cuts, above ground utility or signal boxes, light poles, etc.)	1.1.1	Suggestion	Context	This is not within the scope of the ODS. The City does have submittal requirements for all development applications specified on pages 12-15 of the Oakland Basic Application for Development Review. These requirements include site plan details such as neighboring building footprints, curb cuts, adjacent sidewalks and others. Also, these details are a part of a survey that new construction projects must provide. Bus stops and other infrastructure elements are a part of OakDOT submittal requirements. After the ODS are adopted, the Planning Department will create new application forms with updated submittal requirements and evaluate any necessary changes for the ministerial projects undergoing review under ODS.
43	eehlers@oaklandca.gov	05/07/2024 - 4:42pm	Konveio	Can we please require on-site trash storage and collection for mixed use buildings?	1.3.1	Suggestion	Curb Cuts	Storage requirements are already addressed in the Planning Code. ODS is not an appropriate place for this issue. This also falls more under enforcement rather than design.
44	eehlers@oaklandca.gov	05/07/2024 - 4:43pm	Konveio	revise to "existing or proposed Protected Bike Lanes"	1.3.2	Suggestion	Curb Cuts	Revised
45	Thomas Lollini - STUDIOLOLLINI	05/21/2024 - 4:16am	Konveio	Garage door setbacks for individual dwelling units should also be setback a minimum of 2 feet to protect pedestrians and allow for visibility for drivers as they cross sidewalks.	4.9.3	Suggestion	Parking	The ODS prevent the condition where individual garage door entries are proposed for the ground floor for multifamily developments. The Planning Code also already restricts the number of individual curb cuts a development can have because such condition is very undesirable and dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists. Therefore, this comment does not apply to the draft ODS for 4-8 story multifamily buildings, as such conditions are precluded by both the ODS and the Planning Code. This comment is more appropriate for the upcoming ODS for 1-3 story developments.
46	Thomas Lollini - STUDIOLOLLINI	05/21/2024 - 3:50am	Konveio	Minimum dimensions for healthy tree planting should be at least 3 feet.	1.3.6(a)	Suggestion	Parking	The ODS aim to avoid expanding surface parking lots, which are also becoming less popular with new developments. Standard 1.3.6(b) requires a 3-foot-wide planter suitable for trees. The 18-inch requirement specified in 1.3.6(a) is not intended for large trees; it is designed to provide additional stormwater management and low planting areas along the edges of parking areas where trees are not commonly planted.
47	Thomas Lollini - STUDIOLOLLINI	05/21/2024 - 4:09am	Konveio	All interior lighting of the garage shall be indirect to shield direct visibility of light sources from the public street or opposing buildings.	4.9.2	Suggestion	Parking	This depends on the vantage point. It is difficult to prevent seeing a source of light from all vantage points.
48	Thomas Lollini - STUDIOLOLLINI	05/21/2024 - 4:07am	Konveio	Parking structures along these streets should be set back to allow for a planting area at the base to soften the pedestrian experience. This planting area shall be maintained.	4.9.1	Suggestion	Parking	All building setbacks are controlled by the Zoning Code, and any changes to setbacks are made by amending the Zoning Code. Maintenance requirements cannot be enforced by ODS, as they cannot be checked or enforced at the planning review stage. In addition, ODS aims to enforce physical features to shield a garage structure.
49	Thomas Lollini - STUDIOLOLLINI	05/21/2024 - 3:57am	Konveio	10 stalls at 7-8'/stall are too wide for surface parking shade coverage to avoid heat-island effects unless surfaces are highly reflective. Bosque-type tree planting should be required for dark asphalt parking lots, thus appropriate spacing should be every three to five stalls with mature trees providing a 15-20 diameter canopy. NOTE: This approach to planting will also reduce CO2, eliminate the heat-island effects of surface parking, and improve views from the taller buildings anticipated throughout these guidelines. and filter Surface parking should also be required to be permeable to reduce stormwater runoff, feed water to the landscape, and recharge ground water.	1.3.7	Suggestion	Parking	Given recent state law changes that essentially eliminated many parking requirements, and the development realities in Oakland, Planning does not anticipate large parking lots for 4-8 story residential buildings. Small and efficient parking areas that maximize the residential building footprint, even if not completely covered by the tree canopies are the preferred option in this case. Stormwater requirements are already covered by the C3 provisions and are not a part of ODS to prevent any conflicts.
50	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:20pm	Konveio	Sounds like some properties will have surface parking lots but no garage? Could clarify that in rules in this section	1.4.5	Suggestion	Services and Utilities	Added a requirement for on-site service and loading location if a garage is not proposed.

51	eehlers@oaklandca.gov	05/07/2024 - 4:49pm	Konveio	Any building element in the public right-of-way, including sub-grade utility vaults and above-grade utility transformers, require an approved encroachment permit from the Oakland Department of Transportation.	1.4.4b	Suggestion	Services and Utilities	Added note in 1.4.4.
52	eehlers@oaklandca.gov	05/07/2024 - 4:48pm	Konveio	Utilities serving private property, including transformer vaults, should be located on private property. If this is infeasible, guidelines included here come into play, e.g. screening, preference for below-grade transformers, etc.	1.4.4	Suggestion	Services and Utilities	Revised.
53	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:21pm	Konveio	I really like the idea but will requiring these to be so wide disincentivize their inclusion? Is a smaller footprint feasible?	1.6.1	Suggestion	Mid-Block Connections	The mid-block connections are designed to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists, serving as additional open spaces and extensions of existing streets. A minimum width of 20 feet is recommended due to several factors, including fire access requirements and the need to provide a sense of openness and safety for the public, especially when flanked by 8-story buildings. Also, the 20 foot width is needed to make midblock connections feel like an extension of the existing public routes that are at least 60 feet wide (usually wider). Planning staff recommends maintaining the 20-foot width. However, please note that this standard applies only if such a mid-block connection is proposed and is not a mandatory requirement.
54	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:27pm	Konveio	Could further mandate that artificial turf be porous and use the newer PFAS-free turf available	1.7.5	Suggestion	Landscape	Most artificial turf is already permeable. However, some types may be intentionally non-permeable to direct runoff to specific areas, such as drains on rooftops or other designated locations. The ODS should not preclude this type of turf. It's important to note that C3 requirements still apply and control site permeability, ensuring that permeable turf will be used as needed to meet these requirements. Regarding PFAS-free products, ODS cannot mandate anything that Planning cannot verify. Planning staff aims to propose realistic standards that can be enforced at planning stage. Generally, banning specific products due to health and safety concerns falls under State or Federal regulations, not ODS. The State may be currently considering a bill to phase out PFAS by 2028.
55	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:24pm	Konveio	This seems lovely but like a very high standard? If this reduces spots or is too hard to prove will this incentivize properties to build a garage instead (not necessarily better for trees!). Is there another standard that could meet this same general goal?	1.7.3	Question	Landscape	We do not anticipate a lot of parking lots for 4-8 story residential development. Please also see a public comment #50 suggesting significantly higher three requirements, and Planning staff response to that comment.
56	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:28pm	Konveio	Related to 1.7.2, could also mandate that, to save water, automatic irrigation system should only provide water to living plants and should avoid watering artificial turf, concrete pathways, etc.	1.7.5	Suggestion	Landscape	The standard only requires the irrigation for <i>live</i> plant material. Added " <i>live</i> " for emphasis.
57	eehlers@oaklandca.gov	05/07/2024 - 4:51pm	Konveio	Note: any raised planting bed in the public ROW requires an encroachment permit from OakDOT.	1.7.4	Suggestion	Landscape	Added clarification to 1.7.4
58	eehlers@oaklandca.gov	05/07/2024 - 4:50pm	Konveio	I think OPW requires a (free) permit to plant a tree.	1.7.1	Suggestion	Landscape	Added clarification to 1.7.1
59	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:18pm	Konveio	Same comment - do these have to be massing breaks or are there other options that would break up the visual field but not be as ugly as massing breaks are?	2.1.3	Suggestion	Massing Break	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
60	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:17pm	Konveio	Suggest amending this so that other options to break up the visual field are also in play, vs just a "recess or projection" -- could it be that option OR "5 foot wide ornamentation that spans the full height of the property"	2.1.2	Suggestion	Massing Break	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16. Standard 2.1.2 requires a minor massing break along the shared side property line with smaller buildings, providing a small relief in mass facing existing structures. Planning staff does not think that ornamentation alone will achieve the same result in breaking down a potentially imposing wall of mass facing a neighbor. The break in the side building wall could also be used as a highwell benefiting the residents of the new building.
61	Brad Gunkel - Gunkel Architecture	05/07/2024 - 10:07am	Konveio	This document is attempting to make building massing and articulation preferences (which are inherently subjective) into "objective" standards. This defeats the purpose of trying to streamline the review of projects that meet objective zoning standards by introducing subjective design review into the equation. There is nothing objective about building massing or articulation preferences. An inspiring design would more likely subvert these preferences than comply with them. Baking these preferences into "objective" standards will do nothing but prolong the review process and encourage homogeneity.	2.1 Building Mass	Suggestion	Building Mass - Context	Existing zoning standards alone do not establish a design baseline, leaving the public with few tools to ensure minimally acceptable development. ODS, derived from studying examples and leveraging both internal and external expertise, offer objective and flexible minimum design requirements. These standards do not stifle design creativity, providing a level of certainty to the public that new developments will meet minimum baseline requirements and fit within the existing context. Additionally, ODS aim to protect the public from instances of egregious design. ODS are required by state for certain developments described in the Applicability section of the ODS draft.
62	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:13pm	Konveio	Most of the suggestions in this section sound, I hate to say it, a little ugly. Could you clarify the public interest of mandating these?	2.1.5	Question	Building Corner	Buildings that emphasize their corners help frame the busy street intersections, add character, and often serve as nodes or landmarks due to their high visibility. Staff believes that building corners are important to support with a few standards, most of which only apply to corners of major streets (not all corners). The options specified in 2.1.5 do not preclude designers from coming up with other perhaps more appropriate for a specific setting option to emphasize a building corner.
63	eehlers@oaklandca.gov	05/07/2024 - 4:53pm	Konveio	Suggest moving the note into the heading, as the heading refers to dining b/t the ROW and the building face. OakDOT does not review or approve outdoor dining not in the public ROW.	3.4.8	Suggestion	GF Commercial	3.4.8 Revised
64	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:06pm	Konveio	Why does it have to be recessed or inset?	3.6.6	Question	GF Residential	Revised.

65	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 5:59pm	Konveio	Having lived in a ground floor unit along the street I would prefer a recessed entrance with a door perpendicular to the street. I'm not sure why mandating that the door face the street is in the public interest. Suggest clarifying or removing this requirement.	4.2.1	Suggestion	Entrance	Street-facing entries to ground-floor units play a vital role in shaping the overall design and character of buildings and neighborhoods. These entrances enhance neighborhood safety, walkability, and accessibility and have long been part of the design guidelines for Oakland and other similar cities. Removing this standard could lead to new developments placing entries on the side or rear of buildings, resulting in blank, uninviting fronts facing the street. Such designs have been discouraged by the current adopted guidelines. The role of the ODS is to ensure a minimum acceptable and predictable design standard for the public. Therefore, planning staff believes maintaining the requirement for street-facing entries is crucial. While rare examples of side-facing entries do exist, these have been approved through a discretionary design review process with findings ensuring they do not negatively impact existing neighborhoods. Planning staff strongly believes this design issue should remain within the discretionary design review domain and not be broadly permitted by the ODS. This approach ensures each case is carefully evaluated for its impact on overall design and consistency with existing neighborhoods.
66	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:03pm	Konveio	Could clarify here something like "in which case accessibility features such as a ramp that meets ADA guidelines must be provided"	4.1.1a	Suggestion	Entrance	ADA requirements still apply to projects independently. Like the provisions in the Zoning Code, ODS do not replace or duplicate these existing applicable requirements. This helps to avoid confusion and potential conflicts shall other requirements change.
67	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 6:05pm	Konveio	Some of these make sense with other parts of the ODS (such as the need to also abide by the Awnings requirements in sections 4.4) but others seem overly restrictive. Is a covered porch different than an awning? Would meeting items #ii. or iv. here not also meet item iii. Suggestion to amend to clarify that awning requirements must be met, and not requiring the additional elements suggested here.	4.1.1d	Suggestion	Entrance	According to the ODS Glossary (see Attachment A), a porch is defined as a roofed area outside a building entry, typically attached to the front walls of a house. A covered porch may include a roof, an awning, or another type of covering. As a part of the building, a porch often includes features such as an entryway and a recess. It is usually raised and located on private property, while awnings alone can project into the public right-of-way. Standard 4.1.1 pertains to shared entries like lobbies, not only to awnings or porches. These shared entries encompass more features than just the awnings. Therefore, meeting awning standards satisfies only a portion of the shared entry standard. It is important to maintain other elements, such as at-grade requirements for accessibility, minimum height for prominence, recess for privacy and weather protection, trims and decorative elements for architectural balance.
68	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 5:56pm	Konveio	I don't understand this requirement - what is the harm if the stoop begins more than 5 feet from the setback?	4.2.3a	Question	Stoop	Revised. The 5 feet minimum removed.
69	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 5:58pm	Konveio	This seems unnecessarily restrictive. Particularly as if a street has challenging sloping or height requirements I'd assume more than 25% of buildings would face the same challenges and need to deviate from the 2-5 foot rule. Is the next building that exceeds the 25% just out of luck, then? I'm not clear why mandating height requirements for stoops is in the public interest.	4.2.3c	Suggestion	Stoop	The 25% exception applies to buildings with multiple separate ground floor entries (multiple entries in the same building). The requirement for stoops between 2-5 feet is considered good urban design as it prevents extremes. Staff included this 25% exception for sloped sites to allow for more flexibility, although such scenarios are not anticipated to be frequent. Staff recommends maintaining this standard to ensure practical urban design.
70	eehlers@oaklandca.gov	05/07/2024 - 4:38pm	Konveio	5' seems like a reasonable limit on balcony projections. Please revise the note to, "Note: All right-of-way encroachments require an approved encroachment permit issued by the Oakland Department of Transportation and shall comply with OakDOT encroachment limitations."	4.6.1	Suggestion	Balconies	Revised.
71	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 5:51pm	Konveio	It does not seem like it is in the public interest to have this as a mandated requirement -- i.e., buildings in the Immediate Context could have window orientation that are unsightly or unsuitable for a particular new build. I would be in favor of eliminating this provision, or raising the threshold significantly (for example, to 80 or 90% from 60%).	4.7.1	Suggestion	Window Context	ODS, by their nature, cannot capture every possible scenario or condition on the ground. However, having the standard in place will help foster new buildings that relate to the context, which was likely shaped with the help of discretionary review or historic context. Therefore, these buildings should already be a part of the existing context. If the threshold is increased to 90%, this standard will likely become inapplicable due to the high likelihood of variation within the immediate context area. Also, 60% is a typical threshold consistent with other similar standards in the Planning Code and other adopted guiding documents, as well as this ODS document.
72	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 5:52pm	Konveio	Why can glass not be opaque? Would a railing or screen be allowed to be opaque in this case?	4.6.3	Question	Balconies	Opaque glass eliminates visibility, making buildings appear more like enclosed fortresses. This negates open of the the purposes of balconies, which is to offer openness and facilitate interaction between private and public spaces, thereby enhancing public space. To maintain this openness, railings or screens are required to be at least 25% transparent.
73	hrgo	05/17/2024 - 5:44pm	Konveio	As a resident, I'd prefer 100% stucco; what public purpose does an 80% limit serve? Feels subjective, suggest removing this provision.	4.8.3	Suggestion	Materials	Differentiation in materials ensures that a building has visual variety and practical benefits. For example, using a more durable material on the ground floor reduces maintenance needs and creates a visual separation between different parts of the building. While there are well-executed examples of 100% stucco buildings ranging from 4 to 8 stories, the standard aims to guard against extremes, such as a poorly done 8-story stucco building that lacks any other exterior materials.
74	myrnawalton	05/21/2024 - 9:14am	Konveio	How would section 5.3 apply to the proposed development of the CCA site?	5.3 Roof Slope	Question	Roof Slope	Section 5 is applicable to additions to existing 4-8 story residential buildings and new buildings on lots with existing buildings, applicable to eligible projects. Please review page 2 to see which projects are eligible for ODS. If CCA meets this definition and criteria, then a minimum of 50% of the roof area of street-facing additions shall exhibit the same roof form and roof slope category as the existing building(s) on site. A new building on site shall exhibit the same roof form(s) as the existing building but need not match the existing roof pitch as long as the pitch is not shallower than the existing roof pitch. Rear additions and new buildings shall be required to meet this standard only if they are taller than the existing building(s) along the street.

75	Scott Forman	5/4/2024 Scott Forman Comment Letter	There is simply no need to micro-manage the appearance of buildings like this, and doing so makes our city less vibrant, while imposing serious costs that have the effect of making many projects impossible and making others more expensive to build than they otherwise would be. California housing continuing to be ruinously expensive, and many of these requirements will serve only to perpetuate that reality. Just to take one example, "breaking up the massing." This is a very costly requirement, directly in construction costs, and making it much harder to build water-tight well insulated structures. And as a design matter, many of the most beautiful buildings in the world don't do this at all! Many such examples in this document will actively make the city a worse and more soulless place from a design standpoint AND at great cost. I would strongly encourage the city to carefully evaluate each one of these standards, quantify the cost of compliance, and carefully consider whether those costs are worth the benefits.	Statement	Massing Breaks	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16. Planning staff developed ODS to ensure the quality of projects built in the absence of a discretionary design review process or public input, as required by the state for certain projects. Staff have listened to public comments and eliminated a significant portion of standards that could potentially result in higher project costs. Staff has also referenced the recently published ABAGs ODS Gudebook that discusses a cost-benefit analysis of ODS. Current draft ODS require significantly less than what would be required if the existing design guidelines applied through discretionary review. Additionally, compared to massing breaks and volume reduction requirements in other cities with adopted ODS, the currently proposed ODS are significantly lower and easier to meet.
76	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Where Objective Design Standards (ODS) are necessary and where ODS may not be necessary or even unnecessarily raise the cost of housing, foster bad design, or detract from the livability of new apartments unintentionally.	Question	Location	Please see responses to similar questions for #15, #16 and #76.
77	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	EB4E has observed that many local governments in more suburban East Bay locations have proposed or adopted ODS that are basically identical in breadth, scope, and prescription. These ODS seem to be procured from a handful of planning consultants. Given Oakland's history and rich diversity of neighborhoods as well as values of housing inclusion, the adoption of ODS indistinguishable from more suburban jurisdictions with more exclusionary land practices in Alameda and Contra Costa counties would be a mistake.	Statement	General	Over the last two years, Planning staff has invested significant effort and resources to ensure that the proposed ODS are inherently "of Oakland." We collaborated with an Oakland-based consultant and then brought the project in-house to draft standards that align with our zoning, locally adopted design guidelines, and other guiding documents consistent with the Oakland General Plan. While we referenced other cities' ODS, the resulting standards are grounded in Oakland's existing requirements and updated to address key City priorities, such as building more affordable housing while also respecting the existing context and history.
78	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	How 4-8 story multifamily residential relates to the street is worth public consideration where there are clear public objectives. But adding prescriptive requirements into ODS where there is either no clear public purpose or when the purpose is more about subjective taste is not costless. Such additional ODS can increase construction costs, reduce group and private open space, and result in a narrow band of poor-to-middling design.	Statement	General	The standards are thoughtfully evaluated to achieve specific public goals, as described in the "Purpose and Intent" sections that preface each portion of the standards. None of the proposed standards are arbitrary; they are carefully written to align with the public goals and policies of the Oakland General Plan and other adopted guiding documents.
79	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	While some standards (such as restrictions on curb cuts and blank walls) have clear public purposes, many others (such as the requirement that facades consist of multiple materials) do not. Many of these standards could be removed as requirements without any negative impact on the health, safety, and general wellbeing of Oakland residents.	Suggestion	General	Please see responses to similar questions for #15, #16 and #76.
80	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	As a general matter, for smaller sites, design standards can often be difficult to meet without causing an awkward or inefficient plan. We recommend exempting small sites (less than 1/4 acre, or about 2-3 house lots) from the Draft ODS.	Suggestion	General	These ODS apply to eligible 4-8 story residential buildings, regardless of lot size. However, at this time, not all 4-8 story buildings will be subject to these ODS at this time—only those described on page 2 of the ODS draft. Projects not subject to ODS will continue to undergo the discretionary design review process under existing design guidelines. It is likely that market-rate projects on smaller lots may not be a subject of ODS depending on the project type, affordability level, and other factors.
81	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	The instinct for articulation of facades is clearly responding to the tendency of large, long developments with monotonous walls and facades with over 100s of feet of frontage. This issue is downstream of the fact that off-street parking, discretionary processes, egress rules and the concentration of FAR/height on commercial or arterial streets incentivizes lot consolidation, by consequence, and large developments that do not have vertical distinction that is characteristic of development patterns in Oakland prior to downzoning and off-street parking requirements instituted in 1961.	Statement	Articulation	Please see responses to similar questions for #15, #16 and #76.
82	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Requirements to articulate the facade and break up massing can increase costs from architectural drafting to construction to maintenance. Every corner turned is an additional complication in the construction process, additional surface area for heat loss/gain, and an additional failure point for waterproofing.		Articulation/Massing Break	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
83	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	They can constrain floor plans in ways that produce lower quality apartments for the residents. They can preclude the use of innovative techniques to enhance construction productivity such as modular, panelized, or mass timber construction.	Statement	Massing	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.

84	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Finally, the challenges that articulation requirements pose to energy efficiency and the use of low- or negative-carbon materials directly impede the ability of Oakland's building stock to meet the requirements in Oakland's Council-adopted Equitable Climate Action Plan.	Articulation/Sustainability	Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
85	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Option A: simply drop most of these standards, which increase cost, can lead to greater energy consumption, and are more difficult to waterproof. They do not necessarily make buildings look any better either. The proliferation of articulation is a major contributor to features of the five-over-one style that many people dislike about newer residential and mixed-use developments of the past ten years.	Suggestion	Articulation/Massing Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
86	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Option B: exempt facades 100 feet or less in length (as for massing breaks). Reduce the massing break requirements overall. Reduce or eliminate horizontal articulation requirements above the first floor or podium as horizontal articulation is not required above the pedestrian level experience. Most of this purpose is already achieved by the requirements to avoid and mitigate blank walls.	Suggestion	Articulation/Massing Please note that the public draft ODS initially required no massing breaks for buildings less than 100 feet in length. However, this requirement was further relaxed, and the threshold increased to 150 feet. Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
87	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Option C: adopt North Berkeley BART ODS encouraging ornamentation in lieu of articulation: 2.2.5 Ornamental Facade Alternative In lieu of meeting the major or minor break requirements (Sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4) ornamentation must be provided such that it covers 5% of the area of a building facade. Ornamentation is defined as any exterior articulation such as projections, recesses, columns, banding, fins, decorative molding, trim, artistic inlays or reliefs, cornices, or sculptures with a minimum depth of 8"; or decorative tile or murals. Ornamentation must deviate in color and/or material from the wall material behind it or be constructed from brick, stone, ceramics, metal, wood, tile, or fiber-cement board. Ornamentation shall not include built-up stucco trim or molding (also known as "plant-ons"). North Berkeley BART ODS, page 70.	Suggestion	Articulation/Massing Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
88	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	We further note that Oakland Heritage Alliance has similarly expressed opposition to the current articulation requirements in the Draft ODS. This is an area where typically-opposing groups are in agreement that a different approach is needed.	Statement	Articulation/Massing Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
89	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Generally, contextual requirements are more complex to comply with and administer, and assume that uniform appearance (and height, setbacks, etc) are desirable when that may not necessarily be the case.	Statement	Context ODS are flexible, include choices, exceptions, and control only certain key aspects of a building, allowing plenty of room for design creativity. Similarly, contextual ODS require minor modifications that help new buildings consider and respond to the existing context. Contextual ODS are drafted to apply in rare cases, only when absolutely necessary. The context transitions are very important as they provide the local community with assurance that new developments will adhere to basic design standards and respect existing neighborhoods in the absence of discretionary design review or public input. Please see more detail in other responses about the context standards in #91, 93, 140 and others.
90	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	EB4E is concerned that standards requiring "contextual" height and setbacks will limit growth and new housing opportunities in historic districts and next to historic properties (even if the subject parcel itself has no historical significance). Outside of Oakland's downtown, historic districts and historic properties are highly correlated with higher resource census tracts. Such contextual ODS requirements may have the unintended effect of reducing development capacity and feasibility of multifamily housing – including mixed-income and 100% affordable housing – in higher resource census tracts.	Statement	Context The context standards have been further refined to restrict their application to cases where it is absolutely necessary. Please refer to the responses provided for comments #90, #93, #140 and others. ODS do not restrict growth or new housing opportunities in historic districts or elsewhere. This is precisely why ODS do not include a subset of standards specifically tailored for historic districts such as APIs and ASIs. The height and setback transition standards are minimal and are applicable in rare instances, requiring only a slight transition for a portion of a new building. This modest adjustment serves a significant public purpose: creating transitions where there are substantial differences in density without significantly impacting the usable space of a new development.
91	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	contextual ODS requirements invite ambiguity, interpretation, and conflict as many Oakland neighborhoods are rich with variation, and it would be appropriate in many cases to add to that variation. Item 3.1.2 requires projects to align with contextual base heights while item 3.4.3 states that the minimum floor-to-floor height for commercial spaces is 15 feet, higher than it is in many existing buildings. Does the ODS intend for 3.1.2 or 3.4.3 to govern in this scenario? Or would the project be required to somehow comply with both, which is surely not an objectively good outcome.	Question	Context Please see definition of "building base". The base height in Standard 3.1.2 refers to the height of the first story or first two stories of context buildings. This standard does not control the overall building height, which is regulated by the Planning Code. Instead, it ensures a coherent transition by maintaining consistency at the base level. Additionally, the base height is flexible within a two-foot range. Standard 3.4.3. is not a contextual standard. 15 feet height for commercial ground floor is a typical requirement. This height helps to accommodate multiple and changing uses and distinguish the commercial ground floor from the rest of the building.

92	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Requirements to reduce height and increase setbacks near historic districts are of particular concern for developments in and around downtown, where most of the city's historic districts are concentrated. Many historic areas are full of buildings of varied height side by side. A walk down Lakeshore Avenue next to Lake Merritt illustrates how non-contextual development patterns over time are natural parts of the public realm.	1.1.1 and 2.1.1	Statement	Context	<p>Please see revised standards 1.1.1 and 2.1.1. After the revision, both standards apply in <u>very limited cases</u>. Standard 1.1.1 applies to proposals on Corridors, which includes most Downtown zones, <u>only</u> when an adjacent lot contains a highly historically-rated Civic building such as a church, and only when it is set back more than the proposal. Planning staff has encountered similar cases in the past during a discretionary review, when a setback transition is highly desirable and should be required, making this an important issue to address in ODS given the local expertise. A link to a Corridors map is included in the public draft ODS.</p> <p>Lakeshore Avenue is not within a Corridor, but it is within an Area of Primary Importance (API), where the standard would also apply. However, only about 2% of all Oakland properties are within APIs or designated as A or B. This standard is essential in these very limited areas to protect the existing context from overly assertive new buildings in the absence of discretionary design review. Moreover, the standard does not require matching existing setbacks, but only asks for 50% of the setback difference for the first 10 feet from the adjoining side property line. In practice, this may affect only a few feet of the new building, considering the required side setbacks in very rare cases, and provides a highly desirable transition without significantly limiting the usable area or increasing construction costs.</p> <p>Similarly, standard 2.1.1 has been revised to limit its applicability significantly. After the revision, it will only apply to Designated Historic Properties and Potentially Designated Historic Properties rated A or B. For context, this is only about 2% of properties in Oakland. Furthermore, an exception was added to limit the standard application in Downtown only to 55-foot height zones and only to historic Civic buildings in any Downtown zone. The standard was further revised to impact the first 10 feet or 10% of lot width from the abutting side lot line, whichever is less. The standard requires only a minor transition (50% of the height difference) for the first few feet of a new building. These transitions are fairly minor, apply in very rare and specific cases, but have a very high positive impact when they are required.</p>
93	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Balconies are an excellent way to provide private open space in midrise multifamily developments. The City's Draft ODS should facilitate their construction, not saddle them with unnecessary restrictions. Oakland is full of existing apartment buildings with unrecused "tacked on" balconies, and they look fine while providing a valuable amenity for building residents.		Statement	Balconies	Please see a response #7. Balconies are encouraged by both ODS and Planning Code.
94	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	Requiring balconies to be inset will make them more difficult and costly to provide to residents of new multifamily structures, and for no clear public benefit.		Statement	Balconies	Please see a response #7 above.
95	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	The public benefit of requiring balconies to have transparent railings is similarly unclear. When paired with the restriction on balconies along the interior side property line, it gives an unfortunate suggestion that privacy is required for the neighbors of multifamily housing but not for the residents. Many existing Oakland buildings have balconies facing the side lot line, allowing their residents a quiet outdoor space of their own.		Statement	Balconies	Some key privacy requirements must be balanced with the needs of new developments in ODS. Side-facing balconies are not prohibited by ODS when a minimum reasonable setback is provided. This is consistent with the existing adopted design guidelines the City has been applying in discretionary review. Cities are required to replace subjective guidelines and create ODS to guide design. Please also see a response #7 and #73 above.
96	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	We like the restrictions on curb cuts, especially for streets with existing or planned protected bike lanes. It is critical to limit potential for user conflicts such as curb cuts in order to properly plan the right-of-way for non-car based mobility.		Statement	Curb Cuts	ODS are consistent with the goals and policies set in the Planning Code, design guidelines, and other adopted City policies.
97	East Bay for Everyone	5/21/2024 EB4E Comment Letter	We like the requirement for a Children's Play Area where developments consist of 100 or more units with a majority of units having two or more bedrooms. Given the current dearth family-sized units in the developments of the past ten years and current pipeline, Oakland should consider ways to structure this requirement to avoid disincentivizing production of family-sized units. Consider allowing waiver of parts of capital improvement impact funds if such playgrounds are made open to the public. Oakland should also consider adopting other planning or building changes to incentivize more family-sized units such as adopting NFPA 101 as an Alternative Means and Methods bulletin to allow single stair construction up to four stories.		Suggestion	Open Space	Amenities for children are crucial for the City. The shared use of private playgrounds is a concept employed in other cities and should also be used in Oakland. General Plan Update OSCAR element will be looking into similar goals and policies. However, the ODS is not the appropriate mechanism to require this, as it regulates design, not use. Similarly, NFPA 101 falls within the domain of the Building Code and not the ODS, which does not address the building's interior.

98	myrnawalton	5/27/2024	Konveio	What is the rule if the building lot contains an historic property. I am referring specifically to the CCA proposal on Broadway.	1.1.1	Question	Context	<p>The question is unclear. For inquiries regarding the CCA, please direct them to the assigned project planner, as other staff involved with ODS may not have all the details about that specific proposal. It's important to note that CCAs may or may not be eligible for ODS, so please review the proposed applicability section on pages 2-3 of the draft ODS for clarification.</p> <p>The ODS includes several context transition standards designed to integrate new buildings within the existing built context. Depending on the location of a project (on or off Corridors), if a new building is proposed on a lot with an existing building (designated historic or not depending on location and specific standard), the context includes that existing structure, and the new building must respond to it according to various ODS standards such as those for roofs, windows, entry consistency, and others. For detailed guidance, please refer to the Additions section of the ODS. You may also find a response to a similar question in #75.</p>	
99	Thomas Lollini - STUDIOLOLLINI	5/27/2024	Konveio	These options and numbers are insufficient in any urban context where there are pedestrians. 300' with only two breaks means three 100' long elements. See the requirements for 100' long facades above and triple them.	2.1.4	Suggestion	Building Mass	Please see responses to similar massing break related questions for #15 and #16.	
100	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Many buildings, particularly on a sloped site, are using Type I concrete construction with this floor-ceiling assemblies to provide 9 stories of housing within the "mid-rise" construction requirements of the building code. These buildings are typically about 85' tall, and should be covered by these guidelines, as they have the same urban design impact as an 8 story building at a similar height. Consider renaming the guidelines to allow inclusion of 9 story, 85' mid-rise buildings.		Applicability Section	Suggestion	n/a	ODS for 8+ story buildings are not yet complete and will be offered for public review once ready. In recent project examples, 9 story buildings in Oakland often include a mezzanine level instead of a full story. Also, because of the existing zoning height limits, 4-8 story threshold is more appropriate in this case.
101	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Clarify what is meant by "existing street grid must be extended". Does this mean that a publicly accessible street will be required to break up large sites?	1.1.4	Suggestion	Site Circulation	Yes, for sites wider than 200 linear feet in areas with grid street patterns or nearly rectilinear street patterns, new streets, and any internal circulation such as pedestrian walkways shall be aligned with the existing neighborhood street grid and the existing street grid must be extended. This is important to maintain and promote walkability in the city. In reality, staff does not anticipate many cases like this going through ODS at this time given the realities on the ground.	
102	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Allow exception for sites facing onto a public open space or on an alley that needs activation, that allows for primary entrance to face onto these spaces if a secondary residential access and/or commercial entrances are provided on the street.	1.2.4	Suggestion	Pedestrian Access	This would be a rare exception rather than a typical project in Oakland, but if included, it could potentially be misused by project sponsors. By their nature, ODS aim to address the majority of typical cases, not every edge case.	
103	Kristen Belt - Mithun	45445	Konveio	It is often better in an urban project to consolidate open space into fewer, larger open spaces that can be inhabited. Consider an exception for driveways serving fewer than some number of cars...maybe less than 20 or similar	1.3.6	Suggestion	Parking	1.3.7 does not relate to usable open space. It is for softening the appearance of parking lots. The required landscaping would not qualify as usable open space in the Planning Code.	
104	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	It is often better in an urban project to consolidate open space into fewer, larger open spaces that can be inhabited. Consider an exception for driveways serving fewer than some number of cars- maybe 30 cars or fewer	1.3.7	Suggestion	Parking	1.3.7 does not relate to usable open space. It is for softening the appearance of parking lots. The required landscaping would not qualify as usable open space in the Planning Code.	
105	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Parking areas are often used to provide car ports with PV panels. In this case, trees can't be planted in the landscape islands, which minimizes their effectiveness in providing landscaping. Consider an exception for parking areas where PV carports are provided?	1.3.7c	Suggestion	Parking	Added exception.	
106	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Provide exception for buildings that have limited or no parking garages	1.4.5	Suggestion	Services and Utilities	This contradicts feedback we've received from OakDOT and pedestrian/bike safety groups regarding safety concerns. Without this standard, developments may not allocate dedicated space for loading and trash, leading to trash bins left on the street, which conflicts with the City's safety principles and creates other issues. This standard aims to mitigate these negative impacts on public space, which is shared by all. Specifically, it consolidates loading areas with other automobile facilities where possible. Waiving the code-required loading would typically be through a variance, a process currently in place and often granted when justified. An ODS standard cannot override Planning Code requirements.	
107	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Are there "Corridors" with overhead lines? If so provide exceptions for corridors with overhead lines, where taller trees are not possible and more creative approaches are required	1.7.1	Question	Landscape	Standard removed.	
108	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Provide exception for parking areas providing PV car ports	1.7.3	Suggestion	Landscape	Added exception.	
109	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Provide exception for parking areas serving 15 or fewer cars	1.7.3	Suggestion	Landscape	Exception added for 10 or more cars.	
110	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	10' spacing is too close for pedestrian pole lighting. Consider providing a requirement tied to maximum pole height and minimum lumens	1.8.2	Suggestion	Lighting	Standard revised to remove the numeric spacing requirement.	
111	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	These breaks only make sense when the adjacent housing has side-yard windows, and if the breaks align with the location of those windows. Consider tying this requirement to being responsive to existing living room/ dining room/ kitchen windows rather than establishing an interval?	2.1.2	Suggestion	Massing Breaks - Context	Standard revised to align the massing break to align with existing light wells on Corridors. Off corridors this provides visual massing relief for adjacent lower density buildings.	
112	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	On option "a", why is a break in the roof line required if this approach is targeting the "middle section" only (above the base and below the top section)? Suggest removing the break in roof requirement for option "a"	2.1.3	Suggestion	Building Mass	The standard has been modified, and the threshold for the massing break has been increased (made less frequent). Because of that decrease in frequency, it still requires a break in the roofline. However, this standard can also partially satisfy the requirements of the roof articulation standard.	

113	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Clarify where stepping is required, at what length. Or is it intentional to leave flexibility for what interval stepping is required?	2.1.6	Suggestion	Building Mass	The standard is intentionally less prescriptive to allow for flexibility in accommodating various scenarios. ODS by their nature cannot capture every possibility.
114	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Clarify if this requirement is tied to ground floor walls only. Clarify if upper level property line walls where no openings are permitted by building code constitute an "unavoidable" condition. For a deep, narrow site, requiring openings along the property line that meet the 15' maximum length would require a setback of 15', limiting flexibility of the approach to site design.	2.2.1	Suggestion	Blank Walls	This standard applies to street-facing facades, including ground floor.
115	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	This section assumes that the context is subjectively good design, and that it's a positive contribution to the neighborhood. If both neighbors have arcades, and they are both dark, spaces filled with trash that nobody uses, a new project should not need to replicate this. If a site is surrounded by freestanding fast-food chain restaurants and a strip-mall like building we should not be taking architectural cues from that. Consider tying this requirement to the historical standing, as suggested by section 2.1.1, and/or providing exceptions for this requirement	3.1.1	Suggestion	Bulding Base	The standard has been revised to apply under very limited conditions: the proposal must be on a Corridor, and the applicant must survey only the building features of existing Designated Historic Properties (DHPs) and highest-rated Potentially Designated Historic Properties (PDHPs) within the context (that block's face). Only if 60% or more of such buildings include a common element, that element must be replicated in the new proposal. Given the reality on the ground, the application of this standard will be very rare. However, its value is overwhelmingly positive for context transitions in places where it truly matters. Besides, there are few areas where the majority context (60%+ buildings) is universally bad, usually there are only a few bad examples.
116	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Again, this section assumes that the context is subjectively good design, and that it's a positive contribution to the neighborhood. If adjacent buildings have a base height of 10', it would be very awkward to be within 2' of this if a building has a ground floor height of 15' to accommodate common areas, lobbies and possibly a commercial use.	3.1.2	Suggestion	Building Base	Similar to the standar above, this standard has been revised to apply under very limited conditions and only when it counts. Please see response above.
117	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Most of Oakland's historic buildings would not comply with this requirement. This section could produce overly fussy buildings that are decorated with stuff rather than simple designs using quality materials that are thoughtful and well executed. Rely on ground-floor experience and the larger building modulation requirements to create a quality urban experience.	3.2.1	Suggestion	Middle Treatment	Due to their objective nature, ODS cannot enforce subjective terms like "simple, thoughtful, and well-executed." Additionally, requiring "high quality materials" for the entire middle section would likely preclude materials such as popular stucco and significantly increase costs of construction. Planning staff is well aware of good examples of buildings that do not utilize some of the elements required by 3.2.1. ODS aim to prevent particularly egregious examples. This standard helps safeguard against cases where no treatments are used to maximize profits, resulting in plain, boxy buildings that age badly. Please keep in mind that unique design proposals can still undergo discretionary design review for a wide range of buildings that are not required to comply with ODS by state or local laws. Also, this standard has been made more flexible by addition of additional options to choose from. This was done because the massing breaks standards have been reduced significantly. Please see responses to similar questions for #15 and #16.
118	Kristen Belt - Mithun	45445	Konveio	This section feels like it's not necessary for smaller footprint buildings that are maybe 30' or 50' wide. Consider making an exception based on length of street frontage or at a minimum reducing the requirement to one articulation rather than two for buildings with less frontage.	3.3.2	Suggestion	Top Treatment	Staff is unclear why this standard would be inappropriate for narrow buildings. Regardless of building length, top section articulation is important. Building height plays a more significant role here. Therefore, staff has reduced the standard applicability for 4-5 story buildings and included an exemption for buildings without a top section. If 4-5 story buildings do not include a top section, this standard simply does not apply.
119	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Allow exception for sloped sites- possibly suggest that 50% of the commercial active frontages are within 3' of sidewalk grade?	3.4.6	Suggestion	Grounf Floor Commercial	Increased it to 5' for sites with a principal street slope of 10 percent or more.
120	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Is this a minium of 3" maximum of 8" requirement? Could the recess be 2' (complying with 3.4.2)?	3.4.7	Question	Grounf Floor Commercial	Please review the standards closely to avoid possible confusion. Standard 3.4.2 limits the recess of the entire ground floor to no more than 3 feet unless outdoor seating is provided in the recessed space. This is to avoid unused empty spaces along the ground floor. Standard 3.4.7 sets minimum and maximum recess or projection for storefront elements such as display windows, entries, or bulkheads (not entire ground floor facade) by a few inches (3" min and 8" max) to avoid a continious flat wall plane. Clarification added for minimum and maximum dimensions.
121	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Clarify if this section assumes that there are unit entries on the street. Is the 6' setback required in the condition where there are no unit entries from the street? This could be a density impact. Why are on-grade gardens preferred over stoops, which are the best activators for a street? Option "b" should be the priority. The 2.5-5' vertical separation from the sidewalk builds in a level of privacy so that residents don't have their blinds closed all the time. On-grade units with entry gardens on busy streets don't always feel safe, especially if there is an alternate entry to the unit and the 6' setback is not used frequently. These end up as dead spaces that collect trash, with closed blinds.	3.6.3	Suggestion	Ground Floor Residential	Clarification added. The 6-foot setback is only required (as an option) if the units have entries from the street. Stoops have generally been discouraged in these ODS due to multiple accessibility concerns raised during the community engagement process. However, stoops are not completely ruled out because of unique site conditions. Therefore, option "b" is de-prioritized for accessibility and universal design reasons, which take precedence. Increased privacy is achieved through the recess and other transition features such as low walls, gates, planting, and elevated planters. Planning staff recognizes the concern for privacy, but accessibility and universal design remain the priority in this case. Please note that this standard only applies for units fronting Corridors.
122	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Historically, stoops/ units elevated a few feet from grade have been the prefered approach to providing some level of privacy for residential units while still activating the public realm. Curious why this is seen as less preferable to on-grade situations. Concern that on-grade porches would not feel safe to residents and would not be used in a way that helps activate the public realm. If accessibility is the concern, then these spaces could be elevated ground-level decks, rather than unit entries, with the unit entry on a separate accessible path.	3.6.4	Suggestion	Ground Floor Residential	Please see the response above in #123. Staff is well aware of the historic predominance and preference for stoops in many places; however, Planning staff believes that accessibility and universal design should take precedence at this time. Ground floor units should be accessible to people of all ages and physical abilities wherever possible. The stopps are not ruled out, but a valid reasons must be prived. Also, as for any other standards here, please keep in mind that unique design proposals can still undergo discretionary design review for a wide range of buildings that are not required to comply with ODS by state or local laws.

123	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Clarify glazing requirement- section reads as though a 2' tall storefront that runs from 6'-8' above grade for 60% of length of space would be acceptable. Assume this isn't the intent? Change text to eliminate the word "anywhere", and add minimum glazing height?	3.6.5	Suggestion	Ground Floor Residential	The language is correct. An illustration, once available, will help clarify the standard further. The transparent glazing area can be provided <u>anywhere</u> between 2 and 9 feet in ground floor height. This means glazing could begin at 2 feet from the ground and end at 7 feet, or begin at 3 feet and end at 8 feet, or other options between 2 and 9 feet, as long as it satisfied the minimum Zoning requirements for minimum % glazing. That requirement is not repeated here to avoid potential conflicts. This standard offers the range to allow for greater design flexibility.
124	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Clarify that option "a" refers to 50% of the ground floor units rather than 50% of the total units?	3.6.6	Suggestion	Ground Floor Residential	Clarification added.
125	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Clarify where it is acceptable to have a shared entrance, described in 4.1.1 and when the individual unit entries are required. Is there an exception for "corridor" streets? Is there an exception for elevator-served corridor buildings? Many developers have security concerns tied to multiple building entries where interior corridors provide access to the remainder of the building.	4.2.1	Suggestion	Residential Ground Floor Access	ODS do not mandate the placement of individual or shared entries to preserve flexibility, leaving the decision to the developer and their designer based on unique site conditions and other factors. ODS aim to maintain basic design aspects <u>when</u> such entries are provided.
126	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Clarify if this is only required for 4 story buildings, and not 5-9 story buildings. Sloped roofs on 8-story buildings often look contrived and stuck-on. It would also have a density impact to require sloped roofs on taller buildings, due to the way that building height is measured.	4.5.1	Suggestion	Roofs	The language is clear. This standard applies only to 4 story buildings. Additional clarification is added.
127	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	See comment above- clarify if this is ONLY for 4 story buildings, or if it's for all buildings, 4-8 or 9 stories covered by this code.	4.5.2	Suggestion	Roofs	Please see a response above.
128	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Clarify if this section is only required for buildings longer than 50', similar to 4.5.4.	4.5.5	Suggestion	Roofs	This standard applies when a flat roof is provided, regardless of length.
129	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	In order to get variation in the roof line expression, it is common to have a typical parapet height of 2'-4" and use a "gravel stop" edge at recessed areas, which would only be about 6" above the roof surface. Consider providing an exception that allows for this condition.	4.5.7	Suggestion	Parapets	The standards does not preclude the gravel stop edges of any height. This standard sets basic dimensions for parapets <u>when</u> they are provided. It does not require the parapets.
130	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Provide exception for balconies where a parapet from a wall/ building volume below serves as the railing	4.6.3	Suggestion	Balconies	This is a very specific design situation that is not a common occurrence. ODS aim to capture typical cases.
131	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	What is the intention of this section? Other sections in this code lean more heavily on a base-middle-top expression, which allows more flexibility for the differences between what is needed at the ground floor and what is needed above. On tight sites with a single ground floor opening, for example, it might be hard to meet this requirement depending on where the party walls between units need to be for maximum efficiency. Consider eliminating this requirement, or providing an exception for buildings with only one opening at the ground floor (where blank walls can't be avoided).	4.7.4	Suggestion	Window Alignment	Staff believes that 60% is already a very flexible and permissible standard. Maintaining a level of window alignment is important, as emphasized in multiple other comments and suggestions received during the workshop and other engagement, to avoid a general sense of "busyness." Building section variation is successfully addressed by other standards, such as variation in materials and specific requirements for the ground floor. Based on the feedback received at the workshop and reflected in the comments here, staff does not believe that additional articulation is necessary here as this may overcomplicate the ODS.
132	Kristen Belt - Mithun	6/2/2024	Konveio	Most high-quality, high-density fiber cement boards come in a thickness of 7/16", which is slightly less than 0.5". Suggest revising to allow 7/16" products.	4.8.1.o	Suggestion	Materials	Revised.
133	Rockridge Community Planning Council	6/3/2024	RCPC Comment Letter	We appreciate the Oakland Planning Department's efforts to provide predictable, objective standards to expedite approvals for new housing. We recognize the challenge of creating a document that provides flexibility to developers while ensuring that projects make a positive contribution to the public realm. The "Public Draft 4-8 Story Multi-Family Residential Objective Design Standards" is a good start at achieving that balance.		Statement	Support	Thank you. No response needed.
134	Rockridge Community Planning Council	6/3/2024	RCPC Comment Letter	1. Consider revising the name and applicability of this document to address buildings of 4-9 stories, up to 85'. In recent years, many buildings, particularly on sloped sites, are using Type I concrete construction with thin floor-ceiling assemblies to provide 9 stories of housing within the "mid-rise" construction requirements of the building code. These buildings are typically about 85' tall, and should be covered by these guidelines, as they have the same urban design impact as an 8- story building at a similar height.		Suggestion	General	See similar response above in #101.

135 Rockridge Community Planning Council	6/3/2024 RCPC Comment Letter	2. Consider providing more exceptions tied to building size/ parking count/ building frontage where this distinction is not already made, to provide more flexibility for smaller, space constrained sites. Some of these standards feel more important for a one-to-two-acre site or sites with longer frontages. While some standards include provisions for this, others don't. Landscape and trees in driveways or parking areas, top treatment, and middle treatment are examples of sections that should provide exceptions or reduced requirements for smaller buildings and/ or narrower street frontages.	Suggestion		Staff relaxed the building top standards. The parking and tree standards have been reduced as well. Middle articulation options have been expanded and include a long list of optional choices that are not difficult to meet. The options have been selected to not have significant cost or other implications, while delivering valuable and restrained articulation.
136 Rockridge Community Planning Council	6/3/2024 RCPC Comment Letter	3. Consider concentrating design standards on aspects of the building that most impact the urban experience, such as ground floor pedestrian experience, including streetscape planting requirements. Standards should not unnecessarily add to costs. The requirements for the "middle treatment" in particular are problematic. One method of articulation is sufficient for most buildings. Consider reducing this requirement.	Suggestion	General	The ODS predominant focus is already on the ground floor, which defines the pedestrian and urban experience. This is why the Base and Ground Floor sections have significantly more standards, while the Middle section has only <u>one</u> standard. This portion of the comment has been addressed. The choice options for the middle treatment have been expanded, allowing for even more flexibility.
137 Oakland Heritage Alliance	6/3/2024 OHA Comment Letter	The Maps used to define "immediate context area" are now very good. Thank you for providing these. However, use five lots or 250 feet (rather than 150 feet), whichever is greater, to define immediate context area. The context area should reflect neighboring buildings that can be seen with reasonable clarity concurrently with the project site. 150 feet provides an insufficient visual range to accomplish this.	Suggestion		The numeric value in feet has been removed to align the Immediate Context Area definition with the Planning Code, which considers only the number of lots: five on each side and 10 across. Please refer to the revised graphics for details.
138 Oakland Heritage Alliance	6/3/2024 OHA Comment Letter	There is ambiguity concerning whether parcels along "corridors" are subject to the context standards. Please clarify. The context standards should normally apply to corridors as well as non-corridor locations.	Suggestion		Identifying specific standards would help staff provide a response. Generally, application of context transition standards vary based on specific goals and objectives, considering on-the-ground realities and long-standing development goals for various areas within the City. Corridor zones have long been regulated differently from off-corridor zones in core neighborhoods. The City adopted Corridor Design Guidelines for this reason. This is also reflected in Planning Code and the recent zoning changes. For example, most corridor areas have zero front setback requirements, while off-corridor areas have varying setbacks. Therefore, it is reasonable for context transition standards to apply differently to corridors and off-corridors. For example, standard 1.1.1 requires a setback transition to existing context buildings. Since most corridor zones require zero front setbacks for new developments according to the vision and goals for Corridors, this standard applies only if a historic Civic building is adjacent. Planning staff does not agree that all context transition standards should apply automatically and equally in both corridors and off-corridor zones, disregarding long-standing policies and development goals.
139 Oakland Heritage Alliance	6/3/2024 OHA Comment Letter	it appears that context standards apply wherever the "immediate context area" is referenced. Please confirm that we are understanding this correctly. Although applying context standards beyond APis and ASIs is desirable, it may unduly limit relatively creative architectural designs, since such designs can be intrusive within APis and ASIs and the standards should be crafted to discourage such designs within APis and ASIs as per our previous comments.	Question		Please review the definitions of Immediate Context (for areas outside of Corridors) and Existing Context (for areas within Corridors). Context standards do not apply uniformly; they are tailored to address specific issues with appropriate solutions. Sometimes context standards apply when "adjacent" or "immediately adjacent" is used because it is more appropriate to reference adjacent buildings rather than structures from the broader "immediate context area." This can be seen in standards like Contextual Massing Breaks (standard 2.1.2) or Base Height Context Transition (standard 3.1.2) and other standards. Planning staff, including Historic Preservation planners, align that valuable context exists beyond just APis and ASIs districts with the lines drawn (often subjectively) decades ago. The boundaries of historic districts, especially the ASIs, were drawn based on a "windshield analysis" from the 1980s. These boundaries often no longer reflect current realities and are far from perfect. Updating the City's historic designation system or district boundaries is not part of the state-mandated ODS. The proposed ODS approach is more equitable, considering neighborhoods with historical and architectural quality that might not have been previously designated or included in a protected district by past metrics. Oakland has 55 APis and 332 ASIs, including more than 20,000 properties and covering roughly half of the city when considering other historic overlays and individual designations. It would also place an additional burden on applicants to understand and for staff to explain the complex historic designation system to ODS applicants. Planning staff believes that limiting context transition standards only to APis and ASIs would be a mistake and reinforce the un-equitable divisions within the City. The context transition standards do not limit creative architectural designs. These standards are flexible, and their application fairly minor and rare, impacting only small portions of new buildings in limited cases or requiring minor elements that can be incorporated in a modern way with the use of available materials. Additionally, staff decided early on not to require or enforce specific architectural styles or designs through ODS. Planning staff does not believe that ODS should require specific building styles or designs in APis or ASIs, for the

140	Oakland Heritage Alliance	6/3/2024 OHA Comment Letter	Comments have been made by staff that the standards are intended to avoid mimicking historical architectural design. Please confirm if we are understanding this correctly. Mimicking historic architectural design is totally appropriate if it is done well and involves good understanding of proportion, façade composition, architectural detailing, and appropriate materials. It is also endorsed by the General Plan's Historic Preservation Element. The standards can establish parameters for doing this, as indicated in our previous comments that provided specific language for such parameters. If the intent is to design a building in a particular historical architectural style, that should be clearly stated in the design review application. Buildings that have received at least a "C" rating by the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS) that use the same architectural style should be referenced as a source for architectural detailing, proportion, composition, etc.				ODS neither encourages nor discourages any architectural or period building styles. There is nothing in ODS that specifically avoids mimicking or matching historical architectural design. Instead, ODS leaves it up to the building designer to create and propose a building of any particular design or style. Instead of mandating a "style," ODS draft includes several context transition standards that help integrate new buildings into existing neighborhood context by requiring certain common elements that may exist in the context area such as minor transitions in front setbacks, height, or other existing design features that are common to existing buildings. Those elements contribute to formation of the context. For example, standard 4.7.1 asks applicants to identify a dominant window orientation in the existing context and, if such a strong window context exists, to provide windows that are similarly oriented in the proposal. Planning staff appreciates OHA's expert suggestions, and this particular standard was influenced by the OHA recommendation shared as a part of the community engagement process. In some cases, the "context" includes not only specifically OCHS-rated buildings but also buildings that contribute to the neighborhood context even if they do not carry an official designation. In other cases, especially on Corridors, the context buildings include only designated historic buildings. Please see definitions in the Generals Provisions section. Many potentially designated buildings (PDHPs) or just high-quality buildings without any designation also help create the neighborhood context. ODS help new buildings respond to it. However, there are also context standards that ask to respond to a certain type of historic building category (not just any existing context building), such as standard 2.1.1.
141	Oakland Heritage Alliance	6/3/2024 OHA Comment Letter	The draft standards have references to "historic resources", for example Standard 3.4.1 on page 17. What is the definition of "historic resource"?	3.4.1	Question	General	Clarified. Please see standard 1.1.1 on page 6 or Section 5 for a thorough explanation. Oakland has a unique and complex historic designation system. In ODS, "historic" typically refers to Local Register Properties, which include all designated historic properties, certain potentially designated historic properties, properties in APIS, and those within S-7 and S-20 preservation districts. However, some standards vary from this rule and specify which type of historic resource must be present for the standard to apply. For example, standard 2.1.1 applies only if abutting lots contain DHPs or buildings in the APIS.
142	Oakland Heritage Alliance	6/3/2024 OHA Comment Letter	Some of the detail-oriented standards promote elements that will be too underscaled and may look kitschy. For example, Standard 4.5.6 requires cornices on buildings five stories or less to be at least 6 inches tall and project at least 6 inches from the face of the building. 12 inches would be better. Alternatively, a cornice design derived from a building rated at least "C" by the OCHS with the same architectural style as the proposed building could be used, as discussed in Item 4 above.	4.5.6	Suggestion	Roofs	Staff discussed and revised the cornice height to a minimum of 12 inches tall. However, staff believes that a cornice projecting 12 inches on a 4-5 story building would look out of scale and therefore maintains the proposed 6-inch requirement for 4-5 story buildings. The dimension is 12 inches for 6-8 story buildings as suggested. This approach aims to provide flexibility for different architectural styles, some of which utilize a less prominent cornice. It is important to note that it would be unduly difficult or even impossible for an applicant to identify an OCHS-rated building of the same architectural style as their proposal to derive the cornice dimension. Most newly built contemporary 4-8 story buildings do not have a corresponding OCHS-rated building to use as a guide because most contemporary buildings have not been historically rated. This process would defeat one of the key purposes of ODS - to be useful, realistic, and implementable. Therefore, a simple standard compliance is preserved.
143	Oakland Heritage Alliance	6/3/2024 OHA Comment Letter	The Section 4.7 window provisions are inadequate for APIS and ASIs. In such cases, the windows should use wood or steel sash, depending on which of these materials are associated with the proposed building's architectural style or the window materials originally used for at least 50% of the API/ASI's contributing buildings (or using visually matching materials) to establish consistency with the API/ASI buildings. See previous window comments, especially Exhibit D to our 4/30/21 "recommended objectives and strategies", for specific provisions to consider.	4.7	Suggestion	Windows	Added a window materials standard for APIS (see 4.7.6). Because of the equity considerations, staff does not recommend this standard apply in ASIs because Oakland has over 330 ASIs and some of these areas are not that different from other non-rated neighborhood context. Please see comment #140 for more detail. ODS do not include references to the Styles Guide for reasons similar to those outlined in #143 above and response #140. Please keep in mind these ODS are for 4-8 story multifamily buildings. Requiring an applicant to identify the architectural style of the proposed building, find a building of the same style in the context of APIS or ASIs, survey window materials for other 4-8 story multifamily buildings, and then apply one of the three acceptable window materials would be too complex and burdensome for applicants and for staff. This goes against the idea of ODS to streamline the planning approvals and to allocate the staff resources to projects that have higher value to the City.
144	Oakland Heritage Alliance	6/3/2024 OHA Comment Letter	Section 4.8 (materials) should require that within APIS and ASIs surface materials use those found on buildings which contribute to the API/ASI.	4.8	Suggestion	Materials	A materials context standard has been added (see 4.8.5). In addition, ODS already provide a list of high-quality exterior materials for ground floors, where they are most important, and include a list of prohibited exterior materials to prevent undesirable outcomes. Staff believes the current standards are sufficient. Adding additional contextual material requirements specifically targeting APIS and ASIs would be an overreach, create conflicts, increase construction costs, and stifle the development and application of new materials. It is important to note that a 5-8 story buildings requires different construction techniques and materials compared to a 2-story building. Mandating that new higher-density buildings match the exterior materials of existing lower-density buildings in APIS and ASIs would create significant challenges and cost implications, and may not be feasible in many cases. This requirement would also conflict with existing standards for ground floor material variation and other requirements. The suggestion may be more appropriate for 1-3 story buildings, which will be addressed in a separate draft ODS scheduled for future review and adoption. For more information on APIS and ASIs and why staff does not recommend creating a subset of standards specifically for those districts, please refer to our response to comment #144.

145	Oakland Heritage Alliance	6/3/2024 OHA Comment Letter	There needs to be a provision requiring consistency with architectural detailing contributing buildings within APIs and ASIs. The architectural detail provisions of the 1-2 unit Residential Design Review Manual Section 8 could a starting point.		Suggestion	Requiring detailed architectural surveys of building details for consistency with contributing buildings within APIs and ASIs is both onerous and often not feasible for the required ministerial approval under ODS. Such requirements are more appropriate in the 1-2 unit Residential Design Review Manual, which involves discretionary review of single-family homes and lower-density developments. They are not suitable for state and locally mandated by-right applications for 4-8 story multifamily developments covered by these ODS. Please keep in mind that ODS already include context transition standards for various building elements such as porches, windows, horizontal expression lines, cornices, roofs, and other building features. These standards ensure basic consistency with key buildings elements that have a big impact on existing neighborhoods, but a balance must be maintained to avoid overly detailed and harder-to-meet requirements.	
146	Survey Respondent	5/27/2024 Survey Respondent #2	You have done a great job of explaining options, but I'm not sure they will prevent truly ugly buildings. My main concern is that new construction not overwhelm existing neighborhoods by either height or bulk.		Statement	General	While ODS do not control building height, which is regulated by Zoning, they include various bulk-control and context transition standards to prevent projects from visually appearing significantly out of scale with existing neighborhoods.
147	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	One thing City of Alameda allowed in its menu of options for creating articulation was extra-deep window recesses. Not sure many applicants would choose this, though!		Suggestion	Massing Break	ODS require 2" inset and do not preclude deeper recessed windows to create more articulation. This is not a preferred option to expand the already robust list of available articulation options. Designers are free to implement it while meeting other available options.
148	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Difficult to implement 2 and 3 - because #2 Portals: I think this is a good idea, but I wonder if there should be a minimum depth. #3 Court: How to ensure that this requirement actually creates facade variation? Does it create a potential loophole by allowing whole building facade to be set back the same distance?	2.1.3	Question	Massing Break	A portal is an opening in a building that extends through its entire depth. Prescribing a minimum depth for a portal is impractical because building depths vary. Additionally, requiring the entire building to be set back to accommodate a portal would be highly inefficient compared to creating a courtyard. The staff believes that this does not create a viable loophole, as setting the entire building back is fundamentally different from creating a courtyard.
149	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	This is always a tough standard to quantify, and the standards themselves will not guarantee good design. However, I do believe massing breaks are important to include in the standards. If an applicant cannot provide a massing break that meets one of the standards, and they want to propose a different way of breaking up the mass, then they can always elect to go through discretionary design review.	2.1.3	Statement	Massing Break	While ODS cannot completely guarantee a "good design," they can establish a design baseline, ensure greater predictability, create desirable transitions, and prevent highly undesirable examples from being built without a discretionary review or public process. Certain project categories may still undergo discretionary review. Please refer to the Applicability section of ODS to identify which state and locally-required project categories must comply with ODS.
150	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Difficult to implement 6. Window wall systems (full glass and metal panels) at the corners. - Some of the options are not undesirable, per se, but I wonder if they need greater specificity so that the reviewer (and applicant) can determine whether the standard has been met. For example, with #1, at what distance from the building corner does the massing break need to start? For #2, how much taller should the corner element be? (Worth specifying so that an applicant doesn't provide something just inches taller.) For #4, what will count as a change in roof form or break in Building Corners 1 of 6 roofline? #6 I consider somewhat undesirable, or at least not necessarily creating a strong corner element. I'm also concerned with bird safety on facades with so much glass.	2.1.4	Question	Building Corner	Added a numeric value for (b) and (c) (3 feet). Window wall systems are one of 7 options available. According to option 2.1.4(a), a massing break is required after 15 feet of building length from the corner. Option 2.1.4(d) specifies that any change in roof form, such as a transition from pitched to flat, satisfies this requirement. Additionally, any break in the roofline, such as a change in parapet heights or another form of interruption of a continuous roofline after the first 15 feet, is acceptable. ODS aim to preserve design flexibility. Note that we have separate conditions of approval for bird-safe glass, which are not part of the ODS.
151	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	I don't consider a requirement for building corner elements as important as some other aspects of design, like building articulation. Nevertheless, I'm impressed with the array of options for emphasizing building corners that you've come up with.	2.1.4	Statement	Building Corner	Thank you. This outcome is the result of extensive discussions and evaluations, focusing on what is important and effective for Oakland.
152	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Additional blank wall option: Indentations and projections in the ground-floor facade that mimic storefront shapes, even if not actual storefronts. Also include actual storefronts as an option.	2.2.3	Suggestion	Blank Walls	Blank indentations and projections are not desirable and do not solve the issue of blank walls. They have the same issues as blank walls. Please note that ODS includes requirements for storefronts. However, this is not a suitable option in this context because a storefront is not considered a blank wall treatment, and incorporating a storefront would eliminate the blank wall.
153	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Difficult to implement: 1. Murals that are at least 8 feet in any dimension and cover at least 75% of the blank wall area. 4. Planting that covers at least 75 % of the blank wall area. Because #1 and #4 can be desirable, but they can also be difficult to maintain and follow up on. What ensures a mural will not be painted over or covered with graffiti? What ensures that plants on a trellis will be watered, cared for, and successful?		Question	Blank Walls	ODS does not ensure or control maintenance or future performance. However, ODS ensures that irrigation is installed when plants are included and provides minimum soil width and volume to enhance the chances of plant survival. While ODS cannot guarantee future performance or condition, staff does not believe this is a valid reason to eliminate these desirable options.

154	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Additional option: Distinguish shared building entries from individual building entries, and tailor the minimum width and depth requirement for recessed entries accordingly. Give designers the option to provide larger shared entries or multiple smaller entries. For shared entries, I would want doors to have a certain width and transparency; they should be visually prominent and findable, shouldn't look like utility doors.	3.1.3	Suggestion	Residential Building Base	This is already included in the draft ODS. Shared entries are distinguished from individual entries, with specific standards for shared entries, including minimum entry width and transparency. Designers have the option to provide larger and wider entries. The visual prominence of residential entries is addressed in section 3.6 of the ODS.
155	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Difficult to implement: 3. Covered and recessed entries that are a minimum of 6 feet wide and 6 feet deep. Note, this option is required if most (above 50%) existing buildings in the Immediate Context Area include porches or covered and recessed entries because Require a larger, deeper covered entry if a shared entry rather than individual unit entry.	3.1.3	Suggestion	Residential Building Base	Option 3.1.3(c) is one of eight proposed design solutions and is only necessary if the immediate context includes the relevant elements. Staff believes it is crucial to retain this option to ensure a highly-important contextual transition, especially in the absence of discretionary design review and public input.
156	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	For shared entry doors, as in main entry doors to a larger building, a minimum door width and transparency.		Suggestion	Residential Building Base	Please see response #155
157	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Storefront elements options 1, 2, 3, and 4 are difficult to implement. These requirements are too detailed. I suggest using a simple groundfloor minimum transparency requirement instead. It would also be fine to require bulkheads, but not with such specificity about where storefront windows are set in relation to the bulkhead. The materials requirements for bulkheads are also too detailed and strict.	3.5.1	Suggestion	Storefront Elements	The Planning Code already prescribes minimum ground floor transparency. A typical storefront includes all the required elements and staff believes it is not difficult to meet this standard since all the elements are related and do not stand alone. Staff added an additional option to make the standard even more flexible.
158	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Focus on minimum transparency requirements for the ground floor!		Suggestion	Storefront Elements	Please see response #158
159	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Window context groupings - This might be too strict and detailed. I would prioritize other aspects of design instead of including so much detail on groupings of	4.7.1	Suggestion	Window Context	Windows are significant building elements that define the context and character of an area, influencing overall building design. This standard aims to ensure a transition to the existing context. Staff believes it is essential to retain this standard to maintain the critical contextual transition, especially in the absence of discretionary design review and public input for by-right projects.
160	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Window alignment is not as important as other design standards		Statement	Window Alignment	Please see response #160.
161	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #3	Good job! It's not easy to write objective design standards! One thing to please add: minimum facade transparency requirements. I'll follow up by emailing you with an example from my neighborhood of a new building with insufficient transparency		Suggestion	Transparency	Thank you. Please see response #158
162	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	It would be helpful for there to be a broader range of options here, including ones more in line with historical character, including (1) ornamentation of equal width to the currently required massing break (e.g., 5 feet wide); (2) an exception that if sufficiently "high quality"/historically aligned building materials used [could define materials, I don't have an opinion here but EG brick/masonry], can forego massing breaks (or change threshold for buildings with such materials, e.g., 200 ft vs 100 ft); (3) to align with the mandate in the city's Climate Action Plan to reduce emissions from building materials, should offer an option that gives extra incentives and reduces design burden for buildings that can demonstrate they are using x% low-carbon building materials such as Mass Timber or low-carbon cement (or align with the California Green Building Standard in other ways I might not be thinking of right now)		Suggestion	Massing Breaks	Please refer to responses for questions #15, #16, and other related questions regarding Massing and Articulation. Standard 3.1.3 has been updated to include more treatment options, while massing standard 2.1.3 has been adjusted by raising the threshold to 150 feet in building length. Additionally, high-quality and prohibited materials are defined in Section 4.8, Materials.
163	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Please see suggestion #3 above - massing breaks + articulation requirements can be in contradiction w sustainability mandates, could think about ways to balance this by offering a "green building option/exception" as one of the options above.		Suggestion	Massing Breaks	All buildings are required to meet the Green Building requirements. These buildings can also incorporate minor massing breaks and respond effectively to their context. Projects can meet Green Building material standards while still including massing breaks. Staff does not see a conflict between this standard and the Oakland Climate Action Plan. Please also refer to responses for question #163.
164	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Additional Building corner option: 8. Green wall on one of the frontage sides (including required irrigation, other requirements from relevant landscaping sections). 9. Mural or public art installation option		Suggestion	Building Corner	Staff considered the green wall option. However, the high level of maintenance required to keep a green wall viable cannot be enforced by ODS, as irrigation alone is insufficient. Additionally, standard 2.1.4 falls under the Building Mass section. ODS includes non-building mass related articulation and treatment sections, such as 2.2.3, which address mural and public art standards for blank walls. Allowing a mural or public art in lieu of more typical building articulation requirements would create an undesirable loophole. Also, public art requirements already apply to developments independently of ODS. Furthermore, as noted in other public comments, the look and feel of murals cannot be controlled by ODS.
165	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Difficult to implement: Why does #5 have to be 'habitable'? Could revise to remove that requirement - a projection such as energysaving sunshade could be just as nice looking and helpful to residents.		Question	Building Corner	Again, the ODS includes articulation standards for elements such as sunshades (see Section 3.2.1 for example). The term "habitable" projections in Standard 2.4.1 refers to bay windows that extend from the building's surface. These projections are an excellent way to articulate a building and enhance the quality of living units. Bays are optional and are not difficult to implement- many great buildings have bays.

166	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Imagining an intersection with new buildings on all four corners - it is probably undesirable that all four have these "busy" features. Could this be revised to have an exception, that if applicant can demonstrate at least 50% of buildings at given intersection already have these features they are not required.		Suggestion	Building Corner	Planning staff understands the concern. This is why Standard 2.1.4 refers specifically to "Buildings at street intersections where at least one of the streets is a Corridor." Therefore, this standard does not apply to all corner buildings—only certain corners are subject to this standard. Please read the requirements closely.
167	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Additional Blank Wall option: 5. If wall is made of some defined "extra" high quality material (eg, brick), ok as-is without additional steps; 6. Ornamentation such as a frieze or swag - distinct from #3 because this is better applied sparingly, would be unattractive if covering at least 50% of wall area. Could be something like "a frieze running 75% the length of the blank wall area, at least 10 inches in height, placed between 4 and 7 feet above ground level	2.2.3	Suggestion	Blank Walls	Standard revised to include the additional option. A "blank wall" is defined in the Glossary section, and it has been a long-standing City policy to avoid blank walls due to their undesirable effects, as memorialized in adopted design guidelines. While brick and other high-quality materials are already mentioned in standard 4.8.1, a large, windowless brick wall with no fenestration still constitutes a blank wall, even if it includes some type of articulation. Such walls can make buildings appear imposing and fortress-like and provide no connection with the public street among other negative impacts. Planning staff strongly believe that permitting such blank walls, even if constructed from premium materials, would result in multiple negative consequences.
168	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	To clarify "solid doors" - does a door with a peek-through window count as solid or as a window?		Question	Blank Walls	A door with a window is not considered solid.
169	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Mandating 'visual interest' here seems the same as mandating 'busy-ness' which it seems many Oaklanders disagree with. I don't have good ideas to suggest here but would be in favor of additional options others might suggest that can achieve your central goal without adding to the visual busy-ness of a new building.	3.1.3	Statement	Building Base	The planning staff disagrees with the assertion that two required base articulation elements from the choice list in 3.1.3 result in a "busy" appearance. For example, regularly spaced pilasters and a cornice element separating the base from the rest of the building do not create a busy look. Instead, these features contribute to a context-aware and visually appealing base. The same holds true for other design options. These suggested elements prevent plain building bases in the by-right approval process. Please note that the absolute majority of comments on this list come from architects and developers who, understandably, prefer to have no requirements. However, reducing ODS to simple zoning requirements and superficial solutions with little to no cost implications is not in the interest of the majority of Oakland's public who will be living with the results that this by-right process creates.
170	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Difficult to implement: 1. Bays that are at least 5 feet wide and project from the street-facing building by at least 2 feet and not more than 5 feet. Any projections into public right of way must comply with Zoning and OakDOT permitting requirements. 3. Covered and recessed entries that are a minimum of 6 feet wide and 6 feet deep. Note, this option is required if most (above 50%) existing buildings in the Immediate Context Area include porches or covered and recessed entries.	3.1.3	Statement	Residential Building Base	A designer is free to choose not to implement these two options and instead use two of the remaining 6 options available in 3.1.3. Planning staff believes that features such as bays and recessed entries are excellent methods for creating desirable buildings where people want to live. ODS is not simply a collection of the cheapest design options for developers to minimise the design investments. ODS is balanced by offering a variety of desirable options.
171	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	For #3 - In this case I don't think the context of other building entryways should mandate this design choice. It could be an option but should not be required. For #1 - 2-5 foot limit seems overly restrictive. I can imagine a "front yard" type bay that is in the public interest and is much bigger than 5 feet - probably expensive for the builder but if they want to do it we should let them -eg https://media.istockphoto.com/id/1150786967/photo/capitol-hill-historic-community-in-washington-dc-usa.jpg?s=612x612&w=0&k=20&c=cbQnN95qTuY53TzUlxizbUEKKOMwv_rMMGEPIsZbLQc=	3.1.3	Suggestion	Residential Building Base	The standard has been revised to remove the upper limit of a 5-foot projection for (a). Please note that any projection into the public right-of-way requires OakDOT approval. Additionally, option #3(c) in Standard 3.1.3, "Additional Treatment Options for Bases with Residential Uses," is merely an option unless there is a well-established context of porches. Staff believes that porches are a significant contextual design element of neighborhoods. However, the standard has been revised to reduce the context requirement from 50% to 60% of existing buildings.
172	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	These all seem fine, but overly prescriptive. See comment above for #1. For #2, I could imagine design approaches that push stoops beyond 30 feet - could it not be 45 or 60 (as long as other ODS are met such as windows/blank wall standards that seems like it would be fine).	3.1.3(b)	Statement	Residential Building Base	ODS, by nature, cannot cover every conceivable design solution. Designers are free to incorporate stoops that are more than 30 feet apart, provided they meet at least two options from the list of eight. Staff believes that the 30-foot minimum spacing fosters a consistent pattern throughout the residential ground floor, establishing a desirable street condition. It's important to note that this requirement remains optional.
173	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	ground floor access options 1, 2, 3 difficult to implement. Sorry guys, I think this section needs a full re-do. #2 is mandating ADA inaccessibility. This should absolutely NOT be part of the ODS. Also raises question of how you will decide what counts as "not physically feasible" #3 seems subjective - 'other safety or engineering requirements'. What is this an exception to? Can it also be lower than 2.5 feet above sidewalk level? #1 is overly complicated, and seems like it might conflict with the requirements in the previous section. This doesn't seem to be in the spirit of (quoting you ;)) "Limit[ing] the ODS to the most important standards" . Do we need any of these?	3.6.3	Question	Ground Floor Access	The Planning staff strongly disagrees with the assertion that option (b) in Standard 3.6.3 is "mandating inaccessibility." First please note that this standard is only applicable for ground floor residential uses along the Corridors where elevating ground floor residential uses has been a long-standing policy adopted in the existing design guidelines. Planning staff is committed to promoting accessibility. Therefore, Option (b), which allows the residential ground floor to be raised, is only available if the preferred option (a) is not physically feasible. Option (b) preserves the much-needed flexibility along the Corridors where at-grade entries are physically infeasible due to lot cross slopes or other physical constraints that might otherwise necessitate a variance request during a regular design review. This flexibility is also a key feature of ODS along with the accessibility goals. Option (a) is straightforward, incorporating three simple transition features typical for recessed entries. These features promote privacy while ensuring direct at-grade access to the ground floor. Additionally, ground floor elevation might be required by Climate Plan goals in flood-prone areas.
174	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Is the above only for ground floor units along "Corridors"? Not totally clear here		Question	Ground Floor Access	Yes. 3.6.3 applies only to Corridor areas. Off corridors (most of Oakland) is discussed in standard 3.6.4 where accessible at-grade entries are also prioritized and stoops are only allowed if at-grade entry is not physically feasible because is committed to promoting accessibility.
175	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Setback ground floor I would be in favor of additional and more varied options that others might propose, to add to the current options.	3.6.4	Statement	Setback	Planning staff is open to considering any additional options if any are suggested.

176	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	To make this more objective can clarify extent of this - 100% of the street/public space frontage? (I'd suggest not 100% to provide designers with more flexibility if there's an interesting reason to do it differently - perhaps 50 or 75%)	3.6.4	Suggestion	Setback	Standard 3.6.4 does not provide any % requirement specifically to allow designers the flexibility. Any % requirement in this case will reduce that flexibility and make the standard more difficult to implement.
177	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Commercial Building Base additional option #4 - Ground floor is composed of "extra" high quality building materials (eg whatever you guys decide this is - brick, etc). This will allow new buildings to have the option to align with historical buildings in Oakland and avoid mandating 'busy' ground floors		Suggestion	Building Base - Commercial	High quality durable materials for ground floor commercial are already addressed in standard 4.8.1 and brick is on that list. Please also see response to #170.
178	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Building Base commercial - options 1 and 3 are difficult to implement. #1 - Would modify to remove second sentence. Unclear and I think the primary standard is clear given first sentence. #3 - Could this be made slightly more expansive - does it need to be a belt course specifically, could it not be a frieze or similar ornamentation? Does it have to be 4 feet from ground up or what exactly is the mandate for this one?	3.1.3	Question	Building Base - Commercial	The standard has been revised as suggested. The second sentence from (a) has been removed, and "frieze or similar ornamentation" has been added to choice item (c) as suggested. The belt course height has been reduced to 3 feet, measured from the sidewalk grade. Staff believes that providing larger windows for ground-floor commercial uses is not particularly difficult. This practice is common, with examples found in virtually every building featuring commercial ground floors.
179	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Additional option for storefront element: 5. Planters, made of durable material (and including irrigation and other requirements in landscaping section), parallel against storefront walls. Height including plants 18-48 inches. 6. Benches or seating area	3.5.1	Suggestion	Storefront Elements	An option for planters has been added, but their height cannot exceed 24 inches to align with existing Code requirements for transparency. Exterior seating and benches are tenant-driven features and should not be mandated at the ODS stage.
180	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Amend #2 - clarify OK if piers have decorative elements so visually distinct on their way to the ground (eg I often see lintels with tiling from ground floor to ~4 feet up - this looks nice I would not want to regulate it away!). Amend #4 - bulkhead can be up to 36"	3.5.1	Suggestion	Storefront Elements	Staff is unclear about the reason for this amendment. A designer retains the choice to include additional decorative elements if desired. Planning staff believes that requiring additional ornamentation is not desirable and may result in "busy-ness". Additionally, a 36" bulkhead would be inconsistent with the glazing requirements specified in the Planning Code.
181	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Would suggest reducing requirements from pick 3 to pick 1 or 2. Particularly as given reality of storefront window breakage in Oakland, #3 might be out of the question for some builders -- meaning they'll be required to do all of 1, 2, and 4.	3.5.1	Suggestion	Storefront Elements	There are existing transparency requirements in the Planning Code, and Option C is consistent with those standards. It essentially requires a recess in storefront flanked by display windows. To increase flexibility, staff added an additional option to the standard for planters. However, staff believes that at least three of these elements are necessary for a successful storefront.
182	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Additional option for building materials 16. Mass timber (important to add this, to comply w city of Oakland climate policy!); 17. Why not stucco, beyond just above a bulkhead?	3.5.1 and 4.8.1	Suggestion	Materials	Stucco is not allowed for bulkheads because it is not durable and resistant to surface damage. Stucco is of course allowed beyond the bulk head (see 4.8.1(f)). Mass timber is wood and included with Heavy Timber option.
183	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Roofline articulation additional option: 4. A cornice projecting upward with projections of at least 12 inches, no further than 36 inches apart (eg https://www.thoughtco.com/thmb/hNYhSKX7ZTcSHh2640AeOmgxCAs=/1500x0/filters:no_upscale():max_bytes(150000):strip_icc():89006613-56a02f8a5f9b58eba4f4913.jpg). 5. I don't know how to make this objective but other visual interest such as dormer windows (https://c8.alamy.com/comp/HHW9X2/view-of-rooftops-of-paris-from-the-rooftop-of-galleries-lafayette-paris-HHW9X2.jpg)	4.5.4	Suggestion	Roofline Articulation	The cornice option has been added.
184	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	I personally prefer a continuous uninterrupted roofline so not sure this rule could be clearly said to be in the public interest. That said, proposed a couple of additional options. I would generally recommend removing this one entirely.	4.5.4	Suggestion	Roofline Articulation	The cornice option has been added. Instead of personal preferences, ODS are grounded in existing design guidelines, examples from other peer cities, best practices, and existing examples of successful buildings. ODS aims to avoid undesirable examples where no articulation is provided at all to create the cheapest possible buildings. ODS set a design base in the absence of the discretionary review.
185	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Roof edges. Seems fine. I wonder if options #1 and #3 leave too much room for subjectivity - what are the conditions under which a design submitted to you would not qualify for one of these?	4.5.3	Question	Roof Edges	The proposed options include a built-in flexibility to allow for a variety of designs. The options are not subjective. If an applicant includes at least one of the three options the standard is met. Staff will accept a wide variety of options. This standard is just less prescriptive than some others.
186	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Window Context orientation. I worry we are restricting beauty and creativity here - I don't know that neighboring buildings will have made the 'right choice' for window orientation. Particularly since these buildings are larger - 4-8 stories -- they provide context unto themselves and don't necessarily need to match their neighbors		Statement	Window Context - Orientation	By their nature, ODS cannot predict and address every possible contextual situation in a diverse city like Oakland. However, establishing a window context standard is crucial for creating effective transitions between buildings, especially in situations when a higher density building is proposed in a lower-density existing context and must be approved by-right. Many existing buildings in Oakland have undergone a discretionary review process that applied similar context-sensitive guidelines or those building may have a historic designation. Based on this, staff believes that the window context standard will lead to desirable and context-appropriate transitions.
187	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Additional options for window context grouping. 3. Classic bay window. 4; Standalone vertically oriented windows (eg standard double-hang look, with whatever safety upgrades given story height).	4.7.1	Suggestion	Window Context - Grouping	The suggestions have been added to the draft ODS.
188	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Window context - groupings option 2 is difficult to implement. #2 seems overly restrictive, could language be clarified/loosened?	4.7.1	Suggestion	Window Context - Grouping	These optional items are not mandatory, as contextual conditions can vary. Option E allows for any other window grouping that exists within the context.
189	Survey Respondent	6/3/2024 Survey Respondent #1	Window alignment For objectivity, could provide further clarity to what (1) vertically aligned means (center-aligned, aligned on either edge, etc); (2) what "a structural element framing a larger opening at the ground level" means	4.7.4	Suggestion	Window Alignment	Clarified. Final ODS book will include graphics that will further clarify standards.