



# Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update

---

City of Milpitas

## Workshop #1 Summary

### **INTRODUCTION**

At 6 p.m. on August 22, 2023, the City of Milpitas Zoning Ordinance Update project team hosted the first of three community workshops. The workshop was conducted virtually via Zoom. Notifications of this meeting were distributed by the City and posted on the project website ([www.milpitaszoningupdate.org](http://www.milpitaszoningupdate.org)). Ahead of the meeting, the meeting agenda and presentation were posted on the project website, along with a link to register via Zoom. Though only two members of the public attended the workshop, the full presentation was recorded and posted on the project website so it may be viewed at any time by any interested party.

### **ATTENDANCE**

#### **City Staff**

- Jay Lee – Interim Planning Director
- Holly Pearson – Zoning Update Project Manager
- Kristina Phung – Associate Planner
- Liz Medina – Administrative Assistant

#### **Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc. (LWC)**

- Jen Murillo – Director/LWC Project Manager
- Monica Szydlik – Senior Associate
- Caroline Chen – Associate
- Abby Weizer – Associate

### **OVERVIEW**

Jay Lee, Interim Planning Director, welcomed participants to the workshop and introduced the City Staff team. LWC Director, Jen Murillo, then introduced the LWC team and gave a PowerPoint-supported presentation. The presentation covered the following topics:

- Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update Background
- Background Review and Recommendations Report

- Code Organization
  - Zoning Districts
  - Use Regulations
  - Development and Design Standards
  - Sign Standards
  - Administration and Procedures
- New Zoning Districts Overview
  - Zoning Map Update Overview

After the presentation, workshop participants had time to ask general questions about the overall project. Then time was allotted to discuss the recommendations in the Background Review and Recommendations Report. Jen Murillo shared her screen to show a Miro board with six questions to facilitate discussion and record comments. The discussion questions followed the recommendations chapter (Chapter 2) of the Background Review and Recommendations Report and are listed below:

1. Do you agree with the ordinance organization recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.1 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
2. Do you agree with the zoning districts recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.2 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
3. Do you agree with the use regulations recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.3 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
4. Do you agree with the development and design standards recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.4 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
5. Do you agree with the sign standards recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.5 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
6. Do you agree with the administration and procedures recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.6 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)

LWC Associate, Abby Weizer, took discussion notes using a Miro board so all participants could see via the shared screen.

## **PARTICIPANT COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

A summary of responses given for each discussion question is provided below (the Miro board notes from the discussion are attached).

1. Do you agree with the ordinance organization recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.1 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
  - There are inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance, which should be addressed by removing duplicative/overlapping standards.
  - Hyperlinked cross-references within the Zoning Ordinance are/would be helpful.
2. Do you agree with the zoning districts recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.2 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
  - The proposed 20 percent restriction for warehousing in the new BPRD Zoning District could be too limiting.
  - The relationship between base zoning districts and overlays should be clear. Which applies? When does one supersede the other?
  - Housing Opportunity Zones/Districts are directed by the adopted Housing Element and work is underway. The City recently released information about these HODs (see here - <https://www.milpitas.gov/1119/Housing-Opportunity-Districts-HOD>).
3. Do you agree with the use regulations recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.3 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
  - Some terms and uses are missing from the definitions section of the current Zoning Ordinance; make sure all uses are defined.
  - Ensure allowed uses do not preclude new uses (e.g., resilience hubs).
4. Do you agree with the development and design standards recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.4 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
  - Interest in encouraging energy efficiency and sustainability through the Zoning Ordinance where appropriate (i.e., do not overlap with the Green Building Code, etc.).
  - Ensure there is sufficient electric vehicle (EV) parking for new units. Team noted that State law regulates parking ratios in some cases (e.g., affordable units, units near transit).
  - Good examples of design standards or examples include the Metro Specific Plan and certain developments in Mountain View (El Camino Real/San Antonio Road) and San Jose (Sprouts).
  - The proposed BPRD Zoning Districts standard that requires a minimum of 10 percent of all parking lots to be landscaped may be a constraint. Clarify how this would be measured/defined.
  - Review/revisit the proposed BPRD Zoning District standard for 12 feet of separation between parking areas and usable common open space.

- Clarify if the proposed BPRD Zoning District standard requiring usable common open space equal to 10 percent of the site area is private or public common area.
5. Do you agree with the sign standards recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.5 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
    - The Metro Specific Plan is a good model for sign standards to consider when updating citywide sign standards.
  6. Do you agree with the administration and procedures recommendations? (Refer to Section 2.6 of the Background Review and Recommendations Report)
    - No concern with the current processes.

### **MEETING CONCLUSION**


After the facilitated discussion on the recommendations in the Background Review and Recommendations Report, Jen Murillo summarized next steps in the project and suggested that participants reach out to others in the community to encourage more participation in future Zoning Ordinance Update events. Then the workshop concluded. Following the workshop, the presentation and Background and Recommendations Report were also posted to the City's online calendar.

Attached: Miro Board / Facilitated Discussion Notes



## MIRO BOARD / FACILITATED DISCUSSION NOTES

<b>1</b> Do you agree with the ordinance <b>organization</b> recommendations?	<b>2</b> Do you agree with the <b>zoning districts</b> recommendations?	<b>3</b> Do you agree with the <b>use regulations</b> recommendations?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inconsistencies within the Code; some things are defined slightly differently leaving room for big gaps in interpretation</li><li>• Cross-references hyperlinked is great</li><li>• Interest in interactive PDF version</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 20% restriction for warehousing in BPRD is a concern (see tracker)</li><li>• Lack of clarity on how base zoning districts and overlay districts interact (objectives for parcels that have overlays become unclear);</li><li>• Unclear relationship between zoning districts, land use designation, and overlay districts; remove ambiguity, especially regarding the function/purpose of overlays</li><li>• Housing Opportunity Zones/Districts</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some missing definitions; allowed uses need a good check against the definitions</li><li>• Example: Resilience hub</li></ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b></p> <p>Do you agree with the <b><i>development and design standards</i></b> recommendations?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5</b></p> <p>Do you agree with the <b><i>sign standards</i></b> recommendations?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6</b></p> <p>Do you agree with the <b><i>administration and procedures</i></b> recommendations?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro Specific Plan is a good example to follow</li> <li>• Good example of a pleasant space: El Camino and San Antonio Road development, public spaces</li> <li>• Landscaping in BPRD - some constraints for architects/developers (minimum of 10% of a parking lot must be landscaped, what are the rules of measurement here? Clarify)</li> <li>• BPRD - 12 feet of separation between parking and public space</li> <li>• BPRD - 10% of open space to be common area, public or private?</li> <li>• Reduce runoff into parking lots, etc. and redirect to landscaping, wetlands, etc.</li> <li>• East Brokaw and Old Oakland Road (Sprouts, N. San Jose)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro Specific Plan is a good example for the rest of the City (model we can work off of)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfied with current process</li> </ul> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 20px;">  </div>