

**EXCEPTIONS IN OTHER CITIES AND COUNTIES**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Approval process</b>	<b>State variance findings?</b>	<b>Findings</b>
City of Auburn	Exception allows residential additions to encroach into rear or side yard setback.	Administrative approval.	No	
City of Rancho Cucamonga	Minor Exception: Deviations from Setbacks, lot coverage, fence height, signs, landscaping, open spaces	Administrative review by Director. Notice to contiguous property owners 10 days prior to decision.	Yes, but slightly less restrictive	Practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships, exceptional circumstances that do not generally apply to other properties in the same district
City of San Dimas	Minor Deviation; 10% reduction in lot area, yard areas	Administrative review by Director.	Yes, but slightly less restrictive	Exceptional circumstances that do not generally apply to other properties in the same district
Town of Mammoth	Zoning Adjustments	Administrative review by Director	N	Variance findings, or significant community benefit
City of Salinas	Minor Exception: Construction of addition or second story equal to existing legal nonconforming setback, replacement of detached accessory structure in setback	Decision by PC, or administrative approval by Director if applicant provides written approval by adjacent property owners.	N	Standard use permit findings required.
City of Malibu	Minor Modifications: height increases, setback reductions of 20%, remedial grading, etc.	Decision by Planning Director.	N	Does not adversely affect public views or neighborhood character.
City of Morgan Hill	Minor Exception for fence height, setbacks (25%), lot coverage (10%), height (10%)	Decision by Director. Notify contiguous property owners 10 days prior to decision.	N	
City of Palmdale	Minor Exception, generally 10% exception from development standards.	Administrative approval by director.	Y	
City of Dublin	Setback exceptions by right for certain types of lots.			

City of Laguna-Niguel	Minor adjustments: 20% increase in height, 20% reduction in setbacks, other deviations determined by the Planning Director to be consistent with purpose of section.	Administrative review by Director, can be referred to PC or City Council.	N	Findings; requires a better design, not detrimental to public, other findings.
City of Antioch	Administrative variance: 25% reduction in required setback.	Decision by ZA, with public hearing. Noticing to adjacent neighbors.	?	
City of Windsor	Exceptions Can be requested as part of any project heard by PC or City Council.	Decision by PC or City Council.	?	
South Pasadena	Administrative modification.	Administrative review by Director. No notice required.	Y	
Chino	Minor Variance. 25% deviation from certain site standards.	Administrative review by Director.	Y	Additional findings: Will not endanger public health, safety, or welfare, will not be detrimental to property values, will not result in significant environmental impacts
La Verne	10% exception to various development standards.	Approval by Director.	N	Allowed when warranted by practical difficulties, unnecessary hardships, or results that without the minor exceptions may be inconsistent with the general intent of this code.
City of Glendora	Minor modifications: 15% setback reductions, 5% FAR,	Action by Director. Notice mailed 10 days prior to decision to property owners within 100 feet.	N	No special reason required for exception. (No "special circumstances" finding required. Property owners could never meet the legal standard for special circumstances. )

City of Chowchilla	10% reduction in setbacks, space between buildings, population density. 10% increase in lot coverage or height. Remodeling of NC structure to bring structure into greater conformity with site standards.	Action by “site plan review committee” (sub-committee of PC).	N	Findings; Not detrimental to welfare or injurious to property and improvements.
City of Rosemead	20% setback reduction in residential zones.	Decision by Planning Director.	N	Findings: Adjacent properties and public welfare will not be affected.
City of Fresno	Minor deviations: modify up to 10% of any property development standard	Administrative review by Director – no noticing or appeals	?	
City of Delano	Minor variance: 20% reduction in front setback, 40% reduction in side setback, 10% increase in lot coverage	Administrative approval by Director	Y	
City of Glendale	Administrative exceptions: Height, setbacks, extension of existing setback encroachment	Administrative approval by ZA	N	Design improvements; compliance with code would create hardship due to space restrictions.
City of Sonoma	Minor exception; 30% exception from certain standards	Public hearing and decision by PC	N	“...Justified by environmental features or site conditions, historic development patterns of property or neighborhood, or the interest in promoting creativity and personal expression in site planning and development.”
City of Firebaugh	Exception: 20% reduction in setbacks, lot area and dimensions, distance between buildings, height.	?	?	
City of San Bernardino	10% deviation from site standards.	Review by Director – public hearing required.	Y	

County	Description	Approval process	State variance findings?	Findings
Santa Clara County	No general exception, but side setback reductions allowed by right for certain lots, based on lot size, depth, width.	By right	N/A	N/A
Sonoma County	Expedited process by right for minor exceptions– front yard averaging, side yard exceptions if neighbors sign off, exceptions to minimize grading, allowing reduced front setbacks	By right	N/A	N/A
Santa Barbara County	“Modifications” allowed for design, practical difficulties, topography or habitat protection. Setback reductions up to 20%, up to 10% height increase, up to 10% increase in FAR.	Public hearing by ZA, with design review, appealable.	N	Special findings, including that modification is minor in nature, better architectural or site design, and/ or will result in greater resource protection. “Any adverse environmental impacts will be mitigated to a level of insignificance.”
San Luis Obispo County	Administrative Adjustment: Setback reductions can be approved administratively under specific situations, such as front setback reductions for shallow lots, and front yard averaging	Administrative review by Director – no public hearing required.	N	
San Mateo County	“Home improvement exceptions”: Exception from site standards for yards, lot coverage, daylight plane, and FAR for small residential additions less than 250 sq ft. Does not apply for active violations.	Public hearing required if requested by anyone within 300’. Otherwise, administrative decision by ZA, appealed to PC.	N	Findings: Only minor exterior changes, enhances existing design concept or neighborhood character.

Marin County	Administrative variance: 2' height extension, 2% increase in FAR, 40% reductions in setbacks	Administrative decision by Planning Director, can be appealed to PC.	Y	
Mendocino County	No exception or minor variance available	N/A	N/A	

### Summary

#### Cities

24 cities identified with minor variances or exceptions.  
 1 city allows limited exceptions by right.  
 12 allow without requiring state variance findings  
 7 require state variance findings.  
 (3: required findings unknown.)  
 16 require administrative review without a public hearing.  
 6 require public hearing.  
 1 unknown

#### Counties

Of the 7 counties reviewed:

1 (Mendocino) has no exception or minor variance available.  
 2 (Santa Clara and Sonoma) allow some minor exceptions by right, including setback exceptions  
 2 (Marin and San Luis Obispo) allow exceptions with administrative approval by planning director.  
 2 (Santa Barbara and San Mateo) require a public hearing. (For San Mateo, no hearing is required if adjacent neighbors provide signed approval for project.)

Of the 4 counties requiring discretionary approval for exceptions, 1 (Marin) requires state variance findings, and 3 (San Mateo, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara) do not.