

City Planning Commission  
Sacramento, California

Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Final Approval of Office Complex at 2535 Natomas Park Drive  
(P83-432)

The Planning Commission at their meeting of February 23, 1984 conditioned approval of the project to Design Review Board review and approval of the following: a) incorporation of strong reveal lines; b) incorporation of window recesses and articulation of fenestration; c) color; d) texture of materials; e) better design solution to screening the mechanical equipment penthouses f) use of alternative building materials to provide additional contrast and interest to the building.

The Board reviewed revised drawings and material samples provided by the applicant at their meeting of March 21, 1984. Staff felt that the concerns and the conditions of the CPC had been met by the revised project. At the Design Review meeting, one Board member was absent, two were required to abstain due to conflict of interest. This left six voting members of the Board to review and take action on the project. The first motion of the Board was to approve the project as submitted by the architect. The motion failed, due to a 3-3 tie; (Lagomarsino, McCabe, Malinowski approve, Comacho, Ryser and Zanolio, opposed). The Board discussed the problems and concerns of those voting against the project. The concerns of those opposed were not with the items referred to the Design Review Board by the Planning Commission, but dealt with the overall design and massing of the structure. It was pointed out that those aspects of the project were not submitted to the Design Review Board by the City Planning Commission for review and action. Nevertheless, those members opposed to the project felt that they could not, in good conscious, vote for the plans as submitted.

A motion to deny failed for lack of a second. A motion to consider each of the Planning Commission concerns on an individual basis failed on a 3-3 tie. Finally, a motion to refer the project back to the City Planning Commission with the concerns of the dissenting members of the Board and a request for the Planning Commission to either approve or deny the project as resubmitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the project as redesigned by the applicant utilizing the wider horizontal and vertical reveal lines and the change of exterior material from cement plaster to Dryvite, the reduction of screening height of mechanical equipment due to the lower elevation of the proposed equipment to be used and the color combination and material combination as submitted on the sample material board. Staff, in discussing the possibility of window recesses with the applicant, is willing to compromise and recommend approval of the flush exterior window treatment as proposed on the revised drawings.

