

City Planning Commission  
Sacramento, California

Members in Session:

Subject: 65402(b) Review for a 94,189 to 112,000 square foot  
County of Sacramento building (P90-185)

Location: Northeast corner of Folsom Boulevard and Howe Avenue

Summary: This is a review for General Plan and Community Plan  
Consistency under Section 65402(b) for a proposed 94,189  
to 112,000 square foot building to be occupied by the  
County of Sacramento (County Traffic and Small Claims  
Court) on 11.8+ vacant acres in the Office Building (OB)  
zone.

PROJECT INFORMATION

General Plan Designation:	Community/Neighborhood Commercial & Offices
Existing Zoning of Site:	OB-R(PUD)
Existing Land Use of Site:	Vacant

PROJECT EVALUATION:

The subject site consists of two vacant parcels on 11.8+ acres in the Office Building Review Planned Unit Development (OB-R-PUD) zone. The General Plan designates the site for Community/Neighborhood Commercial & Offices. Surrounding land uses and zoning include apartments and Highway 50 to the north, zoned Multi-Family-Review-PUD (R-2B-R-PUD); California State Automobile Association and SMUD station to the south, zoned Heavy Industrial (M-2S); Office and apartments to the east, zoned General Commercial - PUD (C-2PUD); and a gas station and offices to the west, zoned C-2. The subject site is located in the Seven Lakes Planned Unit Development. The County has indicated to staff that the County Traffic and Small Claims Courts and Office of Revenue Reimbursement Complex will be a three story building (59') built in two phases (94,189 sq. ft. phase one and 17,811 sq. ft. phase two, totaling 112,000 sq.ft. at final completion).

Section 65402(b) of the California Government Code requires that the City Planning Commission review the project and determine whether the project is consistent with the City's General Plan and Community Plan. Staff has reviewed the proposed project and determined that it is consistent with the City's General Plan from a land use perspective only. Staff has found the project to be inconsistent with other policies and goals in the General Plan, particularly regarding traffic circulation policies. Until an adequate traffic study is completed that examines existing traffic

with future traffic projections, it is not possible to determine consistency with policies and goals in the General Plan.

The project is within the East Sacramento Community Plan area. Because the area is not covered by an updated community plan, the General Plan provides the guiding policies for comprehensive planning in the area. The proposed structure is, however, in the Seven Lakes PUD. Presently the project is inconsistent with the PUD development guidelines and standards of the City Zoning Ordinance. These guidelines and standards include setbacks, landscaping, height, tree shading of parking areas, parking ratio for office use, and signage criteria. The Zoning Ordinance requires that the maximum height limit in the OB zone not exceed 35 feet. The proposed county building will be 59 feet in height. Typically, in a Planned Unit Development setting, staff requires a 25 foot landscape setback along public streets. The submitted site plan indicates landscape setbacks ranging from 5 feet to 22 feet. Staff has some concerns with only five foot landscape setbacks being provided along Howe Avenue and portions of Bicentennial Circle. The applicant's proposed landscape setbacks are out of character with the existing 25 foot landscape undulating berms provided for the multi-family and office uses in the immediate area. A monument sign is indicated on the site plan yet it is unclear to staff of its material, design or lettering.

The development guidelines require one space for each 225 square feet of gross floor area. Adequate parking is provided on both vacant lots for the proposed office use. A Variance, however, would be required by the City to locate parking off-site. A major goal in the General Plan is to maximize alternatives to single occupant vehicle use, such as public transit. The purpose of this goal is to reduce congestion and improve air quality. The applicant's proposal is in conflict with this goal due to surplus parking being recommended. Other General Plan goals and policies identified in the Circulation Element which the project is inconsistent with includes the following:

Goal C - Create and maintain a street system which protects residential neighborhoods from unnecessary levels of traffic.

Policy 1- Continue wherever possible to design streets and to approve development applications in such a manner as to eliminate high traffic flows and parking problems within residential neighborhoods.

The project would subject the neighborhood to additional level of traffic. The applicant has not provided enough information to convince staff that the traffic from the specific use proposed by the applicant may be equivalent to that assumed in the General Plan.

Goal D - Work towards achieving an overall Level of Service C on the City's local and major street systems.

Policy 1- Assess the impacts of land use decisions on the surrounding City street system.

The intersection of Howe and Folsom is projected at LOS 'F' during peak periods. Under these circumstances, the General Plan advocates mitigating potential impacts through various design features. A private project not exempt from the City's review would be required to obtain a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) permit in order to comply with specific provisions to mitigate traffic impacts and encourage employees to utilize public transportation and/or carpool.

Special conditions are identified in the development guidelines which are not being met. One of the guidelines require that a bus turnout land be provided by the project developer on Folsom Boulevard to encourage the use of Regional Transit. Pedestrian walkways were to be designed to facilitate pedestrian access to the bus stop area.

The City's Transportation Division has the following concerns:

- A detailed traffic report was completed after the Negative Declaration was ratified.
- There is some concern that the same trip generation rates were used for the proposed site as a comparison to the existing downtown traffic court. These rates would probably be quite dissimilar due to transit availability downtown.
- Because the traffic analysis was for existing conditions, long-range cumulative conditions were not studied. However, the Transportation Division did initially propose a study with current conditions.
- The City did pass a zoning amendment for the site from commercial to business in 1983. A 180,000 sq. ft. building was proposed. However, Transportation Division has found that this amendment has expired. Therefore, the County's transportation analysis comparison between the Traffic Court and the original zoning is acceptable. However, depending on future proposed projects for the subject site (in addition to the Traffic Court), future development for the site may have to be limited to remain consistent with the General Plan and existing projected trip rate.

The Environmental Coordinator has reviewed the County's Negative Declaration for the project and has found it to be deficient in the following areas:

- There is no flooding discussion even though the site is located in the A99 zone.
- There is a sycamore tree identified in the initial study as worth saving but there is no mitigation measure and tree preservation plan to address the sycamore.
- The traffic analysis should be expanded to include future development.


CONCLUSION:

City staff was assured by the applicant that this project would be consistent with the Seven Lakes PUD development guidelines yet it is not. The project is inconsistent with goals and policies in the General Plan and is not in compliance with the current Zoning Ordinance regulations for projects in the Office Building - Review (PUD) zone.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission find that the project is not consistent with the General Plan. The applicant should submit the necessary documents and modify the proposed plans to meet the General Plan policies.

Report Prepared By




Bridgette Williams  
Associate Planner

Recommendation Approved



Joy Patterson  
Senior Planner

# VICINITY MAP



SEE MAP NO. 2.

Site Subject 2.

COLLEGE TOWN

POR. SEC'S 14 & 15, T8N., R.5E. | M.D.B. & M.


LAKE FOREST DR.

LAND USE & ZONING MAP

item

5-24-90  
5-10-90

990-195



Seven

Hotel  
under  
construction

GAS  
STATION

SMUD  
M-25

POWER INN RD

FALSON  
& FALSON  
BLVD

OFFICE

VACANT

VACANT

C2 PUD

C2 PUD

C2 PUD

AAA

1R10-918  
1R15-106  
A909-821 #21

1R84-114  
A828-303

M449-885  
1R85-166 #15  
1R84-1034 #25

HO-88-1987 & N  
HO-88-687

Apts.

SUBJECT  
SITE

20

21

11

7  
15.541N

1R8101

Apts.

6  
OFFICE


8  
AAA

C2 PUD

50

FREEWAY

Exhibit "A-1"



**SITE SUMMARY**

**SITE 1: 6.88 AC (2,814,000 sq. ft.)**  
 General Category: 470 - mixed  
 General Purpose: 1  
 Maximum: 60 (200' x 200')  
 Density: 200 (200' x 200')  
 Total: 1,376,000 sq. ft.

**SITE 2: 2.81 AC (1,212,000 sq. ft.)**  
 General Category: 470 - mixed  
 General Purpose: 1  
 Maximum: 60 (200' x 200')  
 Density: 200 (200' x 200')  
 Total: 565,000 sq. ft.

**THE SPINK CORPORATION**  
 300 NORTH BAY ST.  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95811  
 916 442-1111

STATEMENT OF WORK  
 PREPARED FOR THE SPINK CORPORATION  
 BY THE SPINK CORPORATION  
 10/1/90

DATE: 10/1/90  
 DRAWN BY: J. SPINK  
 CHECKED BY: J. SPINK  
 SCALE: AS SHOWN  
 SHEET NO. 1 OF 1

SP-1

P90-185

5-24-90  
~~5-10-90~~

9  
 Item 17

P90-185

5-24-90  
5-10-90

R-21 L-1483

PROPOSED LEASE PARCELS  
HOWE AVE & BICENTENNIAL CR.  
FEBRUARY, 1990 SCALE: 1"=100'




Exhibit "A-2"

**THE SPINK CORPORATION**  
 ENGINEERING • ARCHITECTURE • PLANNING • SURVEYING  
 MAPPING • PHOTOGRAMMETRY • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE  
 1000 KENTWOOD ROAD SW, SUITE 1000, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87102

DATE: 02/11/90 10:00 AM 100% (SHEET) 02/11/90 10:00 AM 100% (SHEET)

R-21 L-1483

Item # 2



AMENDED BY STAFF 5-23-90 (Additional Exhibits C,D, and E)

May 23, 1990

City Planning Commission  
Sacramento, California

Members in Session:

Subject: 65402(b) Review for a 94,189 to 112,000 square foot  
County of Sacramento building (90-185)

Location: Northeast corner of Folsom Boulevard and Howe Avenue

Summary: This is a review for General Plan Consistency under  
Section 65402(b) for a proposed 94,189 to 112,000 square  
foot building to be occupied by the County of Sacramento  
(County Traffic and Small Claims Court). As a result of  
several meetings with the County (applicant), the College  
Glen Neighborhood Association, the Power Inn Business  
Association, Council Person Kim Mueller, and City Staff,  
it was necessary to amend the original staff report for  
the subject project.

Background:

In the original staff report included in the City Planning  
Commission's package, City Staff found the project to be  
inconsistent with the goals and policies in the General Plan, and  
not in compliance with the City's Zoning Ordinance and the Seven  
Lakes Planned Unit Development Guidelines. After several  
meetings, the applicant agreed to comply with specific conditions  
to address concerns expressed by the Power Inn Business  
Association, the College Glen Neighborhood Association, Council  
Person Kim Mueller, and City Staff. The concerns expressed,  
included inadequacy of the Negative Declaration and traffic study  
prepared by the County, significant traffic impacts generated by  
the project and the lack of efforts to mitigate traffic impacts and  
encourage employees to utilize public transportation. The County  
has recently submitted a revised Traffic Study which is currently  
being reviewed by City Staff.

The County has indicated a willingness to enter into an agreement  
with the City, which would include all of the negotiated conditions  
listed below. The project is conditioned on the basis of the County  
Board of Supervisors approval of an agreement containing the  
conditions listed below. Building permits will not be issued until  
the County Board of Supervisors approves the agreement.

#990-185

Planning Comm. Date  
- 5/10/90  
- 5/24/90

don't know when signed  
City Clerk Office

26 p - 1905

P90-185

Special  
Exception for  
County

May 24, 1990

Item No. 9

Summary:

The following modifications and conditions are required for project consistency:

1. Resubmittal of a revised Landscape and Irrigation Plan which will include 25 foot landscaped setbacks along Howe Avenue and Folsom Boulevard, and 22 1/2 foot setbacks along Bicentennial Circle, between the two new parking lots. Phase II parking will be constructed at a later date. The County has agreed to gravel the Phase II parking and provide a 25 foot landscape setback along the Folsom Boulevard for the unused portion of the Seven Lakes PUD site. Perimeters and post barricades to divide Phases I and II designated parking will also be provided. The remainder of the unused portion of the Seven Lakes PUD site shall be kept weed-free or landscaped to the satisfaction of the City. The 25 foot and 22 1/2 foot landscape setback along the perimeter and gravel in the designated Phase II parking area will be provided prior to occupancy of Phase I development.

A maximum of 477 parking spaces shall be provided as part of Phase I development, and a maximum of an additional 73 parking spaces shall be provided as part of Phase II of the project. Such parking shall be furnished in the location and configuration shown on the revised Exhibit C attached. Phase II parking shall not be made available prior to completion of the Phase II construction.

2. The applicant has submitted a Transportation System Management Plan (TMP) which is currently being reviewed by City Staff and the neighborhood and business groups. The County has accepted the condition that there may be additional changes to the measures identified in the TMP, after the neighborhood groups and City Staff's review. The County shall comply with the City's Transportation System Management (TSM) Ordinance(s), and shall obtain approval from the City of the TMP prior to occupancy. Some of the preliminary requirements in the TMP would include the following:
  - a. An on-site coordinator shall be provided.
  - b. The County shall pay the cost involved in establishing a residential parking program to prohibit clients from parking on Bicentennial Circle.
  - c. The County agrees that the 2.6% of its fair share mitigation obligation mentioned in the TMP is not a cap. The County has agreed to work with the City Staff to develop a methodology to determine its fair share for the area.
3. The County will participate in its fair share to construct a grade separation at Folsom Boulevard and Power Inn Road and at Power Inn Road and the Light Rail tracks. The County will

cooperate with the City to expedite the time table for the grade separation allowing design and environmental review to begin immediately.


4. A pedestrian walkway will be constructed beginning at the Light Rail Station, bisecting through the PG&E property, and paralleling with Folsom Boulevard to connect with Bicentennial Circle with a pedestrian crossing and a pedestrian activated signal. The County shall provide the City with substantial evidence that efforts have been made to obtain easements from PG&E. The estimated cost of constructing this walkway will be between \$100,000 to \$150,000 dollars. The County has agreed to contribute the full amount of funding to allow the construction of the walkway prior to occupancy of the building; and provided that they are reimbursed the difference of their fair share on an agreed upon date. The fair share will be determined by City and County Public Works' staff for the project.

With regards to other items discussed at the meetings, the City is willing to allow the building to exceed the 35 foot maximum height limit allowed in the Office Building Planned Unit Development (OB-PUD) zone. The County has agreed to assist the City in meeting with County Judges to discuss the provisions of pay stations throughout the County and the scheduling of court appearances, to help mitigate the potential traffic problems.

Recommendation:


Staff finds that the project will be consistent with the General Plan and Seven Lakes Planned Unit Development if the conditions and modifications specified above are met and the agreement is approved by the County Board of Supervisors.

Report Prepared By:



Bridgette Williams  
Associate Planner

Recommendation Approved





Joy Patterson  
Senior Planner



**PATTERN KEY**

	CONCRETE LANDSCAPE / GRAVEL		ASPHALT		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"
	BRICK PAVING / CONCRETIC ST. SURROUND		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"
	BRICK PAVING / CONCRETIC ST. SURROUND		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"
	BRICK PAVING / CONCRETIC ST. SURROUND		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"
	BRICK PAVING / CONCRETIC ST. SURROUND		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"
	BRICK PAVING / CONCRETIC ST. SURROUND		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"
	BRICK PAVING / CONCRETIC ST. SURROUND		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"
	BRICK PAVING / CONCRETIC ST. SURROUND		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"
	BRICK PAVING / CONCRETIC ST. SURROUND		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"
	BRICK PAVING / CONCRETIC ST. SURROUND		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"		FLAGSTONE FROM "POLY/STONE"



SEE SHEET L-14 FOR PLANTING LEGEND & NOTES, AND SHEET L-15 FOR PLANTING DETAILS.

**PLANTING PLAN**

**THE SPINK CORPORATION**  
 2200 VENTURE DAKES BLVD  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95811  
 (916) 426-5666

• ARCHITECTURE  
 • ENGINEERING  
 • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE  
 • PLANNING  
 • SURVEYING  
 • MAPPING

**SACRAMENTO COUNTY TRAFFIC & SMALL CLAIMS COURTS & OFFICE OF REVENUE REIMBURSEMENT**  
 SACRAMENTO CALIFORNIA

• ARCHITECT RECEIVES THE COPYRIGHT TO ALL DRAWINGS AND DESIGN. A CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS. DESIGNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS. ARCHITECTS APPROVAL REQUIRED TO CONSTRUCT.

DATE: 03-27-07  
 SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"  
 DESIGNED BY:  
 DRAWN BY:  
 CHECKED BY:  
 SHEET #

**L-1.1**

EXHIBIT D

