

City Planning Commission  
Sacramento, California

SUBJECT: Various Matters Related to the 111 Capitol Mall (Revised Project  
P87-196)

- A. Negative Declarations;
- B. Resolution adding an Old Sacramento Historical Preservation District Element to the General Plan;
- C. Special Ordinance approving the 111 Capitol Mall project.

LOCATION: North side of Capitol Mall and south of Neasham Circle, between Front and Second Streets

This is an informational item only - no action to be taken (APN: 006-0136-007,022)

#### SUMMARY

This report is intended to provide the Planning Commission with a status report on the 111 Capitol Mall project. This project is proposed to be revised pursuant to a compromise agreement between the developer, Save Old Sacramento Association, and Redevelopment Agency, and the City.

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Final EIR, Planning entitlements and Redevelopment Agency matters for the original 111 Capitol Mall project went before the joint Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission in April 1988. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the EIR and denial of the project entitlements. The Redevelopment Agency Commission recommended approval of the EIR and approval of the agency agreements for the project.

On July 5, 1989, the City Council heard the developer's appeal of the Planning Commission's denial of the Special Permit and associated entitlements. The City Council decided in favor of the applicant and approved the project. One condition of the Special Permit approval required a secondary architectural review of the project prior to the Design Review/Preservation Board evaluation of the project.

### SECONDARY DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS

To facilitate the secondary review process, an architectural team was formed. The team consisted of two consulting architects with expertise in designing buildings in historically sensitive areas, two members of the DR/PB, the State Architect, the project architect, and City and Redevelopment Agency staff members. The secondary review process resulted in the development of two significant products: site specific architectural design criteria for new buildings developed adjacent to the Old Sacramento Historic District; and a redesigned building responding to the design criteria based upon the size and height conditions approved by the City Council.

The redesigned building went before the Design Review/Preservation Board on January 4, 1989 for review and comment. Before the second Design Review/Preservation Board meeting was held, an agreement was reached that has resulted in substantial revisions to the project.

### REVISED PROJECT

As the Commissioners are aware, the original project as approved, generated substantial controversy and an initiative petition, which among other things was intended to: 1) amend the Old Sacramento Historical District Boundary to include the 111 Capitol Mall property, and 2) amend the General Plan to limit height, mass, design, and land uses in the Old Sacramento area. Discussion among the Redevelopment Agency and City staff; the Mayor's office; Save Old Sacramento Association and their legal representatives; Mr. Stagen and his legal representatives, indicated that a costly legal and electoral process was on the horizon.

The Mayor initiated, with the support of the Council, a process for attempting to reconcile the issues of concern to the parties. This effort successfully resulted in the compromise which is the revised project. The revised project is generally described below. A revised statement of conditions for the project is also attached.

1. The building would not exceed 75 feet in height as measured from the Capitol Mall grade, except for the tower at the southeast corner which may extend an additional 30 feet in height.
2. Additional floors could be developed on the existing Crane Building to a maximum height of 75 feet.
3. The package of amenities was eliminated (e.g., 150 public parking spaces, day care center, Art In Public Places Program, shuttle bus, etc.).

4. Development of the Redevelopment Agency owned parcels in Old Sacramento were eliminated. However, the developer has requested the right to exclusively negotiate with the Agency for 180 days for the right to develop the historical parcel.
5. Adopt the design criteria for the new building as shown on Attachment A.
6. A three member team consisting of Bob Rakela and Mark Rusconi of the Design Review Board, and Gene Masuda of Planning staff will review and approve the revised project. Decision of the design team is not appealable.
7. Adoption of an Ordinance approving the 111 Capitol Mall project which includes conditions of approval (Attachment B).
8. Adoption of an amendment to the City's General Plan to add an Old Sacramento Historic Preservation District Element (Attachment C).

The Environmental Coordinator has evaluated the project and has determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has issued a Negative Declaration for the General Plan Amendment and the approving Ordinance.

Also included in this report are the following attachments: Attachment D - Settlement Letter; Attachment E - Conditions of Project Approval.

#### ADVISORY REPORT FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION

In order to implement the compromise project, a revised statement of conditions, an amendment to the City's General Plan (applicable to the Old Sacramento area), and related actions must be taken. Normally, such matters would be submitted to the Planning Commission pursuant to the standard practice. However, part of the compromise agreement is that certain actions be taken by the City prior to the last date in which Save Old Sacramento may submit a valid initiative petition. Consequently, it has been decided, with the concurrence of the City Attorney's Office, that City ordinances permit the submittal of these actions directly to the City Council for action.

Therefore, these matters are being presented to the Planning and Redevelopment Commissions as a status report. The hard work done to date by all Commission members and staff on this project is appreciated by the Council, and if either Commissions desire to make advisory recommendations (although such is not required), any recommendations will be forwarded directly to the City Council on February 21, 1989.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael M. Davis  
Director of Planning and Development

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND ATTACHMENTS A, B, C, D, & E  
WILL FOLLOW**

