

# CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

1231 T STREET, SUITE 200, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

APPLICANT: MORTON E. PITALO, INC. 1430 Alhambra Boulevard, Suite #200, Sacramento, CA 95816  
OWNER: Robert E. Burt, 112 Scenic Drive, Ordina, CA 94563  
PLANS BY: Buzz Garcia Associates, 1610 Arden Way, Suite 225, Sacramento, CA 9581.  
FILING DATE: 5/22/87 ENVIR. DET. 6/15/87 PREPARED BY: DJH:vt  
ASSESSOR'S-PCL. NO. 119-070-031

- APPLICATION:
- A. Negative Declaration
  - B. Tentative Map to establish one air space condominium.
  - C. Special Permit to develop 120 condominium units on 9.8± net acres in the Single Family Alternative (R-1A) zone.

LOCATION: Southwest corner Mack Road and Morrison Creek

PROPOSAL: The applicant is requesting the necessary entitlements to develop a 120 unit condominium project on 9.8 acres.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

1974 General Plan Designation:	Residential
1986 South Sacramento Community Plan Designation:	7-15 du/net acre Residential
Existing Zoning of Site:	R-1A
Existing Land Use of Site:	Vacant
Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:	Setbacks: Required Provided
North: Residential Single Family; R-1	Front: 25' 25'
South: Residential Single Family; R-1	Side(Int): 5' 0'
East : Residential Single Family & Vacant; R-1	Side(St): 5' 100'
West : Morrison Creek & Mobile Home Park; R-1 and A	Rear: 15' 120'
Parking Required:	180 spaces at 1.5 space per unit
Parking Provided:	233 spaces; 125 covered
Property Dimensions:	Irregular
Property Area:	9.8± acres
Density of Development:	12.1 d. u. per acre
Square Footage of Building:	Unit A = 751 sq. ft. Unit B = 825 sq. ft. Unit C = 1,005 sq. ft.
Height of Building:	2 Stories
Topography:	Flat with 15 foot high soil pile 300 ft. long.

APPLC. NO. P87-252 MEETING DATE August 13, 1987 ITEM NO. 48

8-27-87

Street Improvements:	Existing
Utilities:	Existing/to be extended
Exterior Building Materials:	Stucco, aluminum windows, steel tubing
Roof Material:	Composition asphalt shingle

PROJECT BACKGROUND: On December 5, 1985, the Planning Commission voted eight ayes and one absent to approve a Special Permit for a 100 unit condominium project in 12 buildings. The City Council approved the Tentative Map on January 14, 1986 (P85-456). The proposed project increases the number of units from 100 to 120 units and changes the number of buildings from 12 smaller complexes to 9 larger complexes.

SUBDIVISION REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On June 10, 1987, by a vote of five ayes and four absent, the Subdivision Review Committee recommended approval of the Tentative Map subject to the attached conditions.

PROJECT EVALUATION: Staff has the following comments:

A. Land Use and Zoning:

The subject site is a vacant 9.85+ acre lot which is zoned Single Family Alternative (R-1A) zone and is designated for residential use in the 1974 General Plan and Residential 7-15 du/acre in the 1986 south Sacramento Community Plan. The site is bordered by Morrison Creek to the west, Mack Road single family and vacant lands to the east and north, and single family uses to the south.

B. Project Description:

The applicant is proposing a one lot subdivision and 120 airspace condominium units. A total of 24 one bedroom Unit A's, 48 one bedroom with den, Unit B's and 48 two bedroom, two bathroom Unit C's are proposed. A comparison of the previous unit size follows:

	<u>Unit A</u>	<u>Unit B</u>	<u>Unit C</u>
(P85-456) 100 Units	759 sq. ft.	820 sq. ft.	1,010 sq. ft.
(P87-252) 120 Units	751 sq. ft.	825 sq. ft.	1,005 sq. ft.

Since the square footage is similar, the project is basically a redesign of the exterior buildings and an increase by 20 units on the site. The applicant proposes 233 parking spaces with 125 covered spaces. Figures provided on the site plan are incorrect. A revised site plan shall show all parking spaces numbered, for verification.

P87-252

~~August 13, 1987~~

Item #4

8-27-87

8

The applicant proposes a cluster of nine buildings. Three buildings each contain 3,300 sq. ft., 7,320 sq. ft. and 7,004 sq. ft. All structures are two stories in height. The site is constrained by a 95 foot wide drainage easement along the west property line and a 100 foot wide power line easement along the south property line.

- C. The exterior building materials for the units will include stucco/wood siding and composition shingle roofs. Staff feels that the building design provides good architectural relief on both the front and end elevations for the A and C units. The B unit end elevations shall be revised to show more relief.

Some of the carport structures would face onto Mack Road. Staff recommends that the carport be designed so as to be compatible in design and materials with the main building. The applicant must submit elevations of the carports for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits. A six foot high solid masonry block wall should be constructed along the south property line as a buffer between the single family residences to the south and the parking area. Each unit should have one enclosed garage since the project is for owner occupancy as condominiums.

- D. No bicycle parking is shown on the site plan. Staff recommends that the applicant provide one bicycle parking facility for every 10 parking spaces as required by the Zoning Ordinance. A revised site plan indicating the bicycle parking areas shall be submitted for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits.

- E. The applicant did not submit landscape/irrigation plans. Such plans must be submitted for staff review and approval prior to issuance of building permits.

- F. Other site amenities include a pool and pond (pool and pond not shown on site plan). A common storage area is also indicated for homeowner's use. The applicant should also provide a clubhouse adjacent to the pool area. The clubhouse design shall be compatible with residential structures and shall be reviewed and approved by staff. The former site plan showed a tennis court. Staff recommends the applicant include a tennis or handball court.

G. Staff Modifications to Site Plan

The staff modified site plan proposes changes to the project to enhance the owner-occupants. Building four should be reduced by eight units in order to allow centrally located area for a recreational meeting room, swimming pool and pond. Barbecue, jacuzzi and other amenities could be provided in the central common area. No laundry facility is to be provided for residences.

A six foot high decorative wrought iron fence should be installed along the 25 foot wide landscape setback between the two entryways to prevent residents from parking on Mack Road and crossing the landscaping to their unit.

Along Morrison Creek, an existing six foot high chainlink fence is constructed. With the consent of the City Public Works Department, staff recommends that the applicant provide a six foot high solid board fence with a landscape strip sufficient in width to provide room for evergreen trees on 20 foot centers. The landscape strip shall be continued adjacent to the six foot high masonry wall along the south property line. Trees should be a mix of five and 15 gallon container sizes.

- H. The project has been reviewed by staff and in addition to the above mentioned comments, the applicant shall comply with the Multi-Family Residential Design Guidelines, Exhibit A

The project includes the additional guidelines for condominium development listed in Section I of Exhibit A. The purpose of these additional design amenities are to encourage owner occupancy through higher quality residential amenities than normally associated with conventional multi-family development. Among the modifications to be shown on the revised site plan and floor plans are:

1. Each unit should have one enclosed parking space in a garage.
  2. Washing and dryer hook ups are to be provided in each unit.
  3. Each unit shall have an enclosable space for storage.
  4. An area is to be designated for outdoor vehicle storage for residents.
  5. Since the project contains 120 units, a centrally located recreation building with space for association meetings shall be included.
  6. At least 50 percent or 60 units should be either two or three bedroom units.
- I. Area residents have provided letters in opposition to the proposed project and are included as Exhibit B - Correspondence. Concerns relate to increased traffic on Mack Road and lack of visibility at the proposed intersection. Also, the issue of owner occupied units versus rental units was raised. The City does not have the authority to require owner occupancy if the builder retains common ownership and decides to rent the units. A third letter concerns environmental issues and is responded to in a July 9, 1987 letter from the City. Area residents will be present at the hearing to indicate their position.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: The Environmental Coordinator has determined that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has filed a negative declaration.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the following actions:

- A. Satisfy the negative declaration.
- B. Recommend approval of the tentative map, subject to conditions which follow.
- C. Approval of the special permit, subject to conditions and based upon Findings of Fact which follow:

Tentative Map Conditions: The applicant shall satisfy each of the following conditions prior to filing the final map unless a different time for compliance is specifically noted:

1. Provide standard subdivision improvements pursuant to Section 40.400 of the City Code.
2. Prepare a sewer and drainage study for the review and approval of the City Engineer.
3. Pay off existing assessments or file the necessary segregation requests and fees to segregate existing assessments.
4. Pursuant to City Code Section 40.1302 (Parkland Dedication), the applicant shall submit to the City an appraisal of the property to be subdivided and pay the required Parkland Dedication in-lieu fees. The appraisal shall be dated not more than 90 days prior to the filing of the final map.
5. Pursuant to City Code Section 40.319-1, the applicant shall indicate easements on the final map to allow for the placement of centralized mail delivery units. The specific locations for such easements shall be subject to review and approval of the City Engineer after consultation with the U. S. Postal Service.
6. The applicant/developer shall designate and place on the final map those structures and/or lots which will meet the required 80 percent south orientation (including solar access) to the satisfaction of the Planning Director, or comply with Title 24 requirements of the Uniform Building Code.
7. Meet all County Sanitation District requirements.

8. Dedicate a standard 12.5' Public Utility Easement for underground electrical facilities and maintenance adjacent to all public ways.
9. Construct grounded chain link fence along canal right-of-way (contact P G & E for grounding details).
10. Show reciprocal easements on final map.
11. If project is to be phased, all improvements shall be constructed with first phase.
12. Provide 10 ft. maintenance easement at the toe of the levee.
13. Contact P.G.& E. regarding restricted uses within P G & E Easements.
14. A portion of the site lies in a Federal Flood Hazard Area. No development can be approved until appropriate measures are taken to remove area from flood zone.

Special Permit - Conditions

1. The applicant shall comply with the Multi-Family Residential Design Guidelines. Exhibit A including revisions shown on the staff modified site plan and stated in Section G.
2. The applicant shall submit detailed landscaping, irrigation and shading plans for staff review and approval prior to issuance of building permits.
3. The applicant shall provide on site bicycle parking spaces. A revised site plan indicating the bicycle parking areas shall be submitted for staff review and approval prior to issuance of building permits.
4. Trash enclosures shall be provided in sufficient number and in a convenient location. Additional trash enclosures shall be located on site and a revised site plan shall indicate the additional enclosures.
5. A six foot high solid decorative masonry block wall shall be constructed along the south property line. Design of the wall shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director.
6. The applicant shall submit elevations of the carport structure. Carports shall be trimmed with a material which is compatible with the proposed condominium units.

7. The buildings shall include the following items:
  - a. Exterior materials shall include wood and stucco siding with windows or variation on all exterior end elevations of the units.
  - b. Stairs shall have double stringers.
  - c. All roofs shall be covered with wood shake, shingle, tile material or heavy butt composition shingle that is approved by the Planning Director.
8. The applicant shall provide a swimming pool, a clubhouse facility and tennis or handball courts. Design of facilities shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director. No common laundry area shall be shown.
9. Roof lines on buildings 3, 5 and 7 shall be broken up and not a continuous line.

Findings of Fact - Special Permit

1. The project, as conditioned, is based upon sound principles of law in that:
  - a. adequate parking is provided; and
  - b. the subject site is logically situated for this type of development in that it is conveniently located adjacent to a major street and within 1/2 mile of shopping facilities.
2. The project, as conditioned, will not be injurious to surrounding properties in that provisions have been incorporated to insure its proper development.
3. The project is consistent with the General Plan goal to:

"Achieve safe and adequate housing for all citizens and provide each with an opportunity for choice between alternative living environments."
4. The proposed project is consistent with the City's Discretionary Interim Land Use Policy in that the site is designated for residential uses by the 1986 South Sacramento Community Plan and the proposed condominium project conforms with the plan designation.



CITY PLANNING DIVISION

EXHIBIT B

CORRESPONDANCE

JUN 24 1987

June 22, 1987

RECEIVED

Dear Mr. Hendryckx:

I am responding to the proposed project  
(P87-252) to be located on APN 119-070-3.

I am very concerned about the traffic during working commutation hours in the mornings and in the evenings. I live at 7810 Deer Meadow Drive and often find myself, especially in the morning, not judging the extremely fast traffic going toward Franklin Boulevard from the bridge on Morrison Creek. In other words, when I make a right hand turn onto Mack Road from Deer Meadow Drive, the oncoming traffic cannot be seen until it comes off the bridge and even though it appears like it's safe, I find myself stomping on the gas because of the approaching cars from the bridge.

002799

P-87-252

~~8-13-87~~  
8-27-87

item 4  
8

I feel that the exits onto Mack Road from this new project should be carefully designed so that there is ample room to enter Mack Road while there is room to accellate safely.

In addition, there is more new development behind me so that there will be added traffic coming onto Deer Meadow and onto Mack Road.

Sincerely

Kohi Tanaka

P.S. Note that from the bridge on Morrison Creek to Deer Meadow Rd, there is a slight downhill grade!

002800

FERNANDO M. CORIANO  
4080 Deer Run Way  
Sacramento, California 95823-4477

CITY PLANNING DIVISION

JUN 26 1987

RECEIVED

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

JUN 24 1987

RECEIVED

City of Sacramento  
Department of Planning  
and Development  
1231 "I" Street  
Room 300  
Attn: Mr Dan Hendrycks

23 June, 1987

Dear Mr. Hendrycks:

This letter is in response to P87-252, the proposed construction of 120 Condominium units at the intersection of Morrison Creek and Mack Roads. I must vehemently oppose this project on grounds that the area does not need this type of facility and must protest the lack of planning that has been demonstrated by the issuance of a building permit for this project.

Understandably, the developer is within his right to use the R1-A zoning to his advantage. This is understood. What is in contention, is that where previously existed virtual prairie, now exists a community which is vibrant, healthy and truly up-beat. It may sound corny to you, "cosmopolitan," types downtown, however we are proud of our new homes in their semi rural setting. We are here now and not the cattle, gophers and rabbits which could not voice their opposition to the initial R1-A determination back in 1981. As explained to me, this project has had a long history of being proposed yet not developed. Indeed, the initial permit to construct was issued to a different developer back in 1984 only for it to lapse into expiration. Now the new developer has added an additional 20 units to the original plan and is ready to construct next spring. We wish to maintain our present community integrity and not the high density area proposed.

Of much concern to us is that it seems obvious that this is just a ploy by the developer to introduce apartments to the area, a use that is contrary to section 2 of the City's zoning ordinance. In previous condominium projects in the area, the units have been converted to rentals. Rentals which in essence are garden apartments. This is the case at the infamous Franklin Villa area. No doubt, this is the future of the new proposed project which ironically is called, "Franklin Villa Unit No. Five,". We don't wish to have the drug activity synonymous with Franklin Villa in our backyards. That is not why we are hardworking taxpayers. We abhor the decision of the city and the developer and request assurances that the final decision will be favorable to maintaining the integrity of the community. Give this new community of ours a chance to remain productive and develop into the type of tax base the city can depend on. Mack Road has enough apartments and the vacancy rate is obvious to any passer-by. The Sacramento Bee carried a story, not to long ago, about the glut of condominiums in Sacramento. How can the developer substantiate the need for his units? Even Franklin Villa, on any day

P-87-252


002801

8-13-87 8-27-87

item #8

has a tremendous amount of units available for sale or rent. It just doesn't make sense. The area has many homes for sale which fall into the price range of the proposed units. Villa Royale, on Franlin Road has two bedroom homes for the same price that the two bedroom condo units will cost. The indication that the intention to convert to rental units is clear to me. This is not an allowed use and we will protest this coversion if it happens.

Yours Truly



Fernando M. Coriano

FMC/jb

CC: Terry Kastanis  
Ann Rudin  
Robert E. Burke  
Morton & Pitalo Inc.

002802

P-87-252

~~8-13-87~~ 8-27-87

item 4/8

CITY PLANNING DIVISION

JUN 23 1987

From Thomas J. Ducharme  
4070 Deer Run Way  
Sacramento, Ca. 95823

To  
**RECEIVED**  
City of Sacramento  
Department of Planning & Development

This letter is in response to the public notice, P87-252 APN:119-070-31, that I, Thomas James Ducharme of 4070 Deer Run Way, Sacramento, Ca. 95823, recently received.

I am very much against the building of this 120 unit condominium. I have acquired a copy of the City of Sacramento "negative declaration" and "Initial Study" and also the "Environmental Questionnaire." I very much disagree with some of the responses of the applicant whose name I cannot read as written on the "Initial Study" but looks to be Morton & Pitato Inc.

I would like to begin by contesting some of their replies to the questions on the "Initial Study."

number 5 a. asks Animal Life. Will the proposal result in a. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of animals?

The applicants reply was No but I would say that of course there will be a decline in the number of some species of animals. For instance this particular 9.8 acre field is

002803

P-87-252

~~8-13-87~~ 8-27-87

item X

home to a great many animals such as rabbits, snakes, field mice, birds, frogs, and probably some others of which I am not aware. To them as to us this proposal to build cond units is a very big deal indeed.

number 5 d. Will the proposal result in deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat? The applicants reply was NO but I would say of course it will. In the already rapidly developing south area wildlife habitat is shrinking at an alarming rate. I do not believe that this type of housing is justification for destruction of this wildlife habitat area.

number 6 a. Noise. Will the proposal result in increases in existing noise levels? The applicants reply was no but again I think them wrong. People generated noises such as automobiles and personal stereo systems from a 120 unit complex will certainly be noticeable to those of us living within 300 feet of this complex.

002804

number 7 Light & Glare. Will the proposal produce new light or glare? The applicants  
~~8-13-87~~ 8-21-87 item 8

P-87-252

reply is NO. This condo complex is supposed to have a parking lot and condo units facing our existing housing and since these parking areas will certainly be lighted as with the condo units themselves at entryways and porch areas will we not have considerably more light & glare? I say yes we will if these units are built.

number 13 a. Transportation / Circulation. Will the proposal result in generation of substantial additional vehicular movement? The applicant's response was no but I have to think that 120 units are going to generate a great deal of traffic.

number 13 f. Will the proposal result in increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians? The applicant responded NO. Because of the location of this condo complex I feel the proper response to this question is a big YES. Motorists traveling east bound on "mack" Rd. must clear a small but view obstructing bridge over Morrison Creek just prior to the planned Condo development. The speed limit here is 45 mph and the roadway curves in such a way ~~item~~

~~8-13-87~~ 8-27-87

002805

P-87-252

that this condo complex is on the outside of this curve. Cars, bicyclists, & pedestrians attempting to exit and enter this condo complex are going to have to deal with thru traffic that is moving at 45 mph when they suddenly clear Morrison Creek and run smack dab into a 120 Unit condo complex entry and exit way. I believe that this condominium complex would generate a very dangerous potential traffic hazard.

number 14 b. Police protection. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: Police protection? The applicant responded no. I believe this response to be preposterous. The track record for these types of condominium units in this part of the south area is extremely poor as concerns crime. As a prime example of this crime problem I would cite the fact that the applicant stated on the "Environmental Questionnaire" on the Project Proposal line they used Franklin Village Unit #5 as an example of the units they are going to construct. Franklin Village, located about one mile from this proposed ~~item~~ ~~8-13-87~~ ~~8-27-87~~ ~~item~~

002806

P-87-252

120 unit condominium complex at the SW corner of Mack Road & Morrison Creek. The crime rate at Franklin Village is nothing short of alarming including murders and drug problems. I and my family are very very concerned that this proposed condominium complex will end up being another high crime area. The resulting loss in quality of life and property values could be devastating. I believe that this argument all by itself should preclude any development of this condominium complex.

number 14c schools? The applicant responded NO that this condominium complex would have no impact on the schools.

I must say that I think that a 120 unit condominium complex would generate a great many students for an already overburdened Elk Grove school district.

number 14d Parks or other recreational facilities? The applicant responded no to this question also. There is no park or other recreation facility within walking distance for the children and adults who will occupy these condominiums. Perhaps it would be better

002807

P-87-252

~~8-13-87~~ 8-27-87

item 7

1-7-87  
to consider using this property for a park for the residents who currently live here

The following is my rebuttal to some of the responses of the applicant on the "Environmental Questionnaire."

Number IX A. Why is the project justified now

The applicant states that there is a demand for this type of housing.

Well, the way I understand it under R1A zoning these condominiums must be single family dwellings and the applicant himself says that they will sell for between \$50,000 and \$70,000 dollar each. And yet, when you survey existing condominiums in this part of the south area I find them to be almost exclusively "rentals". This amounts to there being apartments when R1A zoning prohibits this. Given the past history of this type of condominium it seems inevitable that should Merton & Pitolo INC be allowed to build these condominiums they will very soon become apartments. Condominiums just do not seem to sell as single family dwellings like ~~the~~ item

8-13-87 8-27-87

002808

P-87-252

they are supposed to. They almost always end up as apartments.

number X 24 affect existing housing or generate a demand for additional housing?

The applicant says that there will be NO effect. I firmly disagree as it shall bring more noise, congestion, and increased traffic hazards.

number X 28 Increase demand for municipal services (police, fire, solid waste disposal, schools, parks, recreation, libraries, water, mass transit, communication, etc. To this the applicant responded yes and yet on question number 14 of the "Initial study" which is basically the same question the applicant responded with a NO. The applicant seems confused about this question. I am not confused, there will be an increase in demand for municipal services and I believe it shall be a significant one.

002809

number X 47 Generate public controversy?

The applicant answered no, but the residents on Deer Run Way are doing item 47.

P-87-252

~~8-13-87~~ 8-27-87

a lot of talking with each other about this proposed condominium complex and negative comments are running very strongly.

Some of the concerns I've heard expressed are already crowded local schools, excessive noise and light coming from the complex, traffic congestion at the entrance to the complex on Mack Road, insufficient recreation for children living in the condominium complex, flooding during heavy rain years, crime problems based on what we have all seen and read about at Franklin Village 1-4, and the danger of these condominiums becoming just another rental complex when its zoned R1A.

In conclusion I do not believe this condominium complex should be constructed. There is simply too much evidence to indicate that it will end up as another apartment complex with the same kinds of problems being experienced at the existing Franklin Village.

Finally I would like to ask that the Department of Planning and Development, the owners of the property in question, and all others involved in the decision making

102810

P-87-252

~~8-13-87~~

8-27-87

item 4

process consider the input of those of  
us who will live with what is done on this  
property along with the developers.

Respectfully submitted by  
Thomas J. Dusharme

002811

P-87-252

~~8-13-87~~ 8-27-87

item ~~2~~ 3



# CITY OF SACRAMENTO

## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

1231 "I" Street

Sacramento, Ca. 95814

July 9, 1987

Mr. Thomas Ducharme  
4070 Deer Run Way  
Sacramento, California 95823

Administration  
Room 300 449-5571  
Building Inspections  
Room 200 449-5716  
Planning  
Room 200 449-5604

Dear Mr. Ducharme:

The project located at the southwest corner of Mack Road and Morrison Circle consists of 120 condominium units on 9.8+ acres zoned Single Family Alternative (R-1-A). The R-1-A zoning permits townhouses and condominium developments subject to the issuance of a special permit. The purpose of that zoning is to allow different types of housing which provides a larger range of housing prices, creating affordable housing for the area.

I will respond to your comments on the Initial Study on a point-by-point basis.

No. 5a - 5d: The animal species you refer to are loosely considered urban wildlife, and will flourish in vacant lots. However, when the vacant lots are developed those animals will relocate to other vacant lots. Their habitat is not unique or specialized and loss of the habitat will not result in the reduction of either the diversity or number, but will result in the relocation of both. Therefore, the result of construction on a vacant lot in an urban environment is not a significant adverse environmental impact.

No. 6a: In an urbanized area, certain noises (such as traffic, children playing, and music) are considered background noise which is unavoidable, due to the fact that people, in their normal course of the day, will generate noise. However, when any of the background noise or new noise (such as industrial noises) are increased above 45 dBL for a residence's interior, then mitigation measures can be applied. In this instance regular noise from the condominiums will neither significantly increase the background noise level, nor the residential interior noise level, and thus is not considered a significant adverse environmental impact.

No. 7: Lighting proposed for the project will have shields around the light posts directing the light toward the ground. While the overall light level in the area will probably be slightly increased, it is considered an unavoidable result of urbanization. The light level will not be considered bright enough to create an adverse environmental impact, and is therefore not considered to be a significant impact.

002812

P-87-252

8-13-87

8-27-87

item 48

July 9, 1987

No. 13f: Mack Road is constructed to standards that make it large enough to accommodate the increase in traffic generated by the project. The entrance/exits are designed to provide maximum visibility for motorists entering and exiting the project, and does not create a traffic hazard.

No. 14b: Police Department personnel forecasts are in part based on both projected land uses and the history of the area for current demand for police protection. The project site has been designated for multiple family development for several years, and thus the Police Department has been aware of the demand for police services for sometime. Because they have planned for expected increases in population and subsequent crime rates, the project will not have a significant impact on police services.

No. 14c: The school district studies have found that multiple family projects generate a significantly smaller student population than standard single family development would. This 120 unit condominium project will have far less impact on schools than a single family, standard subdivision would.

No. 14d: Parks are planned for areas based on proposed land uses and are paid for in part by developer fees. The site has been zoned for multiple family development for some time, and the current park demand is based on that current zoning. While the project may not be within walking distance of any existing park, it was considered in the parks planning process, and thus will not have a significant adverse environmental impact.

No. IXA: The project is a multiple family type of housing proposed for a property designated for that type of development. As long as the units are offered for sale they are considered condominiums. The City cannot regulate who lives there, either owner or tenant, once the building is constructed so long as it was constructed per zoning and special permit requirements. By law, the City cannot dictate who the residents of the units will be if the project does not specify low-income or senior citizen tenants.

No. X24: The project generates housing, not a need for housing. Commercial or industrial projects generate a need for housing.

No. X28: The site is zoned for and is proposed for a type of development which municipal services have been planned to serve and thus make provisions for in their lines of duty. The impact of the project actually being constructed will not be significant.

002813

P-87-252

~~8-13-87~~  
8-27-87

item 2

Thomas Ducharme

-3-

July 9, 1987

No. X47: Public controversy is a relative term. For example, the controversy over this project is insignificant to the controversy generated by the South Natomas Community Plan. However, all residents are encouraged to indicate their positions on proposed projects, and informing staff of your opinion is an effective means of ensuring your concerns are addressed.

I hope the above answers your concerns. If you have any questions, please call me at 449-2037.

Cordially,



Lisa Pyzel  
Planner

LP:jg

cc: File P87-252

002814

-87-252

~~8-13-87~~ 8-27-87

item 48