| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 95 | 07/31/08 | Other | Phil Garcia, Sacramento State | Goal LU 5.1<br>Sacramento State supports City's vision for 65th Street/University Transit Village Master Plan. | 2-76 | **Comment Noted.** |
| 96 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Phil Garcia, Sacramento State | Policy LU 5.1.3<br>Cultural and Entertainment Centers: Sacramento State recommends "education" be added to cultural and entertainment facilities' and events. | 2-76 | **Recommended.**<br>Modify LU 5.1.3 to read:<br><br>"Cultural and Entertainment Centers. The City shall actively support the development of cultural, education, and entertainment facilities and events in the city's centers to attract visitors and establish a unique identity for Sacramento." |
| 97 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Phil Garcia, Sacramento State | Change Policy LU 8.1.10 College Campus Development to read:<br>The City shall encourage colleges to integrate uses such as residential, retail, services, and other public facilities in and around their campuses to augment the economic vitality of the neighborhood and ensure that other public enhancements that contribute to a greater quality of life, such as arts, culture, athletic, public lectures and/or medical facilities, are accessible to the community.~~alleviate impacts created by college students and college employees on surrounding neighborhoods.~~ | 2-113 | **Recommended.** |
| 98 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Phil Garcia, | Change Policy LU 8.1.13 | 2-113 | **Not Recommended** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sacramento State | Medical Centers to read:<br>The City shall work with owners of existing and planned medical centers to develop master plans that advance the City's economic development objectives, support the development of medical professionals, maintain definable medical districts, provide for compability with surrounding areas, and achieve cohesive and integrated land uses. (RDR) | | This policy addresses facilities. Development of medical professionals is addressed in policies within the workforce section of Economic Development Element (ED 2.1). |
| 99 | 07/31/08 | New | Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento Transportation Management Association | This Element should include a guideline for the use of central city developer fees. Developer fees from the central city cannot be used for roadway widening because there is no space. These fees should be diverted to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities. For example, they could fund crosswalks or bike/bus lanes on streets such as J Street where the previous LOS C requirement limited their installation. | 1-11 | **Comment Noted**<br>The Department of Transportation is currently in the process of creating a transportation impact fee and associated administration program.<br><br>Also, see Policy M 9.1.1 (New Development Fees). |
| 100 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento Transportation Management Association | LU 2.7.6 (Walkable Blocks)<br>The Sacramento TMA supports smaller block sizes because they create more livable, people-oriented neighborhoods that are easier to get around by walking and bicycling. We suggest that this paragraph reference LU 4.5.5 which requires 300-400' block sizes for new development. Smaller block sizes should be part of measures taken to implement greater connectivity within and between neighborhoods. | 2-23 | **Not Recommended**<br>LU 2.7.6 does not state the preferred 400 ft. block because the policy is referring to city-wide form and structure, which includes commercial and industrial uses where 400 ft. blocks may not be feasible, yet walkable development can still occur. |
| 101 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Marilyn Bryant, | LU 4.1.5 (Connecting Key Destinations) | 2-53 | **Not Recommended** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sacramento Transportation Management Association | Connecting the city in this way will promote the use of bicycles for everyday transportation. This is a desirable goal, and will benefit the health and well-being of the community. The Sacramento TMA recommends the development of specific connectivity policies and standards.<br><br>Gated communities, cul-de-sacs and other non-grid street systems, sound walls and superblocks are all impediments to connectivity.<br><br>Block sizes would be a key element of the standards as well as crossings of barriers such as rivers, RR tracks, canals and freeways. Standards should be established for the distance between crossings of such physical barriers.<br><br>Other connectivity issues, such as mandatory trail connections at the ends of cul-de-sacs (when cul-de-sacs are permitted), bicycle and pedestrian portals/short-cuts through sound walls or walls surrounding commercial areas should be added. Signage can also help make bikeway connectivity clearer.<br><br>Equity of access must also be considered when planning connectivity. Certain areas of Sacramento have limited-access roadways and severed neighborhoods. Connecting these neighborhoods to destinations is critical to achieving goal LU 4.1. | | Policies related to alternative modes and a community's block size are provided in the Mobility Element (M 1.3.1 and M 1.3.2) and in policies LU 2.5.1 and LU 2.5.2 . |
| 102 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Graham Brownstein, | LU 1.1.2 | 2-7 | **Comment Noted.** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | ECOS | Population growth in the city should be related to its relationship to support of sustainability in the whole Sacramento region. | | The City's Sustainability Master Plan provides more detail on the City's role in regional efforts towards sustainability. |
| 103 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | LU 1.1.6<br>Why would the City expressly permit lower-than-minimum densities in the GP? This simply makes no sense. ECOS strongly suggests that this should only be done on a case-by-case variance basis. | 2-8 | **Not Recommended.**<br>Lower than minimum will only be granted on a case-by-case basis by exception. |
| 104 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | LU 1.1.7<br>The priority should be on revising zoning ordinances so that they do conform to the GP as soon as possible. | 2-8 | **Comment Noted.**<br>Staff is creating a list of prioritized rezones for consistency between zoning and the 2030 General Plan. |
| 105 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | Illustration LU-1<br>There is too much allowance for growth on the periphery and too little focus on growth in the urban core and other more central areas. Sustainability demands maximal growth centrally and minimal growth peripherally. Priority must be given to infill development. | 2-9 | **Comment Noted**<br>Priority for infill is established through the policies, such as those that call for incentives for infill development, and in the Implementation Program which has several measures to facilitate infill. |
| 106 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | LU 1.1.9<br>We are not pleased with the use of the word "balance," particularly without more clarification. The household mix is changing very rapidly. The city - not the marketplace - should be in the position of determining the balance, which has too often been focused on short-term returns rather than on long-term | 2-11 | **Comment Noted.** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | investment in existing neighborhoods. More than 80% of the increase in housing demand will be for non-traditional households (that is, households different from the mom/dad/children model). The GP needs to reflect - and plan for - this reality. | | |
| 107 | 07/31/08 | Other | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | LU 2.8.4<br>We are very supportive of this policy as it attempts to address the issue of environmental justice. | 2-24 | **Comment Noted.** |
| 108 | 07/31/08 | Other | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | Illustration LU-3<br>"Neighborhood centers" at the margins should have their justification clearly defined so that they will encourage appropriate growth in the county and deal with the issue of how to extend equitable services to entire neighborhoods in a manner that does not strain overall city services or the city's ability to accomplish general plan goals. | 2-27 | **Comment Noted**<br>The only new center is located in Delta Shores Planned Area. Centers in Delta Shores will be addressed through the application review process. |
| 109 | 07/31/08 | Edit | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | LU 7<br>The title suggests that the plan seeks to enhance Sacramento as the major employment center in the region but the diagram focuses only on proposed new employment centers and leaves out the economic engine of downtown. | 2-97 | **Comment Noted.**<br><br>The introduction to the Employment section will read:<br><br>"Policies in this section promote the city's position as a major regional and interstate employment center through continuation of existing operations, promotion of new industries, and |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | improvements in job accessibility. Although other land use designations also provide for concentrations of employment, Employment Centers differ in that they allow a larger range of employment uses and can be more responsive to the market. ~~They~~ Employment Center policies provide for the continued growth…" |
| 110 | 07/31/08 | Other | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | LU 8.1.14<br>We agree with the policy but maintain that Greenbriar in its present form does not meet this requirement from either a livability or an environmental analysis. | 2-113 | **Comment Noted.** |
| 111 | 07/31/08 | New | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | Design review should be done on a citywide basis. Citywide design review for all projects would provide the City with a tool for better managing ministerial projects that could otherwise prevent the City from attaining GP goals. | | **Comment Noted.**<br>One of the implementation programs of the General Plan is to establish city-wide design guidelines. |
| 112 | 07/31/08 | Other | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | We strongly suggest that there needs to be more flexibility in some of the central city areas designated "neighborhood residential" to allow for appropriate infill projects that have a higher density than that proposed by the GP but will work well in the neighborhood. | | **Recommended with Modifications.**<br>Add the following revised and new policies:<br><br>Revised:<br>**"LU 4.3.2: Replacement of Non-Conforming** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | **Densities in Traditional Neighborhoods ~~Densities~~.** The City shall preserve the existing diversity of housing types and densities on each block of Traditional Neighborhoods. Where the density of existing development on a Traditional Neighborhood block ~~does not conform to the standards for Traditional Neighborhoods~~ falls outside the applicable density range of its land use designation, the City shall allow replacement development on the parcel that maintains the same density., ~~deviations from those standards may be allowed if replacement of existing housing units does not result in a net increase or decrease in density on the parcel."~~<br><br>New:<br>**"Alley Activation Density Bonus in Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density.** Within the Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | designation, development shall be allowed to reach 36 units per acre provided that the following conditions are met:<br>- The parcel is zoned for a maximum density of 36 units per acre.<br>- The development maintains the character of Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density by presenting a façade of single-family homes or duplexes.<br>- The additional units, bringing the total density up to 36 units per acre, are built in the back of the street-facing units, and are accessed by the alley."<br><br>"**Corner Duplexes and Halfplexes in Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density.** Within the Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density designation, an exception to the maximum density standard shall be granted for the construction of duplexes and halfplexes on |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | corner parcels of a traditionally scaled block."<br><br>"**Density Regulations for Mixed-Density Development Projects.** Where a developer proposes a multi-parcel development project with more than one residential density or FAR, the applicable density or FAR range of the General Plan Land Use Designation shall be applied to the net developable area of the entire project site rather than individual parcels within the site. Some parcels may be zoned for densities/intensities that exceed the maximum allowed density/intensity of the project site's Land Use Designation, provided that the net density of the project as a whole is within the allowed range."<br><br>"**Exceeding Floor-Area-Ratio.** New development may exceed the maximum FAR if it is determined that the project provides a |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | significant community benefit."<br><br>Note: A new implementation measure will be added to Part 4 of the General Plan to update the zoning code to identify a process to determine "significant benefit". |
| 113 | 02/08 | Other | William Lowell via Accessibility Town Hall Forum | Sacramento needs more public restrooms, especially ones that are wheelchair accessible. | | **Comment Noted.** Policies on public restrooms are located in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Also, the Department of General Services is developing a Facilities Master Plan. |
| 114 | 02/08 | Other | Merle Levy via Accessibility Town Hall Forum | There should be grocery stores within rolling distance of homes so that disabled people can more easily buy necessities. | | **Comment Noted.** The General Plan includes policies that support mixed-use development, complete neighborhoods, and complete streets, including grocery stores and retail. These elements all contribute to neighborhoods that are pedestrian friendly and which provide community-serving businesses, such as groceries stores. |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| 115 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Nicole Hara | LU 4.1.9<br>Residential Diversity. Please stop building giant apartment structures in North Natomas. Integration is key here! | 2-54 | **Addressed Elsewhere.**<br>Please refer to comments and responses in the Housing Element section. The Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage economic integration of neighborhoods and to encourage smaller scale apartments. |
| 116 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Nicole Hara | LU 2.8.4<br>Housing Type Distribution. Please stop building the huge apartment complexes in North Natomas. Small dwellings, with the option to buy, would be ideal. Concentration of the very low and low income residents into tightly packed apartment complexes surrounded by middle and upper middle income residents is a recipe for disaster. Integration with small 2-5 unit dwellings mixed in is ideal. | 2-24 | **Comment Noted**<br>Please refer to the Housing Element. |
| 117 | 8/6/2008 | Mod | Sabina Gilbert, City Attorney | The definition of FAR (Floor Area Ratio) on this page needs to be compared with the definition in the Glossary and in 17.16.010 of the Zoning Code. The discussion on 2-29 talks about "the ratio of useable floor area of a building..." but the Glossary and the Zoning Code refer to "gross building area". Is this an inconsistency? | 2-29 | **Comment Noted.**<br>The definition will be as follows:<br><br>"Floor Area Ratio (FAR): The ratio of the gross building area on a site, excluding structured parking, to the net developable area of the |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | site). The net developable area is the total area of a site excluding portions that cannot be developed (e.g. right-of-way, public parks, etc.) A site includes all contiguous parcels that will share parking or access."<br><br>This definition will be used in both the Glossary and the text in the General Plan Land Use Element. This definition is consistent with the Zoning Code. |
| 118 | 8/6/2008 | Other | Sabina Gilbert, City Attorney | LU 4.3.2<br>Where proposed residential development on a parcel within a Traditional Neighborhood block would exceed the maximum allowed density, the City may allow the development if the density of the proposed development, when added to the density of the existing development on the block, would not cause the overall density of the block to exceed the maximum density." Q: How would you handle vacant parcels? Assign them the max. density? | 2-57 | **Recommended with Modifications.**<br>Densities will be calculated and allowed as shown in the following revised and new policies.<br><br>Revised:<br>**"LU 4.3.2: <u>Replacement of Non-Conforming Densities in</u> Traditional Neighborhoods ~~Densities~~.**<br>The City shall preserve the existing diversity of housing types and densities on each block of Traditional Neighborhoods. Where <u>the density of</u> existing development on a |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Traditional Neighborhood block ~~does not conform to the standards for Traditional Neighborhoods~~ falls outside the applicable density range of its land use designation, the City shall allow replacement development on the parcel that maintains the same density., ~~deviations from those standards may be allowed if replacement of existing housing units does not result in a net increase or decrease in density on the parcel."~~<br><br>New:<br>**"Alley Activation Density Bonus in Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density.** Within the Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density designation, development shall be allowed to reach 36 units per acre provided that the following conditions are met:<br>- The parcel is zoned for a maximum density of 36 units per acre.<br>- The development |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | maintains the character of Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density by presenting a façade of single-family homes or duplexes.<br>- The additional units, bringing the total density up to 36 units per acre, are built in the back of the street-facing units, and are accessed by the alley."<br><br>"**Corner Duplexes and Halfplexes in Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density.** Within the Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density designation, an exception to the maximum density standard shall be granted for the construction of duplexes and halfplexes on corner parcels of a traditionally scaled block."<br><br>"**Density Regulations for Mixed-Density Development Projects.** Where a developer proposes a multi-parcel development project with |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | more than one residential density or FAR, the applicable density or FAR range of the General Plan Land Use Designation shall be applied to the net developable area of the entire project site rather than individual parcels within the site. Some parcels may be zoned for densities/intensities that exceed the maximum allowed density/intensity of the project site's Land Use Designation, provided that the net density of the project as a whole is within the allowed range." |
| 119 | 8/6/2008 | Mod | Sabina Gilbert, City Attorney | LU 10.1<br>Intro. paragraph under Goal LU 10.1: Should the term "Planned Development" in the second line be "Special Study Areas"? | 2-124 | **Recommended**<br>Goal LU 10.1 will now state the following:<br><br>"**Growth and Change beyond the Policy Area.** Plan comprehensively for growth and change in ~~Planned Development~~ Special Study Areas consistent with the Regional Blueprint principles and the City's Vision and Building Principles, and ensure that |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | annexation and development provide regional and community benefits." |
| 120 | 7/31/2008 | Mod/New | Rick Bettis | The Plan should specifically recognize form-based zoning as a mechanism to facilitate mixed-use transit oriented development. | | **Not Recommended.** Form-based zoning will not be fully implemented, but many of its concepts will be used to move the City towards a code that recognizes urban form. |
| 121 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Rick Bettis | LU 1<br>Most importantly, the General Plan must be implemented. To be most effective, it must include a mechanism for prioritizing future development. We should emphasize infill as a top priority. Second priority should be development in the most centrally located new growth areas. Access to public transit should also be a top priority. | 2-7<br>2-8 | **Addressed Elsewhere.** Already addressed in Part Four, Implementation Programs. |
| 122 | 8/5/2008 | Mod | Larry Green SMAQMD | LU 2.7.6<br>Requires new development and redevelopment to create walkable, pedestrian scaled blocks. The District recommends that the City make the policy more specific by referencing or repeating the block size requirement from Land Use Policy 4.5.5, which mandates block sizes no larger than 400 feet. | 2-23 | **Not Recommended** LU 2.7.6 does not state the preferred 400 ft. block because the policy is referring to city-wide form and structure, which includes commercial and industrial uses where 400 ft. blocks may not be feasible, yet walkable development can still occur. |
| 123 | 8/5/2008 | Other | Larry Green | LU 4.1.13 | 2-55 | **Comment Noted.** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | SMAQMD | The District endorses this policy. | | |
| 124 | 8/5/2008 | Mod/New | Larry Green<br>SMAQMD | LU 4.3.2, LU 4.3.3<br><br>The District recognizes the City's desire to preserve the form and character of these neighborhoods; however, these policies may unnecessarily prevent the development of new residential or commercial units in the City's most pedestrian-, bicycle-, and transit-friendly neighborhoods. The District recommends that the City amend these policies to include a mechanism that allows for net increases in density, or "upzoning", in traditional neighborhoods where the increases in density could decrease personal motor vehicle trips. Examples could include parcels that are proximate to transit facilities, employment centers, commercial districts, etc. | 2-57<br>2-58 | **Comment Noted**<br>The following policies have been added or modified to address this issue.<br><br>Revised:<br>**"LU 4.3.2: Replacement of Non-Conforming Densities in Traditional Neighborhoods ~~Densities~~.**<br>The City shall preserve the existing diversity of housing types and densities on each block of Traditional Neighborhoods. Where the density of existing development on a Traditional Neighborhood block ~~does not conform to the standards for Traditional Neighborhoods~~ falls outside the applicable density range of its land use designation, the City shall allow replacement development on the parcel that maintains the same density., ~~deviations from those standards may be allowed if replacement of existing housing units does not result in a net increase or decrease in density on~~ |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | ~~the parcel.~~"<br><br>New:<br>"**Alley Activation Density Bonus in Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density.** Within the Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density designation, development shall be allowed to reach 36 units per acre provided that the following conditions are met:<br>- The parcel is zoned for a maximum density of 36 units per acre.<br>- The development maintains the character of Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density by presenting a façade of single-family homes or duplexes.<br>- The additional units, bringing the total density up to 36 units per acre, are built in the back of the street-facing units, and are accessed by the alley."<br><br>"**Corner Duplexes and Halfplexes in Traditional** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | **Neighborhood Medium Density.** Within the Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density designation, an exception to the maximum density standard shall be granted for the construction of duplexes and halfplexes on corner parcels of a traditionally scaled block."<br><br>"**Density Regulations for Mixed-Density Development Projects.** Where a developer proposes a multi-parcel development project with more than one residential density or FAR, the applicable density or FAR range of the General Plan Land Use Designation shall be applied to the net developable area of the entire project site rather than individual parcels within the site. Some parcels may be zoned for densities/intensities that exceed the maximum allowed density/intensity of the project site's Land Use Designation, provided that |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | the net density of the project as a whole is within the allowed range." |
| 125 | 8/5/2008 | Other | Larry Green SMAQMD | LU 4.5.5<br>The District endorses this policy. | 2-61 | **Comment Noted.** |
| 126 | 8/5/2008 | New | Larry Green SMAQMD | Under Goal LU 8.1 (Public/Quasi-Public), include a policy to reduce the emissions associated with airport ground equipment. The additional policy could read:<br>"The City shall promote reduced emission ground support equipment within airport facilities, including electrified equipment, whenever possible." | 2-111 | **Not Recommended.**<br>The City does not have control over airport operations. |
| 127 | | Mod | Planning Staff | Include cemeteries on the list of allowed uses in the Public/Quasi Public Land Use Designation. | 2-110 | **Recommended.** |
| 128 | 8/29/08 | Mod | LAFCO | LU 10.1.2 Comprehensive Planning for Special Study Areas. The City shall require that Special Study Areas be planned comprehensively prior to annexation for the following processes:<br>▪ Amendment of the General Plan, including completion of a new Community Plan chapter where applicable.<br>▪ Approval of a Sphere of Influence amendment by the LAFCo prior to annexation request where applicable. (Sacramento LAFCo local policies discourage concurrent Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation. The city should work with LAFCo to amend the SOI prior to making applications for annexation. LAFCo is the CEQA Lead Agency for a SOIA.) | | **Recommended with Modifications.**<br>Revise the second bullet to state:<br><br>"Approval of a Sphere of Influence amendment by the LAFCo prior to annexation request where applicable. (Sacramento LAFCo local policies discourage concurrent Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation.)" |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Completion and adoption of Master Plans, Specific Plan and Development Agreements, as appropriate, in order to establish the timing, phasing, costs, and responsible parties associated with development in the area to be annexed. | | |
| 129 | 8/29/08 | Mod | LAFCO | **LU 10.1.3 Regional and Community Benefits.** The City shall require that regional and community benefits are achieved as the result of annexations and development approvals in any Special Study Area or Planned Development Area, consistent with the goals and policies outlined in this Plan. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:<br>▪ A mix of land uses that result in a full range of jobs, housing, amenities, services, and open space, resulting in complete neighborhoods and dynamic centers that have strong linkages with the city and region<br>▪ Transportation systems, including transit and roadways that are substantially improved and expanded, in a manner that provides enhanced mobility for all sectors of the community and benefits regional air quality<br>▪ Sustainable infrastructure and community facilities, where adequate land is provided for such facilities, and construction and ongoing maintenance are funded by proposed development<br>▪ Conservation of open space, including important agricultural lands, sensitive habitat areas and wildlife corridors, and | | **Recommended**<br>Revise the last two bullets as proposed. |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | other ~~undeveloped~~ non-urbanized areas that serve as buffers or "greenbelts" for public use<br>▪ Net fiscal benefits are achieved by both the City and County, with minimal impacts to affected special districts *(MPSP/RDR)* | | |
| 130 | 8/29/08 | Mod | LAFCO | Modify LU 1.1.8 as follows:<br>LU 1.1.8 Annexation Prior to City Services. Prior to the provision of City services to new unincorporated areas, the City shall require those unincorporated properties be annexed into the city, ~~or that a conditional service agreement be executed agreeing to annex when deemed appropriate by the City. *(RDR)*~~ | 2-10 | **Not Recommended.** This language is needed to address situations where an annexation is likely to take place, but will be developed in the County before annexation occurs. |
| 131 | | Mod | Planning Staff | Change some FAR and density standards of various land use designations. | 2-31 | **Addressed Elsewhere.** These changes are listed in the Land Use and Urban Form Diagram section of this matrix. |
| 132 | 9/17/08 | Mod | Planning Staff | Add the following to the bulleted list of allowed uses in Traditional Neighborhood High Density:<br><br>"Small-lot single-family dwellings<br>Small-lot single-family attached dwellings (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, townhomes)<br>Accessory second units" | 2-46 | **Recommended.** |
| 133 | 9/22/08 | New | Planning Staff | Add the following new policy under Goal LU 8.1 (Public/Quasi-Public):<br><br>"LU 8.1.x Medical Center Expansions. The City | | **Recommended.** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | shall prohibit the rezoning of any parcel that is residentially zoned for the purposes of expanding a major medical facility." | | |
| 134 | 10/2/08 | New | Planning Staff | A new policy is needed to recognize the American River Parkway Plan. | | **Recommended.** Add the following new policy:<br><br>"The City recognizes the American Parkway Plan as an important state approved land use and policy document." |
| 135 | 10/2/08 | Mod | DSD Staff | There are some industrial uses allowed under the M-1 zoning designation but not allowed under the Employment Center Low Rise General Plan land use designation. Rezoning these properties could reduce opportunities for industrial employment. The allowed uses of ECLR and M-1 should be brought closer together. | 2-98 | **Recommended with Modifications**<br>Edit allowed uses of the Employment Center Low Rise land use designation as follows:<br><br>***"Allowed Uses***<br>This designation provides for employment generating uses that generally do not produce loud noise or noxious odor including the following:<br><br>• ~~Light~~ Industrial or manufacturing that occurs entirely within an enclosed building or an enclosed outdoor area with appropriately |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | landscaped setbacks<br>• Flex-space (i.e., industrial structures converting to office or research and design uses)<br>• Office uses<br>• Retail and service uses that provide support to employees<br>• Compatible public, quasi-public, and special uses"<br><br>As part of the Zoning Code Update (Administration Implementation Program # 12, Part 4) the allowed uses of the M-1 zone will be updated to ensure compatibility with Employment Center Low Rise. |
| 136 | 10/2/08 | Other | Planning Staff | Some Employment Center Low Rise areas are adjacent to light rail stations (47th Avenue, Marconi, etc). When market conditions and infrastructure are in place, these areas may start to transition to urban mixed use development. | | Add the following new policy:<br><br>"**LU 7.1.5 Transitions to Urban Development.** The City shall support changes in land use designation from Employment Center Low Rise to higher intensity land uses, on |

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | parcels located within a half-mile walking distance of a light rail station or other major transit stop, when appropriate market conditions and infrastructure are in place." |

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: **PART 2, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE & URBAN FORM DIAGRAM**

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 137 | 07/02/08 | Mod. | Greg Guardino, Alleghany Properties LLC | The new land use designation should be similar to the existing Neighborhood Commercial/Office designation at Natomas Crossing PUD (APNs 225-1250-002 and -005). The proposed Urban Center High land use designation is out of character with the area. | 2-31 | **Recommended.** The land use designation will be changed to Suburban Center. |
| 138 | 07/31/08 | New | Traci Canfield, RT | Please add DNA optional stations (Metro Air Park, 7th Street/Railyards). | 2-31 | **Not Recommended.** Adopted stations are the appropriate level of detail; we do not want to show features that may not come to pass. |
| 139 | 07/31/08 | New | Traci Canfield, RT | Along Southline Phase 2 alignment, the first station south of Meadowview should be west of the light rail tracks (not adjacent to the UP tracks); the next station at Franklin is on the south side of the light rail tracks and west of Franklin Blvd. (not on the corner). | 2-31 | **Recommended** Will refer to GIS Specialist for map change. |
| 140 | 07/31/08 | New | Traci Canfield, RT | Please describe densities with dwelling units per net acre and per gross acre and define what is excluded in net versus gross. | 2-31 | **Recommended with Modifications.** All densities are net (will clarify in legend). Gross/net definitions are included in the Glossary (Appendix E). |
| 141 | 07/31/08 | Mod | J. Glen Rickelton, Sacramento County Airport System | The footprint of Sacramento International Airport (SMF) is incorrectly shown on the diagram. The County Airport System owns approximately 6,000 acres in the Natomas Basin. | 2-31 | **Recommended.** Will refer to GIS Specialist for map change |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | The property shown reflects roughly one-third of the total property owned. The property extends south to the Sacramento River and north to the Sutter County line. (See enclosed property map, which also includes several parcels west of current airport property identified for acquisition to support future airport expansion.) | | |
| 142 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | The RT maintenance facility site on 29th Street should be changed from Urban Corridor Low to Urban Corridor High for consistency with the adjacent Sutter General Hospital site and to encourage infill development. | 2-31 | **Recommended.** |
| 143 | 07/30/08 | Mod | Marc de la Vergne, CADA | Change the graphic LU-1 to show the boundaries of the Capitol View Protection Act with its height limits. | 2-31 | **Recommended with Modifications** The boundaries of the Capitol View Protection Act will be added to the enlarged Central City map in the Central City Community Plan section and a footnote on the citywide Land Use and Urban Form Diagram will indicate that additional detail can be found in Community Plan maps. |
| 144 | 07/31/08 | Mod | Zachary Miller, State Department of General Services | Identify the boundaries and corresponding height limits of the Capitol View Protection Act. | 2-31 | **Recommended with Modifications** The boundaries of the Capitol View Protection Act will be added to the enlarged Central City map in the Central City Community Plan section and a footnote on the citywide Land |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Use and Urban Form Diagram will indicate that additional detail can be found in Community Plan maps. A new policy will be added to the land use element:<br><br>"**LU 5.6.6 Capitol View Protection.** The City shall ensure that development conforms to the Capitol View Protection Act." |
| 145 | 07/29/08 | Mod | Ron Bertolina, Esq., West Lakeside LLC | Include the West Lakeside Property in the General Plan land use and urban form diagram, as well as in the EIR analysis. In a settlement agreement, the City agreed to process first-stage legislative entitlements for the Greenbriar, Camino Norte, and West Lakeside properties. Why is West Lakeside not included in the GP update while the other properties are? Inclusion of West Lakeside shouldn't be tied to completion of the Sphere of Influence Study for the Natomas Joint Vision Area. (See letter for details.) | 2-31 | **Not Recommended**<br>Resolution 2001-518 (July 24, 2001) restricted processing of first-stage entitlements for properties outside of the existing City limits until the City completes its comprehensive Sphere of Influence Study. The City and County are working collaboratively on a broad visioning effort for the Natomas Joint Vision area, including West Lakeside. This Natomas Joint Vision process would result in an amended Sphere of Influence.<br><br>The Settlement Agreement (May 18, 2001) following litigation over the 2003 HCP |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | provided for City processing of 1st stage entitlements for West Lakeside, Greenbriar and Camino Norte concurrent with the City's SOI Study. Greenbriar and Camino Norte were allowed to proceed independently of the Joint Vision process.<br><br>On November 1, 2005, the City Council approved Resolutions 2005-801 and 2005-802, initiating Sphere of Influence amendment and annexation for Greenbriar; on November 21, 2006, the City Council approved Resolution 2006-859, initiating Sphere of Influence amendment for Camino Norte. The City Council never approved any resolutions specifically initiating the SOI process for West Lakeside. The City was actively processing entitlements for West Lakeside; however, this activity was suspended in 2005 at the request of the West Lakeside landowners.<br><br>Given the passage of time and emergence of various legal and environmental issues, the City |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | believes that the SOI issues for the Natomas Joint Vision should be resolved in advance of processing first stage entitlements for West Lakeside. |
| 146 | 07/29/08 | Mod | Ron Bertolina, Esq., West Lakeside LLC | Include in the GP update the Natomas Unified School District ("NUSD") site north of the West Lakeside property. The NUSD purchased the site to use as a high school west of I-5, as called for in the North Natomas Community Plan. | 2-31 | **Not Recommended** The North Natomas Community Plan does identify the need for a future high school site west of I-5; however, the Plan does not specifically identify the West Lakeside site, nor is the area within the City's existing Sphere of Influence or City boundary. The Natomas Unified School District has not yet filed an application with the City or LAFCo for a Sphere of Influence amendment or annexation. When the District acquired the land, it did not undertake CEQA review of development of the site for a school facility; rather, it relied upon Regulation 15004(b)(2)(A) as a basis for acquiring the site for possible use without doing any CEQA review. Utilization of that section requires a commitment to future CEQA review of any proposed use of that site, a process that the district is only now undertaking. |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| 147 | 08/20/08 | Mod | Norbert J. Bartosik, Cal Expo | Change the land use designation for the Cal Expo site to "Urban Center High" consistent with the Point West designation and the Arden Fair Mall designation. This designation would not include any portion of the Cal Expo Bushy Lake property which is part of the American River Parkway Plan.<br><br>Our discussions have focused on a new plan for Cal Expo to maximize the use of the site and redevelop the fair facilities to a state of the art, energy efficient fairground and exposition facility, as well as a mixed land use of entertainment, retail, commercial, hotel, residential, fair and exposition/convention uses. | 2-31 | **Addressed Elsewhere.**<br><br>Staff agrees that use of the Cal Expo property should be maximized and the fair facilities redeveloped, including consideration of the proposed development of an 18-20,000 seat indoor multi-purpose arena. However, this scope of land use change was not anticipated in the land use analysis. As a result, this land use designation will not be changed concurrent with adoption of the 2030 General Plan. However the following implementation measure will be added:<br><br>"The City shall work cooperatively with Cal Expo to plan future development on the State Fair grounds, including consideration of the proposed development of an 18-20,000 seat indoor multi-purpose arena." |
| 148 | 8/20/08 | Mod | Stoel Rives, LLP | The land use and urban form diagram should be changed to show the Florin Perkins Transfer Station site as "Industrial" (like it is currently), rather than as "Employment Center Low Rise", as proposed in the new General Plan. | 2-31 | **Not Recommended**<br>The site will remain Employment Center Low Rise, which reflects the City's vision for the area as "clean and |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | green" industry that is compatible with planned residential uses nearby.<br><br>This designation will not prevent the waste transfer station from continuing to operate. The waste transfer facility will be "grandfathered in" as an existing nonconforming use. While it will be able to continue operating under its current permits, facility expansion will be prohibited.<br><br>An administrative correction will be made so that the entire facility is located within a single land use designation. (In the Draft Land Use Diagram, the Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density designation partially overlaps the eastern portion of the waste transfer facility.) |
| 149 | 9/8/09 | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | 47th Avenue Light Rail Station. The land use designation to the west of the station should be changed from Traditional Center to Employment Center Low Rise for consistency with existing viable industrial businesses.<br><br>The area may eventually turn over to mixed use urban development when appropriate | 2-31 | **Recommended.**<br>Land use will be changed from Traditional Center to Employment Center Low Rise.<br><br>A new policy will be added to Land Use Element:<br>"**LU 7.1.5 Transitions to** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | infrastructure and market conditions are in place. | | **Urban Development.** The City shall support changes in land use designation from Employment Center Low Rise to higher intensity land uses when appropriate market conditions and infrastructure are in place." |
| 150 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Ben Ali: Due to the existing low-density fabric, access difficulties, and lack of infrastructure in the Ben Ali neighborhood, the designation should be lowered from Suburban Neighborhood Medium Density to Suburban Neighborhood Low Density. | 2-31 | **Recommended.** |
| 151 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Correction of Central Business District Designation: The shape of the CBD designation should be changed so that all parcels zoned C-3 are included and some parcels that are not properly part of the CBD, such as a portion of the Railyards, will be removed. | 2-31 | **Recommended.** |
| 152 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Planned Development Areas: Railyards and Greenbriar. The General Plan requires that locations within the Planned Development land use designation be given new designations when a development project is approved on the site. This has occurred in two Planned Development areas, Railyards and Greenbriar. These areas will be given new designations as appropriate based on their Specific Plans, as approved by Council. | 2-31 | **Recommended.** |
| 153 | | Mod | Long Range Planning | Northeast Line Light Rail Stations. Transit | 2-31 | **Recommended.** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Staff | Village areas along the Northeast Light Rail Line, including Globe, Arden/Del Paso, Royal Oaks, Swanston, and Marconi Stations, were examined based on existing conditions and the previous Transit for Livable Communities recommendations. In some cases the lower densities were recommended to match more realistic expectations, with the provision that the stations will be considered for more intense development when they are ready. | | |
| 154 | | Mod | Development Services Staff | North Natomas. Various changes to land use designations in North Natomas recommended for consistency with current zoning and the North Natomas Community Plan. | 2-31 | **Recommended.** |
| 155 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff, from comments delivered by community members at Hagginwood SNAP on 9/17/2008 | Change Suburban Neighborhood High Density areas at the intersection of Del Paso Boulevard. and Craigmont Street to a lower density land use designation. | | **Not Recommended.** The existing zoning on the parcels is consistent with the Suburban Neighborhood High Density land use designation. Changing to a lower designation would result in downzoning the properties, which will only be done if requested by the affected property owners. |
| 156 | | Mod | Cook Property Owners | The Cook Property, located south of I-80 and west of Northgate Boulevard, is designated primarily Regional Commercial with the southwest portion designated Parks and Suburban Neighborhood Low Density. The request is to change the southwest portion so that the entire area is Regional Commercial. | | **Not Recommended.** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 157 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Change Maximum FAR for Urban Neighborhood Low Density from 1.00 to 1.50. | 2-31, 2-33, and 2-50 | **Recommended.** |
| 158 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Change Maximum Density for Urban Neighborhood Medium Density from 101.0 to 110.0. | 2-31, 2-33, and 2-50 | **Recommended.** |
| 159 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Change Maximum FAR for Central Business District from 10.0 to 15.0. | 2-31, 2-34, and 2-74 | **Recommended.** |
| 160 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Change Minimum FAR for Suburban Corridor from .30 to .25 | 2-31, 2-34, and 2-84 | **Recommended.** |
| 161 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Change Minimum FAR for Urban Corridor Low from .40 to .30. | 2-31, 2-34, and 2-86 | **Recommended.** |
| 162 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Change Minimum FAR for Urban Corridor High from .35 to .30. | 2-31, 2-35, and 2-88 | **Recommended.** |
| 163 | | Mod | Long Range Planning Staff | Change Minimum FAR for Employment Center Low Rise from .35 to .25. | 2-31, 2-35, and 2-98 | **Recommended.** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: **PART 2, HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 164 | 07/31/08 | Other | Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner | HCR 2.1.13 – What sort of Code issues or conflicts may arise with this policy about adaptive reuse? How can the City proactively implement Code modifications to implement this policy? | | **Recommended:** Add a Historic and Cultural Resources implementation program to Part 4 stating:<br><br>"Evaluate the potential for building and zoning code amendments facilitating adaptive reuse of historic resources consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties."<br><br>The time frame would be 2011-2015. |

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: **PART 2, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 165 | 02/08 | New | Heather Sturgill, based on a comment by Rashida Felix via the Accessibility Town Hall Forum | Add a policy about educating business-owners about tax incentives for making private businesses accessible to the disabled. | | **Addressed Elsewhere.** This comment is addressed by Policy ED 1.1.3 (Market Trends). |
| 166 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Caroline Stromberg | The Native American community, as well as other impacted communities, continue to struggle for acknowledgement/assistance for their children, elders, economic development, and their future. | 2-138 | **Addressed Elsewhere:** This comment is addressed by Goal LU 2.8 (City Fair and Equitable). |
| 167 | 7/31/2008 | New | Chris Paros | An economic development plan should be required for all New Growth Areas to compensate for the burden of inclusionary housing on schools and services. POLICY: Committing to an Economic Growth Strategy. | 2-138 | **Addressed Elsewhere:** This comment is addressed by Goal LU 2.8 (City Fair and Equitable). |

Summary of Comments: **Part 2, Housing**

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 168 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | We believe that this is a crucial element of the General Plan and reserve comment until it is incorporated in the draft. However, at this time we would like reiterate our strong support for city-wide extension of the City's inclusionary housing policy. It is critical to the progress and vitality of this City that inclusionary housing exist as a reality across all neighborhoods. | | **Comment Noted.** The City is currently developing a process and timeline for full review of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance as part of the implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element. Also, Program 5 of the Draft Housing Element establishes a process and a timeline to determine the feasibility of expanding the inclusionary ordinance to other areas in the city in order to promote mixed-income development. |
| 169 | 7/31/2008 | Other/New | Nicole Hara | Housing element H 1-2. The City exceeded the 2000–2007 RHNA need for the very low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income levels, and met 99 percent of its RHNA need for low-income units. In total, over 30,000 units were constructed or rehabilitated between 2000 and 2007, compared to a RHNA target of 19,313 units and a production goal of 14,365 units. Among these units are 718 multifamily units rehabilitated and/or preserved for low- and very low-income households which do not count towards the RHNA goal, but represent a significant improvement to the existing housing | | **Comment Noted.** The Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage economic integration of neighborhoods and to encourage smaller scale apartments. Specifically, the Draft Housing Element includes the following policies and programs:<br><br>Policy H-1.2.2: Encouraging a |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | stock for lower income renters. ** Since the city exceeded this, I would suggest that if more very low- and low-income housing is built in North Natomas, integrate it into the neighborhoods, rather than build these giant apartment complexes. | | Variety of Housing Types<br><br>Policy H-1.3.2: Considering Economic Integration of Neighborhoods<br><br>Program 9: Researching How to Better Incorporate Multifamily Developments<br><br>Additionally, the Land Use and Urban Design Element addresses economic integration of neighborhoods and appropriate concentrations of housing types with the following policies: LU 4.1.1 Mixed Use Neighborhoods; LU 4.1.9 Residential Diversity; and LU 4.1.10 Balanced Neighborhoods. |
| 170 | 7/31/2008 | Mod | Chris Paros | We oppose Policy 2.5. Inclusionary housing policy should be implemented city-wide and not only in New Growth areas (NGAs). This policy puts added burden on schools, businesses and services. The policy for inclusionary housing should be 15% for any project that does not already have 15% inclusionary housing in the surrounding 1/2 mile radius. | 2-154 | **Comment Noted.**<br>The City is currently developing a process and timeline for full review of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance as part of the implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element. Also, Program 5 of the Draft Housing Element establishes a process and a timeline to determine the feasibility of expanding the |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | inclusionary ordinance to other areas in the city in order to promote mixed-income development. |
| 171 | 7/31/2008 | Mod/New | Chris Paros | New Growth Areas should get a higher ratio of City revenue and resources for the extra burden of inclusionary housing. Non-NGA's should contribute some of their General Fund monies to NGA needs. | 2-154 | **Comment Noted.** |
| 172 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Chris Paros | Support: Ownership inclusionary housing. There needs to be more ability for working families to improve their status and stability. | 2-154 | **Comment Noted.**<br>The Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage affordable homeownership, within and outside of the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. Specifically, the Draft Housing Element includes the following policies and programs:<br><br>Policy 6.2: Promoting New and Sustained Homeownership Opportunities<br><br>Policy 6.4: Promoting Modest Income Homeownership Opportunities Through the Mixed Income Housing Ordinance<br><br>Program 87: Targeted First- |

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | time Homebuyer Programs<br><br>Program 91: Modifying the Mixed Income Housing Ordinance to Promote Development of Inclusionary Ownership Housing |
| 173 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Chris Paros | Building large 3-story complexes with 100% low-income apartments is a housing model that failed in Chicago, South Sac. and South Natomas. When will the city learn the lessons from its past? Require inclusionary housing be mixed among market-rate apartments. | 2-154 | **Comment Noted.**<br>The Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage economic integration of neighborhoods and to encourage smaller scale apartments. Specifically, the Draft Housing Element includes the following policies and programs:<br><br>Policy H-1.2.2: Encouraging a Variety of Housing Types<br><br>Policy H-1.3.2: Considering Economic Integration of Neighborhoods<br><br>Program 9: Researching How to Better Incorporate Multi-Family Developments<br><br>Additionally, the Land Use and Urban Design Element addresses economic integration |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | of neighborhoods and appropriate concentrations of housing types with the following policies: LU 4.1.1 Mixed Use Neighborhoods; LU 4.1.9 Residential Diversity; and LU 4.1.10 Balanced Neighborhoods. |
| 174 | 7/31/2008 | New | Chris Paros | RULE: Market-rate housing is built first before the inclusionary element. This is critical to help ensure success of the market-rate housing. | 2-154 | **Comment Noted.** The City is currently developing a process and timeline for full review of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance as part of the implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element. |
| 175 | 7/31/2008 | New | Chris Paros | Data monitoring is needed for crime and other problems associated with inclusionary housing. It is unacceptable that the City cannot provide information on crime, police calls, and other trends occurring in inclusionary housing. Are the problem tenants migrating to Sacramento from other areas? This needs to be assessed and addressed. | 2-154 | **Addressed Elsewhere.** The Sacramento City Police Department provides data on crimes by property address on their website at www.sacpd.org. |
| 176 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Chris Paros | The 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness needs to include clear data gathering that answers questions such as: Is the plan creating a "magnet" effect attracting more homeless people to Sacramento for the benefits? How will that be prevented? What will be done to protect the community if issues occur such as drug dealing, | | **Comment Noted.** The homeless population is very complex and varied, and enumerating the population and its impacts on the community is difficult. However, there is clear and definitive research on |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | etc.? What action will be taken to ensure those with mental and physical abilities contribute to the community? Homeless does not equal helpless. There can be litter cleanup or canal trash cleanup efforts. Show some ROI to taxpayers and it will help improve the program. Show that these residents will be contributing to the community, too. | | the "housing first" model and its success in alleviating many of the common concerns with homelessness. |
| 177 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Chris Paros | Condo conversions to rentals need to require notification to the surrounding community with an opportunity for community input. | | **Comment Noted.** As with single-family homes, no special permit or other City approval is needed to rent private residential property. This applies as well in the case of a project approved and under construction as a condominium which the developer then chooses to hold and rent, rather than sell individual units. |
| 178 | 7/31/2008 | Delete | Chris Paros | We oppose reducing parking spaces in any Natomas housing until abundant mass transit is available. We have had numerous problems with parked cars getting hit or vandalized because of insufficient parking spaces within the project. | | **Comment Noted.** The City is not proposing to underpark affordable or market rate housing. The 2008-2013 Housing Element contains a program to revise the Zoning Code for senior and efficiency unit parking requirements from 1.5 spaces per unit to one space per unit. Revision of the Zoning Code to allow for this reduction will be subject to public review and City Council |

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | approval. One of the biggest barriers to the provision of mass transit systems is the lack of sufficient housing densities near the proposed system. Higher residential densities help to qualify the City for further federal transportation funding. This proposed reduction in parking spaces is, in part, to increase density, thus allowing and encouraging expansion of transit systems. |
| 179 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Chris Paros | Residents need to be informed of all inclusionary housing projects. Any application streamlining must maintain community notification with sufficient time for input. | | **Comment Noted/Addressed Elsewhere.**<br>The Housing Element is not proposing streamlining or process modifications for projects subject to the Mixed Income (Inclusionary) Ordinance.<br><br>Program 56 of the 2008-2013 Housing Element will continue to implement the preliminary review process where neighborhood groups provide input early in the development application process. Additionally, residents within 500 feet of the project site are notified of the proposed development. Residents can |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | also track progress on active projects on the City's website: http://www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/reference/maps/ActivePlanningProjects.cfm |
| 180 | 7/31/2008 | Delete | Chris Paros | We oppose allowing group homes by only special permit. Residents need to be notified and have an opportunity for public comment. These need Commission approval. | 188 | **Addressed Elsewhere.** Group homes under six units are allowed by right in all residential zones per California State Law (Welfare and Institutions Code, Sections 5115-5116). Group homes over six units require a special permit, which, consistent with Section 17.212 of the City Code, requires public notification to all residents within 100-500 feet of the property, depending on the level of approval. Approval of special permits is always subject to public review and comment. |
| 181 | 7/31/2008 | Delete/ Other | Chris Paros | Policy 3.2<br>Natomas residents ADAMANTLY OPPOSE any developer fee incentives to build medium or high density housing until our levees are fixed and our services can meet the need. We have an overabundance of unfilled apartments now, numerous homes in foreclosure, flood insurance | 250 | **Comment Noted.** This comment is referring to Program 3.2 from the previous Housing Element. This program will not be continued in the 2008-2013 Housing Element. |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | risks and crime problems primarily from young people. | | |
| 182 | 7/31/2008 | Mod | Joe Smith | Please revise the plan so that inclusionary housing is spread throughout the entire city. It really is a joke to cram it all in the "New Growth Areas".<br><br>Also, add some smaller units mixed in with homes, as well as more ownership opportunities. Building 3- story 100% low-income projects leads to crime. | | **Comment Noted.**<br>The City is currently developing a process and timeline for full review of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance as part of the implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element. Also, Program 5 of the Draft Housing Element establishes a process and a timeline to determine the feasibility of expanding the inclusionary ordinance to other areas in the city in order to promote mixed-income development. |
| 183 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Chantha Trinh<br>Natomas Park<br>Chris Paros<br>NPPC | When inclusionary housing units not in the City's existing housing plan are proposed for development, the same number of units should be removed from another planned inclusionary project within the community ("off-site offset"). For example, the 240-unit Arena Seniors Apartments, P08-013, was approved in July 2008, so the inclusionary requirement in North Natomas should be reduced by 240. | | **Comment Noted.**<br>The Arena Seniors Apartments are not inclusionary housing units; they are being built and financed independent of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance. |
| 184 | 7/31/08 | Other | Chantha Trinh<br>Natomas<br><br>Chris Paros<br>NPPC Park | Require market-rate housing be built first before the inclusionary element. Per Sacramento City code, 15% of market rate housing development is to be inclusionary housing. Zero percent of zero = zero.<br>Direct Staff to assess the economic impact of | | **Comment Noted.**<br>The City is currently developing a process and timeline for full review of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance as part of the |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | building large numbers of low-income rental units prior to the market-rate element. Is this a smart economic strategy? | | implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element. |
| 185 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Chantha Trinh<br>Natomas Park<br><br>Chris Paros<br>NPPC | Don't just develop inclusionary housing units in N. Natomas; make sure the entire city follows the 15% rule. These requests arise from our need to reverse two dangerous development precedents:<br>1. Willow Glen inclusionary apartments are being constructed now in the Natomas Meadows PUD before any market rate housing construction has been built (and while single family home development has been mothballed). Zero % of zero should be zero.<br>2. The Arena Seniors project has been allowed to go forward by Staff without a market-rate element. What has happened once will happen again. Our community needs to be economically compensated for the impact of inclusionary housing to our schools, our services and our economy. Natomas is having a tough enough time dealing with the economic impacts from flood insurance & home foreclosures. We emphasize that we are not opposed to inclusionary housing. But we want policy to be implemented in a true, mixed use manner with sufficient services to help compensate for the impacts. We are tired of seeing all affordable housing condensed into large, 3-story complexes with no ownership opportunities.<br>For the Arena Seniors 240-unit offset, our preferred off-site location (where inclusionary housing is not required) is for any proposed project site located within ½ mi. of the Natomas Charter School (Del Paso Blvd & Blackrock Rd). | | **Comment Noted.**<br>1. The City is currently developing a process and timeline for full review of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance as part of the implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element. Additionally, Program 5 of the Draft Housing Element establishes a process and a timeline to determine the feasibility of expanding the inclusionary ordinance to other areas in the city in order to promote mixed-income development.<br><br>Also, the Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage economic integration of neighborhoods and to encourage smaller scale apartments. Specifically, the Draft Housing Element includes the following policies and programs:<br><br>Policy H-1.2.2: Encouraging a Variety of Housing Types |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | This area is becoming a growing community concern for both traffic & crime due to the high concentration of existing and future apartments around the school, and the future Twin Rivers School District mega-school as well. | | Policy H-1.3.2: Considering Economic Integration of Neighborhoods<br><br>Program 9: Researching How to Better Incorporate Multifamily Developments<br><br>Additionally, the Land Use and Urban Design Element addresses economic integration of neighborhoods and appropriate concentrations of housing types with the following policies: LU 4.1.1 Mixed Use Neighborhoods; LU 4.1.9 Residential Diversity; and LU 4.1.10 Balanced Neighborhoods.<br><br>2. The Arena Seniors Apartments are not inclusionary housing units; they are being built and financed independent of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance. |
| 186 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Nicole Hara | LU 2.8.4 Housing Type Distribution. The City shall promote an equitable distribution of housing types for all income groups throughout the city and promote mixed-income developments rather than creating concentrations of below-market-rate housing in certain areas. (RDR/ MPSP) ** | | **Addressed Elsewhere.** The Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage economic integration of neighborhoods and to |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Please stop building the huge apartment complexes in North Natomas. Small dwellings with the option to buy would be ideal. Concentration of very low- and low-income residents into tightly packed apartment complexes surrounded by middle and upper middle income residents is a recipe for disaster. Integration of small 2-5 unit dwellings mixed is ideal. | | encourage smaller scale apartments. Specifically, the Draft Housing Element includes the following policies and programs:<br><br>Policy H-1.2.2: Encouraging a Variety of Housing Types<br><br>Policy H-1.3.2: Considering Economic Integration of Neighborhoods<br><br>Program 9: Researching How to Better Incorporate Multifamily Developments<br><br>Additionally, the Land Use and Urban Design Element addresses economic integration of neighborhoods and appropriate concentrations of housing types with the following policies: LU 4.1.1 Mixed Use Neighborhoods; LU 4.1.9 Residential Diversity; and LU 4.1.10 Balanced Neighborhoods. |
| 187 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Nicole Hara | H 2-12, Program 3.2<br>H 2-16, Program 10.2<br>I am not sure if this means that the City will no longer follow the North Natomas Community Plan or if it just means that some of the goals have been met. I would hope that it is the latter. | | **Comment Noted.**<br>This comment refers to programs from the previous Housing Element. Program 3.2 called for educational workshops to identify |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | The City has left us high and dry in North Natomas and after seeing all the money I paid in taxes on the house, and beyond, I would hope that this area would continue to be monitored to ensure that all the money and infrastructure investment in the area is not wasted. | | incentives for promoting multi-family density in the North Natomas Community Plan Area. Program 10.2 called for preparing annual reports on compliance with jobs/housing balance, housing type and affordability objectives in the North Natomas Community Plan. These reports did not analyze infrastructure investment. Neither program is proposed for the new Housing Element because the North Natomas Community Area has largely been built out.<br><br>The North Natomas Finance Plan is audited annually by the City's external auditors to account for the receipt and use of all funds. All funds are, and must be, used for the purposes set out in the North Natomas finance plan. The plan itself and all associated uses are approved by the City Council by resolution or ordinance. |
| 188 | 7/31/08 | Other | Nicole Hara | Is it a coincidence that the General Plan calls for the deletion of the Community Plan in the Housing Element? | | **Comment Noted.**<br>The City's existing community plans have been incorporated into the General Plan. No community plan has been |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | deleted. |
| 189 | 7/31/08 | Other | No Name | Inclusionary Housing: Build appropriate amounts of housing in varied settings, not huge ghettos likely to become master-planned slums. | | **Comment Noted.** The Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage economic integration of neighborhoods and to encourage smaller scale apartments. Specifically, the Draft Housing Element includes the following policies and programs:<br><br>Policy H-1.2.2: Encouraging a Variety of Housing Types<br><br>Policy H-1.3.2: Considering Economic Integration of Neighborhoods<br><br>Program 9: Researching How to Better Incorporate Multifamily Developments<br><br>Additionally, the Land Use and Urban Design Element addresses economic integration of neighborhoods and appropriate concentrations of housing types with the following policies: LU 4.1.1 Mixed Use Neighborhoods; LU 4.1.9 Residential Diversity; and LU 4.1.10 Balanced |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Neighborhoods. |

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: **PART 2, MOBILITY**

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 190 | 7/31/2008 | Endorsement | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | ECOS commends the City for a number of important and imaginative improvements in GP mobility policies. The Mobility Element describes mobility policies as subsidiary to land-use policies, saying they must "support increased densities and a mix of uses on multi-model districts." ECOS believes that the mobility policies in the GP set out realistic ways to support the City's land use goals by restricting roadway capacities, reducing existing overcapacity in the roadway system, and by supporting alternative modes. | NA | **Comment Noted** |
| 191 | 7/31/2008 | Endorsement | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | The Mobility Element also states that the transportation network must "conserve energy resources, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution." We commend the City for identifying that increased roadway capacities create environmental damage and that reducing this damage is a primary social responsibility that needs to be reflected in the GP. | NA | **Comment Noted** |
| 192 | 7/31/2008 | Mod | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | Introduction:<br>Remove the phrase "do so while preserving auto mobility." This statement is inconsistent with the | 2-159 | **Recommended with Modifications**<br><br>Phrase will be modified as |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | policies and goals of the Mobility Element because these goals will necessarily involve a reduction in auto mobility to achieve the desired outcomes in terms of land use, pollution and encouragement of alternative modes. | | follows:<br><br>"...and do so while ~~preserving~~ continuing to accommodate auto mobility." |
| 193 | 7/31/2008 | Other | Maggie O'Mara | M1, M4<br>Two-way streets should not have more than 2 through lanes in each direction. One-way streets should not have more than 2 lanes total. By the time left and right turn only lanes are added at intersections, streets with more than 2 lanes in each direction become difficult for pedestrians to cross, especially for people with limited mobility, children, and others. The street becomes an unpleasant place to walk, drive or ride a bicycle. Driver speeds increase and it's difficult to enforce the speed limit. The maximum speed limit on any city street should be 35 mph. 40 or 45 mph speed limits have no place in a city that wants to be "green" and encourage multi-modal travel. The intersection vehicle LOS at peak hours should be E, no higher. | 2-161<br>2-179 | **Not Recommended**<br>The new LOS Standard (M 1.2.2) will decrease the number of roads that will be widened beyond four lanes, but the City cannot state categorically than no road will be widened beyond four lanes. |
| 194 | 7/31/2008 | Mod | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | M 1.1.1 (Right-of-Ways)<br>Change "to best serve future travel demand" to "to best regulate future travel demand." The rest of the language and policies in the Mobility | 2-161 | **Recommended with Modifications**<br>Policy 1.1.1 to be modified as follows: |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Element are moving away from the old "predict and provide" approach toward addressing the role of the transportation network in creating and curtailing travel demand. | | **"M 1.1.1 Right-of-Ways.** The City shall manage the use of transportation right-of-ways by all travel modes ~~to best serve future travel demand~~ consistent with the goal to provide Complete Streets as described in Goal 4.2. *(SO)*" |
| 195 | 7/31/2008 | New | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | M 1.2<br>New Standard for Transportation Impacts<br>We recommend that, for this iteration of the GP, the City should adopt a new parallel standard for assessing transportation impacts, based perhaps on VMT (vehicle miles traveled) or some other more direct measure of environmental effects. Then, in the next iteration of the GP, the City may be able to drop the LOS approach altogether. | 2-162 | **Comment Noted**<br>New methods of assessing Level of Service may be considered in future updates of the General Plan. At present time the method described in the General Plan EIR is the method accepted and supported by City staff to measure and describe transportation impacts. |
| 196 | 7/31/2008 | Endorsement | Graham Brownstein, ECOS | M 1.2.2<br>In changing the vehicle LOS requirement from C to D or E, the City is acknowledging the present overcapacity in the roadway network and the consequent damage to the environment and the health and well-being of the City's people. Policies like Complete Streets (and especially the policy to eliminate gaps in Complete | 2-162 | **Comment Noted** |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Streets) are a good first step toward creating a roadway network that supports rather than hinders the City's overall planning goals. | | |
| 197 | 6/18/2008 | Mod | EIR Mitigation | M 1.2.2 EIR Mitigation Measure 6-12-c) must be added to the GP in order for the plan to be internally consistent. | 2-162 | **Recommended**<br>Add the following text bullets under **M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard):**<br><br>**"a. Core Area Level of Service Exemption**—LOS F conditions are acceptable during peak hours in the Core Area bounded by C Street, the Sacramento River, 30th Street, and X Street. If a Traffic Study isprepared and identifies a LOS impact that would otherwise be considered significant to a roadway or intersection that is in the Core Area as described above, the project would not be required in that particular instance to provide further vehicular capacity-enhancing improvements to that road segment or intersection in order for the City to find project conformance with the General Plan. Instead, General Plan conformance could still be found if the |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | project provides improvements to other parts of the citywide transportation system in order to improve transportation-system-wide roadway capacity or to enhance non-auto travel modes in furtherance of the General Plan goals. The improvements would be required within the project site vicinity or within the area affected by the project's vehicular traffic impacts. With the provision of such other transportation infrastructure improvements, the project would not be required to provide any mitigation for vehicular traffic impacts to road segments or intersections in order to conform to the General Plan. This exemption does not affect the implementation of previously approved roadway and intersection improvements identified for the Railyards or River District planning areas."<br><br>Former a. becomes b. and |

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | former b. becomes c. after the above insertion. Afterward, insert the following:<br><br>**"d. Roadways Exempt from Level of Service Standard**—The above LOS standards shall apply to all roads, intersections or interchanges within the City except as specified below. If a Traffic Study is prepared and identifies a significant LOS impact to a roadway or intersection that is located within one of the roadway corridors described below, the project would not be required in that particular instance to provide further vehicular capacity-enhancing improvements to that roadway or intersection in order for the City to find project conformance with the General Plan. Instead, General Plan conformance could still be found if the project provides improvements to other parts of the city wide transportation system in order to improve |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | transportation-system-wide roadway capacity or to enhance non-auto travel modes in furtherance of the General Plan goals. The improvements would be required within the project site vicinity or within the area affected by the project's vehicular traffic impacts. With the provision of such other transportation infrastructure improvements, the project would not be required to provide any mitigation for vehicular traffic impacts to the listed road segment or intersection in order to conform to the General Plan.<br>• 12th/14th Avenue: State Route 99 to 36th Street<br>• 65th Street: Folsom Boulevard to 14th Avenue<br>• Alhambra Boulevard: Folsom Boulevard to P Street<br>• Arcade Boulevard: Marysville Boulevard to Del Paso Boulevard<br>• Arden Way: Capital City Freeway to Ethan Way<br>• Blair Avenue/47th Avenue: S. Land Park Drive to |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Freeport Boulevard<br>• Broadway: 15th Street to Franklin Boulevard<br>• Broadway: 58th to 65th Streets<br>• El Camino Avenue: Stonecreek Drive to Marysville Boulevard<br>• El Camino Avenue: Capitol City Freeway to Howe Avenue<br>• Elder Creek Road: 65th Street to Power Inn Road<br>• Florin Perkins Road: 14th Avenue to Elder Creek Road<br>• Florin Road: Greenhaven Drive to I-5; 24th Street to Franklin Boulevard<br>• Folsom Boulevard:65th Street to Watt Avenue<br>• Freeport Boulevard: Broadway to Seamas Avenue<br>• Fruitridge Road: Franklin Boulevard to SR 99<br>• Howe Avenue: American River Drive to Folsom Boulevard<br>• Mack Road: Meadowview Road to Stockton Boulevard<br>• Martin Luther King Boulevard: Broadway to 12th Avenue |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | • Marysville Boulevard: I-80 to Arcade Boulevard<br>• Northgate Boulevard: Del Paso Road to SR 160<br>• Raley Boulevard: Bell Avenue to I-80<br>• Roseville Road: Marconi Avenue to I-80<br>• Royal Oaks Drive: SR 160 to Arden Way<br>•Truxel Road: I-80 to Gateway Park<br><br>**e. Modify LOS Policies for Special Study Segments**—The City shall exempt the following special study segments, in the event that the Street Classification diagram is modified to reduce the number of lanes on those segments from four lanes to two lanes.<br>• 24th Street: Meadowview Road to Cosumnes River Boulevard<br>• Capitol Mall: 3rd Street to 5th Street<br>a. Elvas Avenue: C Street to H Street<br>• Folsom Boulevard: 34th Street to 47th Street<br>b. Folsom Boulevard: |

**Edit:** Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

| # | Date | Type | Source | Comment | Page | Staff Comments/ Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 59th Street to 65th Street<br>• Garden Highway: Truxel Road to Northgate Boulevard<br>• J Street: 43rd Street to 56th Street" |
| 198 | 6/19/2008 | Other | Jodi Samuels, Planning Commission | M 1.2.2<br>Consider using alternative measurements (other than traditional LOS) approach for neighborhood traffic impacts. | 2-162 | **Addressed Elsewhere**<br>Planning Commission direction is to develop a methodology to measure neighborhood level of service. This analysis has not been completed but the following implementation measure will be added:<br><br>"The City shall prepare and adopt a methodology to measure neighborhood level of service." |
| 199 | 7/24/2008 | Other | Steve Pyburn, Kimley-Horn & Associates | M 1.2.2<br>Define "multi-modal districts". | 2-162 | **Recommended**<br>Text in M 1.2.2 will be revised as follows:<br><br>"The City shall seek to maintain the following standards in ~~multi modal districts including~~ the Central Business District, in areas within ½ mile walking distance of light rail stations, and ~~mixed use corridors as designated by the City~~ in |