

Meeting Date: 4/29/2014

Report Type: Public Hearing

Report ID: 2014-00292

Title: McKinley Village Project (P08-086) [Passed for Publication 04/22/2014; Noticed 04/18/2014; Published 04/24/2014]

Location: Parcels generally to the North of Union Pacific Railroad, South of Business 80, East of Alhambra Boulevard, and West of Lanatt, District 3

Recommendation: Conduct a Public Hearing and upon conclusion pass 1) a Resolution adopting an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and approving a Mitigation Monitoring Plan; 2) an Ordinance adopting a Development Agreement; 3) a Resolution approving the General Plan Amendment of 48.8± acres from Planned Development to Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density Residential; 4) an Ordinance to Rezone from Heavy Industrial (M-2) to Single-Unit or Duplex Dwelling (R-1A PUD), Multi-Unit Dwelling (R-2A PUD), and Residential Mixed Use (RMX PUD) zones; 5) a Resolution approving the PUD Establishment to create the McKinley Village PUD Guidelines and Schematic Plan; 6) a Resolution approving the Bikeway Master Plan Amendment to incorporate the bikeway network for the McKinley Village project; and 7) a Resolution approving a Master Parcel Map to subdivide one parcel into twelve large lot parcels on 48.8± acres; a Subdivision Tentative Map to subdivide the site for a residential subdivision, park, and recreation center comprised of 384 parcels on 48.8± acres; a Subdivision Modifications to allow nonstandard street sections; the Site Plan and Design Review for the construction of 312 single-unit dwellings, 24 multi-unit dwellings, and a recreation center; and the Driveway Variances to reduce the width of the proposed driveways from 24 feet to 20 feet for all proposed courts.

Contact: Evan Compton, Associate Planner (916) 808-5260; Lindsey Alagozian, Senior Planner (916) 808-2659; Luis Sanchez, AIA, LEED AP, Senior Architect (916) 808-5957;

Presenter: Evan Compton, Associate Planner (916) 808-5260

Department: Community Development Dept

Division: Planning

Dept ID: 21001221

Attachments:

- 01-Description/Analysis
- 02-Background
- 03a - Opposition Petition
- 03b - Support Petition
- 03c - Letters and Emails Received
- 04- Land Use Map
- 05a- McKinley Village EIR Resolution
- 05b- McKinley Village CEQA Findings of Fact
- 05c- McKinley Village Findings Table
- 05d- McKinley Village MMP
- 05e- McKinley Village Errata April 14 2014
- 06-Ordinance (Development Agreement)
- 07-Exhibit A (Development Agreement)
- 08-Resolution (General Plan Amendment)
- 09-Exhibit A - General Plan Amendment
- 10-Ordinance (Rezone)
- 11-Exhibit A - Rezone
- 12-Resolution (PUD)
- 13-Exhibit A - PUD Schematic Plan
- 14-Exhibit B - McKinley Village PUD Guidelines
- 15-Resolution (Bikeway Master Plan)
- 16-Exhibit A - Bikeway Master Plan
- 17- Resolution (Project Resolution)
- 18-Exhibit A - Master Parcel Map
- 19-Exhibit B - Tentative Subdivision Map
- 20-Exhibit C - Final Architectural Plans
- 21-Exhibit D - Materials and Color Board
- 22-Exhibit E - Elevation Key
- 23-Exhibit F - Styles per Color Scheme Matrix
- 24-Exhibit G McKinley Village Community Design Book
- 25-Technical Appendix for Lot Width, Depth, and Size for Villages 1-4
- 26-List of Community Meetings Submitted by Applicant
- 27-Response for removal of tracks
- 28-Partial List of Changes to Project based on input
- 29-Environmental Document Links for Agenda Page

The attachments are directly linked to the document accessed via the City of Sacramento's April 29, 2014 Council Agenda webpage for your convenience -- http://sacramento.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=21&event_id=2460

City Attorney Review

Approved as to Form

Jeffrey Heeren

4/24/2014 8:56:55 AM

Approvals/Acknowledgements

Department Director or Designee: Ryan Devore - 4/23/2014 12:28:38 PM

Description/Analysis

Issue Detail: The proposed project will result in a 336 unit residential subdivision and a 4,200 square foot recreation center on approximately 48.8 acres. The overall density of the project is 11.2 dwelling units per net acre. The project is comprised of several types of housing including single family detached units, condominiums, and optional second units. The project requires the following entitlements: Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Mitigation Monitoring Plan, Development Agreement, General Plan Amendment, Rezone, PUD Establishment, Bikeway Master Plan Amendment, Master Parcel Map, Tentative Subdivision Map, Subdivision Modifications, Site Plan and Design Review, and Driveway Variances. The project is considered to be controversial and has generated extensive public outreach and responses.

Policy Considerations:

General Plan. The project is consistent with the land use designations of the proposed General Plan Amendment to Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density Residential with a density between 8 and 21 dwelling units per net acre. Traditional Neighborhoods and the characteristics associated with them are highly desirable and expected to be highly sought after in the future. Changes proposed in these traditional neighborhoods will focus on preserving and restoring the quality of such areas by protecting and enhancing features such as scale and quality of housing, neighborhood character, and housing choice.

The project is consistent with the many policies of the 2030 Sacramento General Plan including but not limited to infill and sustainable development, walkability, the creation of complete and well-structured neighborhoods, and connections to open space.

Economic Impacts: None

Environmental Considerations: In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, section 15081, the City, as Lead Agency, determined that an EIR should be prepared for the McKinley Village (P08-086) project. An EIR is an informational document that must be considered by the Lead Agency prior to project approval. CEQA Guidelines section 15132 specifies that the Final EIR shall consist of: the Draft EIR or a revision of the draft; comments and recommendations received on the DEIR either verbatim or in summary; a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR; responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process; and additional information provided by the Lead Agency.

The Draft EIR identified impacts to: Air Quality and Climate Change, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Public Safety, Noise and Vibration, Public Services and Recreation, Public Utilities, Transportation and Circulation, and Urban Design and Visual Resources. Mitigation measures were identified to reduce project impacts to a less than significant. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) that lists all of the mitigation measures and required implementing actions has been prepared and is attached to the Resolution to Certify the EIR and Adopt CEQA Findings for consideration by the City Council. The EIR concludes that all potential impacts relating to the project can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

The Draft EIR was prepared and released for a forty-five (45) day public review period, beginning on November 12, 2013 and ending on January 10, 2014. 129 comment letters were received on the Draft EIR. The comment letters and responses to comments are included in the Final EIR. The Final

EIR responds to all comments received on the Draft EIR and revises text and/or analyses where warranted. Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, copies of the responses to comments have been sent to all agencies who commented on the Draft EIR. Copies of the Draft EIR and Final EIR are available on the Community Development Department's webpage at:

<http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports>

Written comments were received following completion of the Final EIR that relate to the project. These are attached to this staff report as Attachment 3C. In some cases the correspondence expressed support for the project, and in other cases identified purported deficiencies in the environmental document. Staff has reviewed the correspondence, and determined that some portions of the EIR should be modified to clarify issues, and that some corrections were needed to account for minor project changes that had occurred since preparation of the responses to comments for the Final EIR. These changes appear in the Final Environmental Impact Errata: April 9, 2014, attached to this staff report as Attachment 5E. None of the changes to the Final EIR constitute new information as described in CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 that would require recirculation of the EIR.

Sustainability: The City has adopted a Sustainability Master Plan to complement the City's General Plan. This was done to ensure that the City set the standard for the practices of sustainability within its own organization as well as becoming a model for any construction projects within the City. Projects should consider the following goals adopted by the City as projects are proposed within the City: 1) Reduce consumption of material and encourage the reuse and local recycling of materials; 2) Reduce the use of toxic materials; 3) Establish and continuously improve "green" building standards for both residential and commercial development--new and remodeled; 4) Reduce dependence on the private automobile by working with community partners to provide efficient and accessible public transit and transit supportive land uses; 5) Reduce long commutes by providing a wide array of transportation and housing choices near jobs for a balanced, healthy city; 6) Improve the health of residents through access to a diverse mix of wellness activities and locally produced food, promote "greening" and "gardening" within the City; 7) Create "Healthy Urban Environments" through Restorative Redevelopment, and 8) Maintain and expand the urban forest.

Staff recommends that the applicant introduce sustainable practices during the construction of the proposed project. Staff recommends the use of energy efficient design, and the use of local materials as a minimum standard for this project.

Commission/Committee Action: On March 27, 2014, the City Planning and Design Commission recommended approval and forwarded the project to City Council with a vote of 11 ayes to 0 noes. The commission recommended one modification to the Development Agreement which was supported by staff, the applicant, and the commission. The change is located in the Development Agreement, Exhibit J, Part II, Section B Off-Site Tunnel, Subsection (2). The only change involves reducing the proposed four year time frame to commit funds toward improving vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access down to two years in the event that the tunnel does not commence. The last sentence will read as follows:

City shall make a good faith effort to commit such funds to Alternative Transportation Improvements and Services within two years after the City Reallocation Date.

Rationale for Recommendation: The proposed project complies with the goals and objectives of the General Plan Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density designation in that: a) provides the necessary entitlements to allow the development of an infill project site with a density that is compatible with the nearby East Sacramento and Midtown neighborhoods; b) establishes the McKinley Village Planned Unit Development Guidelines which envisions making efficient use of an infill site and constructing homes with aesthetic qualities found in the surrounding neighborhoods; c) provides a mix of housing types, models, and architectural styles; and d) is consistent with the proposed General Plan designation of Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density, the proposed Single-Unit or Duplex Dwelling (R-1A PUD), Multi-Unit Dwelling (R-2A PUD), and Residential Mixed Use (RMX PUD) zones, and the proposed McKinley Village Planned Unit Development guidelines.

Financial Considerations: This project has no fiscal considerations.

Emerging Small Business Development (ESBD): No goods or services are being purchased under this report.

Background Information: The project site was in agricultural use and under cultivation until at least the late 1980s as part of Mize’s Farm. Approximately 10% to 15% in the eastern portion of the site was planted with a peach orchard with the remainder of the site regularly plowed and planted with an assortment of vegetables. The orchard was removed from the site in late 2006.

Prior Entitlement History: There have been several proposals at this site as outlined in the following chart and discussed below.

Uses	Centrage Proposal (Denied)	The Village (Withdrawn)	McKinley Village (Current Project)
Dwelling Units	1,200	494	336
Office Square Feet	750,000	0	0
Retail Square Feet	290,000	1.3 net acres*	800**
Hotel Square Feet	260,000	0	0
Church Square Feet	0	84,300	0
Height in Feet	285	85	45

*The proposal did not specifically indicate the square footage of the commercial.

**Flex space in the recreation center

Development has been proposed for this site dating back to the late 1980s when a mixed-use project was proposed known as “Centrage.” On October 28, 1991 the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Centrage project. (P88-394) On March 10, 1992, the City Council adopted Resolution 92-175 denying the Centrage proposal.

In the mid 1990s, a 500,000 square foot discount shopping mall was proposed, but the project application was withdrawn by the applicant prior to completion of environmental review. (P96-069 Capitol City Marketplace)

On July 12, 2006, an application for “The Village” was submitted proposing 444 to 494 residential units, neighborhood retail, a church, and open space. The application was withdrawn by the applicant on July 5, 2007. (P06-118) The concurrent file submitted for the construction of a church on approximately eight acres (P06-130) which was formally withdrawn on January 31, 2012.

On July 31, 2008 the current application was submitted (P08-086). The original proposal was to construct 397 homes and has been modified to the current proposal of 336 dwelling units with a 4,200 square foot recreation center.

Public/Neighborhood Outreach and Comments: Staff provided early notification to the following community groups: East Sacramento Improvement Association, East Sacramento

Preservation, McKinley Elvas Neighborhood Association, River Park Neighborhood Association, Boulevard Park, Grant Park, Marshall School New Era Park, and Midtown Neighborhood. In addition, staff notified property owners within 1,000 feet of the subject property and posted the subject property.

Staff received comments from many community associations and individuals which has been included as Attachments 3A, 3B, and 3C. Comments from the neighborhood at large on the project to date include, but are not limited to, the following:

- *Livability*: The project site is bounded by a freeway and a railroad and there are concerns about noise and vibration for future residents.
- *Poor Access*: Neighbors object to the fact there are only two vehicular access points proposed. One access utilizes an at grade crossing over the railroad tracks and an overpass spanning the freeway and the other access proposed will extend 40th Street to the north of C Street through the existing railroad embankment.
- *Impact to 28th Street*: Neighbors oppose the A Street Bridge connection to 28th Street because of concerns for increased traffic to an existing residential neighborhood. The neighborhood has requested vehicular access to connect to 29th Street or Alhambra Boulevard since these roadways are more commercial in nature.
- *Flood Control*: Neighbors have expressed concern about flooding for the future homes and risks for the existing neighborhood with the installation of flood gates or stop logs to allow for the 40th Street extension.
- *Car-Centric*: The development has been called vehicle-oriented because there is no significant commercial within the development or direct access to transit.
- *Future Improvements*: Neighbors have expressed concerns that the project could conflict with future freeway expansion plans and connection for high speed rail.

This list is not an exhaustive list of all concerns presented to date. A series of community meetings were conducted by the applicant. A list of the meetings has been included in this report as Attachment 26.

Planning and Design Commission Public Hearing: At the March 27, 2014 Planning and Design Commission hearing, the Commission recommended approval and forwarded the project to City Council with a unanimous vote of 11 ayes to zero noes, and two absences. The Planning and Design Commission recommended approval of the project with one change to the Development Agreement. The change is located in the Development Agreement, Exhibit J, Part II, Section B Off-Site Tunnel, Subsection (2). The only change involves reducing the proposed 4 year time frame to commit funds to toward improving vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access down to 2 years in the event that the tunnel does not commence. The last sentence has been modified to read as follows:

City shall make a good faith effort to commit such funds to Alternative Transportation Improvements and Services within 2 years after the City Reallocation Date.

Parks and Recreation Commission Public Hearing: On April 3, 2014, the Parks and Recreation Commission conducted a Review and Comment hearing. The recommendation forwarded from the Commission to the City Council stated that: "the park fees not used within

the project be substantially committed to Sutter's Landing Park for neighborhood and community serving improvements so that Sutter's Landing Park may receive some of the attention and funding it deserves."

2030 Sacramento General Plan

The proposal is subject to consistency with the following General Plan policies:

Infill Development. *The City shall promote and provide incentives (e.g. focused infill planning, zoning/rezoning, revised regulations, provision of infrastructure) for infill development, redevelopment, mining reuse, and growth in existing urbanized areas to enhance community character, optimize City investments in infrastructure and community facilities, support increased transit use, promote pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods, increase housing diversity, ensure integrity of historic districts, and enhance retail viability. (LU 1.1.5)*

Development along Freeways. *The City shall promote high-quality development character of buildings along freeway corridors and protect the public from the adverse effects of vehicle-generated air emissions, noise, and vibration, using such techniques as: requiring extensive landscaping and trees along the freeway fronting elevation; establish a consistent building line, articulating and modulating building elevations and heights to create visual interest; include design elements that reduce noise and provide for proper filtering, ventilation, and exhaust of vehicle air emissions. (LU 2.7.5)*

Sustainable Development Patterns. *The City shall promote compact development patterns, mixed use, and higher-development intensities that use land efficiently; reduce pollution and automobile dependence and the expenditure of energy and other resources; and facilitate walking, bicycling, and transit use. (LU 2.6.1)*

Balancing Infill and New Growth. *The City shall maintain a balanced growth management approach by encouraging infill development within the existing Policy Area where City services are in place, and by phasing city expansion into Special Study Areas where appropriate. (LU 1.1.9)*

Protect Established Neighborhoods. *The City shall preserve, protect, and enhance established neighborhoods by providing sensitive transitions between these neighborhoods and adjoining areas, and requiring new development, both private and public, to respect and respond to those existing physical characteristics, buildings, streetscapes, open spaces, and urban form that contribute to the overall character and livability of the neighborhood. (LU 2.1.2)*

Complete and Well-Structured Neighborhoods. *The City shall promote the design of complete and well-structured neighborhoods whose physical layout and land use mix promote walking to services, biking, and transit use; foster community pride; enhance neighborhood identity; ensure public safety; are family-friendly and address the needs of all ages and abilities. (LU 2.1.3)*

Neighborhood Enhancement. *The City shall promote infill development, redevelopment, rehabilitation, and reuse efforts that contribute positively (e.g. architectural design) to existing neighborhoods and surrounding areas. (LU 2.1.6)*

Unique Sense of Place. *The City shall promote quality site, architectural and landscape design that incorporates those qualities and characteristics that make Sacramento desirable and memorable including: walkable blocks, distinctive parks and open spaces, tree-lined streets, and varied architectural styles. (LU 2.4.1)*

Connected Neighborhoods, Corridors, and Centers. *The City shall require that new development, both infill and greenfield, maximizes connections and minimizes barriers between neighborhood corridors, and centers within the city. (LU 2.5.1)*

Overcoming Barriers to Accessibility. *The City shall strive to remove and minimize the effect of natural and manmade barriers to accessibility between and within existing neighborhood corridors, and centers. (LU 2.5.2)*

Public Safety and Community Design. *The City shall promote design of neighborhoods, centers, streets, and public spaces that enhances public safety and discourages crime by providing street-fronting uses (“eyes on the street”), adequate lighting and sight lines, and features that cultivate a sense of community ownership. (LU 2.7.4)*

Walkable Blocks. *The City shall require new development and redevelopment projects to create walkable, pedestrian-scaled blocks, publicly accessible mid-block and alley pedestrian routes where appropriate, and sidewalks scaled for the anticipated pedestrian use. (LU 2.7.6)*

Neighborhood Amenities. *The City shall encourage appropriately scaled community-supportive facilities and services within all neighborhoods to enhance neighborhood identity and provide convenient access within walking and biking distance of city residents. (LU 4.1.2)*

Walkable Neighborhoods. *The City shall require the design and development of neighborhoods that are pedestrian friendly and include features such as short blocks, broad and well-appointed sidewalks, tree-shaded streets, buildings that define and are oriented to adjacent streets and public spaces, limited driveway curb cuts, paseos and pedestrian lanes, alleys, traffic-calming features, convenient pedestrian street crossings, and access to transit. (LU 4.1.3)*

Alley Access. *The City shall encourage the use of well-designed and safe alleys to access individual parcels in neighborhoods in order to reduce the number of curb cuts, driveways, garage doors, and associated pedestrian/automobile conflicts along street frontages. (LU 4.1.4)*

Connections to Open Space. *The City shall ensure that new and existing neighborhoods contain a diverse mix of parks and open spaces that are connected by trails, bikeways, and other open space networks and are within easy walking distance of residents. (LU 4.1.7)*

Neighborhood Street Trees. *The City shall encourage the strategic selection of street tree species to enhance neighborhood character and identity and preserve the health and diversity of the urban forest. (LU 4.1.8)*

Balanced Neighborhoods. *The City shall require new major residential development to provide a balanced housing mix that includes a range of housing types and densities. (LU 4.1.10)*

Connections to Transit. *The City shall require new neighborhoods to include transit stops that connect to and support a citywide transit system and are within a 1/2 – mile walking distance of all dwellings. (LU 4.5.6)*

Grid Network. *The City shall require all new residential, commercial, or mixed use development that proposes or is required to construct or extend streets to develop a transportation network that provides for a well-connected, walkable community, preferably as a grid or modified grid. (M 1.3.1)*

Housing and Destination Connections. *The City shall require new subdivisions and large-scale developments to include safe pedestrian walkways that provide direct links between streets and major destinations such as transit stops and stations, schools, parks, and shopping centers. (M 2.1.8)*

Emergency Access. *The City shall develop a roadway system that is redundant (i.e. includes multiple alternative routes) to the extent feasible to ensure mobility in the event of emergencies. (M 4.1.1)*

Connections between New Development and Bikeways. *The City shall ensure that new commercial and residential development projects provide frequent and direct connections to the nearest bikeways. (M 5.1.8)*

Planned Development. *The City shall require areas designated Planned Development on the Land Use and Urban Form Diagram be developed consistent with the General Plan's Vision and Guiding Principles and obtain a General Plan Amendment to designate the area consistent with the proposed project using the appropriate designations contained in the Land Use and Urban Design Element. (LU 10.1.4)*

Zoning: The site is zoned Heavy Industrial (M-2). The proposal to construct a residential subdivision requires a rezone of the property. The proposal is to rezone the site to Single-Unit or Duplex Dwelling (R-1A PUD), Multi-Unit Dwelling (R-2A PUD), and Residential Mixed Use (RMX PUD) zones. (See Rezone Exhibit in Attachment 11)

The proposed Single-Unit or Duplex Dwelling (R-1A PUD) zone is to permit single-unit or duplex dwellings, whether attached or detached, at a higher density than is permitted in the Single Unit (R-1) zone. Generally the minimum lot size is 2,900 square feet per dwelling unit, and the minimum lot widths are 20 feet for interior lots and 38 feet for corner lots. Minimum lot depth is 80 feet and the maximum lot depth is 160 feet.

The proposed Multi-Unit Dwelling (R-2A PUD) zone is to permit garden apartments and cluster housing. This zone is regulated to minimize the ground area covered by structures and maximize open space. Generally the minimum lot size is 2,500 square feet, the minimum lot width is 20 feet for interior lots and 38 feet for corners. Minimum lot depth is 80 feet and the maximum lot depth is 160 feet.

The proposed Residential Mixed Use (RMX PUD) zone is to allow a mix of residential and commercial uses as a matter of right, and to preserve the residential character of neighborhoods while encouraging the development of neighborhood-oriented ground floor

retail and service uses. There are no minimum lot size standards for this zone. This zone is proposed for the 1.0 acre portion of the site to be developed with the recreation center.

A majority of the site will be R-1A PUD for the detached single family homes. The four parcels for the Parkside Flats will be zoned R-2A PUD to accommodate the attached multi-unit product type. The Park/Recreation Center in the middle of the site will be zoned RMX PUD which would allow future commercial uses such as a coffee shop or assembly uses.

The single family homes in the R-1A PUD zone, the Multi-Unit Dwellings in the R-2A PUD, and the Recreation Center in the RMX PUD zones are permitted and have been reviewed in this staff report for final site plan and design review approval.

Table 3: Land Use Overview					
Village Number	Proposed Zoning	Use	Net Acres	Units	Density
Village 1 (except Parkside Flats as noted below)	R-1A PUD	Single-Unit	6.9	64	9.3
Parkside Flats on Lots 49, 58, 59, 68	R-2A PUD	Multi-Unit	1.6	24	15
Village 2A and 2B	R-1A PUD	Single-Unit	8.2	82	10
Village 3	R-1A PUD	Single-Unit	6.4	82	12.8
Village 4	R-1A PUD	Single-Unit	6.8	84	12.4
Lots A - Q	R-1A PUD and RMX- PUD	Open Spaces, Park, Recreation Center	6.9	n/a	n/a
Public Streets	n/a	Streets	12	n/a	n/a
Totals:			48.8	336	11.2 avg

Project Site Access

The McKinley Village subdivision envisions two vehicular access points. The project proposes to construct an extension of 40th Street to the north of C Street. A vehicular access would be created through the existing Union Pacific Railroad embankment. Existing access to the site is from an unimproved roadway and an existing overpass that spans the Capital City Freeway. A bicycle and pedestrian connection is proposed to align with Alhambra Boulevard on the southwest portion of the site.

The Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) for the project site is 001-0170-028. Other properties that would be used for ingress and egress include the following APNs: extension of 40th Street 001-0170-025, 001-0170-009, 004-0010-031, 004-0010-002; A Street east of freeway 001-0170-013, 003-0061-011; Alhambra undercrossing 003-0010-003; and A Street west of freeway 003-0050-016, 003-0050-014, and 003-0050-012.

Master Parcel Map and Tentative Subdivision Map design

The applicant is proposing to subdivide one parcel into 384 lots which would include 312 single unit dwelling lots, 4 multi-unit dwelling lots, 5 park lots, 11 open space lots, 51 private drive lots, and 1 recreation center lot.

Master Parcel Map: A master parcel map is a map that subdivides large tracts of land into smaller parcels for the purpose of later selling or otherwise transferring the parcels for further subdivision, or for the purpose of securing financing, together with planning and construction of infrastructure elements. The master parcel map is not for the purpose of creating individual residential lots for sale to end-user homeowners.

As stated in Sacramento City Code 16.32.160, a master parcel map requires a development agreement and appropriate access either by easement or an agreement which specifies access easements to be recorded with the map. Furthermore, each parcel for the master parcel map shall be a minimum of 5 acres for medium density residential uses. Staff finds that the master parcel map conforms to these requirements.

Table 4: Master Parcel Map Overview (Reference Attachment 18)				
Parcel Number	Use	Minimum Size (gross acres)	Actual Size (gross acres)	Deviation?
1	Single-Unit and Multi-Unit Dwellings	5.00	10.10	No
2	Single-Unit Dwellings	5.00	5.80	No
3	Single-Unit Dwellings	5.00	8.90	No
4	Single-Unit Dwellings	5.00	8.80	No
5	Single-Unit Dwellings	5.00	9.50	No
6	Park	n/a	0.95	No
7	Park	n/a	1.40	No
8	Park	n/a	0.90	No
9	Park	n/a	0.20	No
10	Park	n/a	0.15	No
11	Detention / Open Space	n/a	0.70	No
12	Recreation Center	n/a	1.40	No
Total:			48.80	

Tentative Subdivision Map and Subdivision Modifications: A technical appendix has been prepared for each Village and may be found in Attachment 25. As part of the project review, the applicant also requested several Subdivision Modifications which include allowing nonstandard intersections, roadway configuration and turnaround, and a dead end street. Staff finds that Public Works, Solid Waste, and other applicable departments and agencies reviewed these requests and there were no objections to the proposed layout.

The Subdivision Review Committee reviewed the Tentative Subdivision Map and Subdivision Modifications and on February 12, 2014 forwarded a recommendation to approve the request subject to conditions in Attachment 17. On February 19, 2014, the SRC reviewed the Master Parcel Map and forwarded a recommendation to approve the request subject to the conditions in Attachment 17.

McKinley Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) Guidelines and Schematic Plan

The applicant is requesting to establish the McKinley Village PUD. A planned unit development designation constitutes an overlay zone and the guidelines lay forth a vision for how the project site will be developed. The guidelines are based on principles which include creating a residential development that incorporates the aesthetic qualities of the surrounding East Sacramento and McKinley Park neighborhoods, making efficient use of an opportunity for infill development with a project density between those of McKinley Park and Midtown, and providing adequate access points for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

The purpose of the PUD Guidelines is to provide regulations and standards to guide development on the project site to ensure the overall development is harmonious. The proposed schematic plan establishes the land uses and intensities for each designation. The McKinley Village PUD Guidelines are organized into the following sections: Introduction; Residential Uses; Parks, Open Space, and Recreation; Transportation; and Implementation and Phasing.

A copy of the document is provided in this report as Attachment 14. Staff has reviewed the guidelines and schematic plan and recommends approval of the documents because the proposed standards will ensure appropriate infill development for the site in layout, building materials, and architectural character.

Bikeway Master Plan Amendment

The Bikeway Master Plan will be amended with the approval of this project to incorporate the new bikeway connections proposed with the McKinley Village project. (See Attachments 15 and 16) The Bike and Pedestrian Coordinator for the City of Sacramento has reviewed the amendment and has no objections to the proposed layout.

Site Plan and Design Review

Site Plan and Design Review is a discretionary permit and the process seeks to ensure the development project: a) is consistent with the general plan and policies; b) is high quality and compatible with the surrounding development; c) has adequate infrastructure to support the development; d) promotes energy efficiency and water conservation; and e) avoids or minimizes adverse environmental effects of the development.

The proposal includes the construction of 312 single family homes and 24 multi-unit dwellings. The architecture proposed includes thirteen styles: California Cottage, Colonial, Craftsman, English Revival, European Cottage, French Country, Italian, Mid Century Modern, Modern Prairie, Monterey, Spanish, Urban Contemporary, and Urban Farmhouse.

The proposal includes several home model types including Park Homes, Cottage Greens, Commons, and Courtyards. The multi-unit dwellings are designated as the Parkside Flats.

Table 5: Overview of Residential Models and Architectural Styles						
Village / Models	Home Size* (sqft)	# of Units	Garage Type	# of Plans	# of Styles	Typical Lot Size
1: Park Homes	2138-3150	64	Recessed, Front-Facing, Alley-Loaded	4	10	50 x 80 feet
1: Parkside Flats	1514-2396	24	Alley-Loaded	1	1	58 x 211 feet
2A, 2B: Cottage Greens	1995-2364**	82	Alley-Loaded	3	9	40 x 80 feet
3: Courtyards	1295-2007	82	Side-Loaded	5	7	38 x 70 feet
4: Commons	1540-2264	84	Side-Loaded	5	6	53 x 58 feet

*Does not include the two car garage.

**Does not include the optional 418 square foot second unit.

RecreationCenter

The proposal includes the construction of a 4,200 square foot recreation center on 1.0 acres. The site would include a community room with flex space, indoor/outdoor fireplace areas, and pools. Staff has reviewed the proposed exterior design and materials and supports the proposal as shown in the attached exhibits.

Height, Area, and Setbacks

The McKinley Village Planned Unit Development establishes the required height, lot coverage, and setback requirements. The project proposes establishing a PUD which will allow higher lot coverage allowances and smaller setback requirements. Staff concludes the standards are appropriate to encourage the densities the City needs to achieve adequate housing supply for residents.

Parks and Landscaping

The project site proposes three neighborhood parks, two pocket parks, and a series of open space lots. There will be a 1 acre centrally located park and two smaller parks at the west and east portions of the subject site. The park designs will be determined through a public master planning process at a later date. More information may be found in the McKinley Village PUD Guidelines on page 36.

Parking

This project meets the minimum parking requirements in the Planning and Development Code. Each home would require a minimum of one parking space. If a second unit is constructed on the site, an additional parking space would be required. Based on the home plans provided, each home will have a two car garage.

Driveway Variances

Driveways for the Courtyards and Commons require driveway variances from Public Works for the proposed width. Sacramento City Code Section 18.08.050 (4) state the driveways must be a minimum of 24 feet wide and the proposal is for the driveways to be 20 feet wide. The request to reduce the width of the driveways from 24 to 20 feet was reviewed by Public Works and staff has no objections to the request.