





SYCAMORE  
Environmental  
Consultants, Inc.  
Basemap:  
City of Sacramento GIS

R-2B-PUD = Multi-Family  
R-3-PUD = Multi-Family  
R-4-PUD = Multi-Family  
OB-PUD = Office  
C-1-PUD = Limited Commercial  
A-OS PUD = Open Space

R-1 PUD = Standard Single-Family  
(unshaded lots)  
R-1A-PUD = Single-Family Alternative  
(shaded lots)

Islands at Riverlake Project (P01-033)  
Administrative Draft EIR  
City of Sacramento, CA  
25 May 2005

RCA = Riverlake Community Association

Figure 11. City of Sacramento Zoning Map.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

current minimum requirements set forth in the subdivision regulations, that lot may be occupied by a permitted use if the yard and lot coverage requirements are satisfied.

SCC Title 17.180 Planned Unit Developments (PUD) Regulations and Maps: The purpose of this chapter is to provide for greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of zoning regulations. It is the intent of this chapter to encourage the design of well-planned facilities, which offer a variety of housing or other land uses through creative and imaginative planning.

SCC Title 17.212 Special Permits: A Special Permit may be granted at the discretion of the zoning administrator, planning commission or city council and is not the automatic right of any applicant. In considering an application for a Special Permit, the following guidelines shall be observed:

- A. Sound Principles of Land Use. A Special Permit shall be granted upon sound principles of land use.
- B. Not Injurious. A Special Permit shall not be granted if it will be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or if it results in the creation of a nuisance.
- C. Must Relate to a Plan. A Special Permit use must comply with the objectives of the general or specific plan for the area in which it is to be located.

#### **4.1.3 Standards of Significance**

An impact is considered significant if the project would:

- Conflict with GP designation or zoning;
- Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies w/jurisdiction over the project;
- Be incompatible with existing land use or planned growth in the vicinity;
- Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community;
- Substantially alter the present or planned land use of the area;
- Be incompatible with long-term uses on adjacent properties; or
- Alter the type or intensity of land use within the area.

#### **4.1.4 Consistency with Land Use Policies**

This section evaluates the consistency of the project with existing land use and zoning designations, and land use policies in Sacramento regionally and in Riverlake locally. This section includes an evaluation of the proposed amendments to the Pocket Area Community Plan and LPPT PUD Development Guidelines. Section 15125 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that: "The EIR shall discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans." Physical environmental impacts that could result from the proposed project as a result of inconsistencies with adopted policies are discussed in the respective sections of this Chapter of the DEIR.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

**4.1.4.1 SACOG Blueprint Growth Principles**

**LAN-1 Impact:** Inconsistency with the SACOG Blueprint Preferred Scenario for 2050 could result in a potentially significant land use impact on the Sacramento region.

**Analysis:** The SACOG identified the building type for the project site as “Single Family Small Lot” on the Blueprint Preferred Scenario for 2050 Map. The proposed project would construct residential dwelling units on lots ranging from 2,812 square feet up to 6,056 square feet. Of the 139 proposed single-family residential alternative lots, 135 are less than the City of Sacramento’s minimum standard lot size of 5,200 square feet and four lots exceed the standard lot size. The SACOG stated in a letter to the Supreme Court of California dated 27 January 2005 that the proposed project provides the kind of “Single Family Small Lot” development for which the Blueprint designates the project site.

**Conclusion.** The proposed project is considered consistent with the building type identified for the project site in the Blueprint Preferred Scenario.

**Significance:** Impact LAN-1 is considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None required.

**LAN-2 Impact:** Inconsistency with SACOG Blueprint Growth Principles could result in potentially significant land use impacts.

**Analysis:** The following analysis evaluates the consistency of the project with the SACOG Blueprint Growth Principles listed in the Regulatory Setting description above.

1. Transportation Choices.

The proposed project includes design features that encourage people to sometimes walk, ride bicycles, or ride the bus. A concrete path would provide each residential unit a connection with the concrete pathways in the mini-parks. The concrete pathways in the mini-parks connect with the existing walkway in the Linear Parkway. The Linear Park pathway provides pedestrian opportunities to commercial development east of the project site and Garcia Bend Park west of the project site. Both sides of Pocket Road have a striped bike lane. Regional Transit bus stops are located on both sides of the Pocket Road adjacent to the project site.

**Conclusion.** The proposed project integrates with existing transportation choices. The proposed project is considered consistent with this SACOG Blueprint Growth Principle.

2. Mixed-Use Developments.

The LPPT PUD Schematic Plan designates a number of land uses including houses, apartments, senior housing, commercial uses, business, and open space. The proposed project would provide slightly less dense housing than identified on the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan (7.15 dwelling units per net acre proposed versus 8 dwelling units per

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

net acre designated). The proposed transportation and circulation plan for the project integrates with existing surface connections with the other land uses in Riverlake.

**Conclusion.** The proposed project contributes to the variety of land uses indicated on the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan and nearly achieves the density target. The project integrates with the other land uses in Riverlake. The proposed project is considered consistent with this SACOG Blueprint Growth Principle.

### 3. Compact Development.

As discussed under Impact LAN-1, 135 of the proposed single-family alternative lots are smaller than the 5,200-square foot City standard lot size. The proposed project would be more compact than the standard R-1 residential development.

If the project site were developed at the density designated by the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan, 164 dwelling units would be constructed. The proposed project would construct 139 dwelling units. Build out of the project at the maximum density identified in the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan (164 dwelling units) would be more compact than the proposed project.

As previously discussed, the proposed project would provide connections with existing alternative transportation modes. The project provides the connections through the passive use, landscaped mini-parks. Benches are proposed for the mini-parks to encourage use of the mini-parks.

**Conclusion.** The proposed project is more compact than standard R-1 residential development and would be slightly less compact than indicated on the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan. The project provides open space mini-parks to provide aesthetic connections with alternative modes of transportation. The proposed project is considered consistent with this SACOG Blueprint Growth Principle.

### 4. Housing Choice and Diversity.

The original LPPT PUD Schematic Plan provided a variety of places to live. Over the years, land use designations on the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan have been revised (section > of this DEIR details changes to the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan). Major revisions included approving the development of halfplexes on corner lots and changing five of the eight "Townhouse and related R-1A" designated subdivisions to "Single-Family R-1." In addition to the "Single-Family R-1" and halfplexes, the apartments, senior housing, commercial, and office uses have been constructed. The proposed project nearly achieves the density requirement of the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan and offers a housing type that is different than "Single-Family R-1" products, halfplexes, and garden apartments. With smaller houses on smaller lots (average 1,841-square foot house on an average 3,514-square foot lot), the proposed project is expected to sell for less than the typical houses in Riverlake (average 3,230-square foot house on an average 9,107-square foot lot).

**Conclusion.** The proposed project is a component of a PUD that provides housing choice and variety. The housing type proposed for this project is different than other housing types in Riverlake and is expected to be more affordable than the average R-1

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

zoned Riverlake house. The proposed project is considered consistent with this SACOG Blueprint Growth Principle.

5. Use of Existing Assets.

The proposed project is located on some of the last undeveloped parcels in the LPPT PUD. Although the project does not qualify as "infill development" as defined in Policy 5 of the City's Overall Urban Growth Policies (SGPU page 1-37), the project satisfies the definition of "infill site" in California Public Resources Code 21061.05 because it is surrounded by "qualified urban development" and no parcel has been created on the project site.

**Conclusion.** Based on the state's definition of infill under CEQA, the proposed project is an infill development in an urbanized area. The proposed project is considered consistent with this SACOG Blueprint Growth Principle.

6. Quality Design.

The City of Sacramento adopted "Single-Family Residential Design Principles" (SFRDP) in 2000 to assist developers, homebuilders, and architects design and build quality residential subdivisions. The evaluation of project consistency with the Design Principles in section 4.5 "Aesthetics" of this DEIR found the project to be designed consistently with the principles. When the project was previously approved by the City Council in 2003, the City made a finding that the project was consistent with the SFRDP. These principles include general architecture; garages; porches/entries/courts; driveways/entry walks; setbacks/lot widths; landscaping/sidewalks; street view walls/monument entries/access; and orientation to parks/public open space.

**Conclusion.** Project design that is consistent with the SFRDP ensures that the proposed project is consistent with this SACOG Blueprint Growth Principle.

7. Natural Resources Conservation.

When the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan was approved, a 15-foot wide parkway easement was granted to the City of Sacramento and a 25-foot wide landscape easement was granted to the Riverlake Community Association. Taken together, both easements comprise a "Linear Parkway" that provides an open space buffer between Riverlake and Pocket Road. The proposed project would include seven mini-parks totaling 0.36 acre where mitigation trees would be planted. The mini-parks would have a concrete pathway connection to the concrete walkway in the City parkway easement.

Additional natural resources conservation incorporated in the proposed project includes off-site preservation of 10.3 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat to mitigate for the conversion of foraging habitat on-site to residential use. Stormwater management will be designed and constructed in accordance with City standards. A Conceptual Landscape Plan (Quadriga, Exhibit D) identifies the locations on the proposed lots where Riverlake Community Association approved shade trees would be planted as well as the locations in the mini-parks to be planted with shade trees.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

**Conclusion.** The proposed project provides open space and opportunities for residents to use the Linear Parkway. The proposed project includes off-site habitat preservation and shade trees on-site. The proposed project is considered consistent with this SACOG Blueprint Growth Principle.

Significance: The project is consistent with all of the SACOG Blueprint Growth Principles. Therefore, Impact LAN 2 is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

---

#### **4.1.4.2 Sacramento General Plan**

LAN-3 Impact: Inconsistency with the Sacramento General Plan Land Use Designation could result in a potentially significant land use impact.

Analysis: The project site is designated Low Density Residential (4 – 15 dwelling units per net acre) on the November 2003 SGPU Land Use Map. The net acreage of the project site is 19.44 acres. The project would construct 7.15 residential units per net acre (total 139 dwelling units). No General Plan Land Use amendment is needed.

Significance: Less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

---

LAN-4 Impact: Inconsistency with Sacramento General Plan Overall Urban Growth Policies, the Residential Land Use Element, or the Housing Element could result in potentially significant land use impacts.

Analysis: **Sacramento General Plan**

#### **Overall Urban Growth Policies**

Policy 1 – Quality of Life: It is the policy of the City to enhance and maintain the quality of life by adhering to high standards for project and plan evaluation as they relate to the following characteristics that help to define the quality of life in the City:

- The protection and preservation of the urban and natural environment are important factors to consider when evaluating development proposals and new community plans for the City.

**Consistent.** The project site's land use designation was converted from agricultural use to urban use in 1985 (City Council Resolution adopted 20 August 1985) in accordance with the Pocket Area Community Plan – South Pocket Specific Plan. Prior to issuance of a grading permit in August 2004, the applicant demonstrated proof to the City Public Works Department that the conversion of 20.6 acres of Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) foraging habitat had been mitigated through a

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

0.5-to-1 ratio preservation of 10.3 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat off-site. Applicant is also required to replace heritage trees removed from the project site at a ratio of 1-inch diameter at breast height (DBH) for each 2 inches DBH of heritage trees removed. The proposed project protects and preserves the urban and natural environment consistent with the policy.

- Air quality is a top priority in maintaining Sacramento's quality of life. The goal of compliance with Federal air quality standards - as soon as possible - must be considered in land use decision making and transportation planning.

**Consistent.** The project proposes fewer residential units than originally designated for the project site. The estimated long-term project emissions of ozone precursors, PM10, and carbon monoxide are below the significance thresholds (City of Sacramento Initial Studies 2002 & 2005). Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 will ensure that emissions of ozone precursors during project construction will be below the significance thresholds (City of Sacramento Initial Study 2005 and Section 4.2 of this DEIR). The project includes the incorporation of a sufficient number of trees to minimize localized temperature increases. The project is consistent with the City's goals of compliance with federal air quality standards.

- A valuable asset for each community is the open space and parks that are provided for recreational purposes. Adequate land and funding for improvements and maintenance will be necessary in newly developed areas to ensure the provision of this asset.

**Consistent.** The LPPT-PUD satisfied the parks requirement under SCC 16.46 at the time of approval (City Council Resolution dated 20 August 1985). A condition of the LPPT PUD approval was the dedication of a ± 2.2-acre parkway easement to the City, which was completed. The LPPT PUD has developed with fewer dwelling units than the maximum number of dwelling units anticipated by the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan. Therefore, no additional parkland or parkland dedication fees are needed for development in the PUD.

The Linear Parkway is ± 5.8 acres (2.2 acres in the City parkway easement and 3.6 acres in the Riverlake Community Association landscape easement). The proposed project would construct five new driveways in the Linear Parkway (fewer than the 1987 adopted Pocket Road Manor Houses project and one greater than the 1994 adopted Riverlake Park Homes project). Approximately 0.16 acre of the Linear Parkway would be removed due to the new driveways. The proposed project would include seven passive use mini-parks totaling 0.36 acre. Therefore, the project would result in increasing the acreage of parkland by 0.2 acre. The project is consistent with the City's goal of providing recreational opportunities for residents of Sacramento.

- Cultural amenities such as symphonies, theater, schools, libraries, museums and art help enhance the urban environment. Support for these amenities will help ensure a rich vital urban experience.

**Not applicable.** This development project does not interfere with the City's support of cultural amenities.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

- Because most parents are in the paid work force, adequate childcare at the worksite would help attract and maintain a productive work force.

**Not applicable.** This is a residential development project. This site was never anticipated for employment center use or childcare use.

- Crime, physical hazards and debilitating influences detract from the well-being of the neighborhood environment. Some neighborhoods in the City are experiencing the adverse effects of blighting influences, crime, and problems associated with homeless individuals. Efforts to correct these problems will be necessary to ensure the protection of the public's health, safety and general welfare.

**Consistent.** Riverlake, in the Pocket area of Sacramento, is not exposed to blighting influences. The project would not alter the density of development previously planned for this site. The project would not result in a need for new police facilities not already planned for and evaluated in the SGPU EIR and PACP-SPSP.

- It is the objective of the City that urban resources are developed in a manner which is equitable to all citizens in each community of the City. A disparity in level of service or opportunities between individual community areas is detrimental to the overall character of the City.

**Consistent.** The project would not alter the density or intensity of development planned for the site. The project would not result in a need for governmental facilities and services not planned for and evaluated in the SGPU EIR and PACP-SPSP. Therefore, the project is not expected to draw resources away from other community areas.

- The image a community projects is partly reflected in the quality and design of its development. Design and development guidelines are authorized in some communities in the City. In some areas which lack guidance, the character and integrity of the community is threatened since design and compatibility are features often overlooked.

**Consistent.** The proposed project is located in the LPPT PUD, which has Development Guidelines in place to protect the character and integrity of Riverlake. The project has been evaluated pursuant to all of the City's development and residential design standards. An evaluation of the project with the SFRDP (City of Sacramento September 2000) is in Section 4.5 "Aesthetics" of this DEIR. This DEIR also evaluates project design alternatives in Chapter 5.

- To create pleasant attractive neighborhoods, it may be necessary to develop minimum standards and guidelines for residential, commercial and industrial development that reflect the image and needs of affected communities.

**Consistent.** The LPPT PUD Development Guidelines provide minimum standards for development of residential land uses in Riverlake. The project has been designed to be consistent with the Development Guidelines. The project is consistent with the City's Single-Family Residential Design Principles (SFRDP; City of Sacramento September 2000). Please refer to the evaluation in Section >[4.2.4] "Aesthetics."



**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

Policy 4 – New Growth Areas: It is the policy of the City to approve development in the City's new growth areas that promotes efficient growth patterns and public service extensions, and is compatible with adjacent developments.

**Not Applicable.** The Islands at Riverlake project is not located in a new growth area.

Policy 5 – Urban Conservation and Infill Areas:

2. Infill development shall be defined as the development, redevelopment or reuse of a vacant and underutilized site of five acres or less, except where designated in the General Plan as an infill target area, that may contain one or more parcels and is substantially surrounded by urban uses, where the median age of the surrounding urban development area is 20 years or more, and where the proposed project is consistent with the general plan, any applicable community plans, and zoning.

**Not Applicable.** The project site exceeds five acres and is not designated in the General Plan as an infill target area. Although the project site does not satisfy the General Plan's definition of infill development, the project satisfies the definition of "infill site" in the California Public Resources Code 21061.05 because it is surrounded by qualified urban development and no parcel has been created on the project site.

Policy 6 – General Plan Land Use Amendments: It is the policy of the City in considering General Plan land use map amendments to evaluate the impact of such amendments upon the General Plan and Community Plan goals and policies.

**Not Applicable.** This project does not require a General Plan amendment.

Policy 7 – Annexations: It is the policy of the City to work with LAFCO to study the appropriate sphere-of-influence for the City and to develop an annexation policy.

**Not Applicable.** The proposed project is located in an incorporated area of the City. The project does not require annexation.

Policy 8 – Transportation: It is the policy of the City to promote an efficient, safe, and balanced transportation system.

**Consistent.** The transportation system in the South Pocket was designed to accommodate traffic resulting from the LPPT PUD and other subdivisions in the area. The maximum number of dwelling units allowed by the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan is 2,973 dwelling units. The City made findings that traffic resulting from development of the LPPT PUD at the contemplated density would not result in significant impacts to traffic and circulation in the area. Currently 1,657 dwelling units have been built in the LPPT PUD. There are 71 vacant parcels in the LPPT PUD including two large parcels in the Northland subdivision, which are zoned R-3 and R-4 respectively and the six Islands at Riverlake parcels. Based on how each parcel is currently zoned and net acreage of the larger lots, The approximate maximum development potential for the vacant parcels in the LPPT PUD is 407 residential dwelling units including standard R-1 houses; nonstandard R-1A detached and attached houses; apartments; elderly care facility; and townhouses and related. The Islands at Riverlake project proposes 139 dwelling units. If approved, the approximate maximum development potential for the vacant parcels in the LPPT PUD would be 382. If approved the total

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

number of dwelling units that could be built in the LPPT PUD is approximately 2,040 (382 future dwelling units plus 1,658 existing dwelling units). This number of dwelling units is 69% of the maximum number of dwelling units contemplated by the LPPT PUD in 1985. An evaluation of buildout of the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan is in Section >[number] of this DEIR. Table 8 compares the approved LPPT PUD Schematic Plan map with the uses that have been built. Approval of the proposed project would increase the efficient use of the transportation system by maximizing utilization of the existing road facilities.

The City of Sacramento Public Works Department and Sacramento Fire Department have reviewed the proposed circulation plan for the project and have determined that the project satisfies safety requirements and that it provides satisfactory access for public works and emergency vehicle access.

The project provides balanced transportation by including access to existing pedestrian, bicycling, and bus facilities. The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) provides bus service to the project area with Transit Centers on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road and a Transit Center on Pocket Road at the intersection of Greenhaven Drive. Bus stops located along Pocket Road adjacent to the project site provide access to Route 3, the "Riverside Express," for service to downtown Sacramento and the local Route 226 "Pocket/Riverside Boulevard" for service to the Rush River Transit Center. Route 56 "Valley Hi" stops at the Transit Center on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road. Route 56 also provides connecting service to the Rush River Transit Center. The Rush River Transit Center provides connecting service to Routes 2, 6, 7, 56, and 62.

Bike lanes are located on both sides of Pocket Road and Greenhaven Drive.

Policy 9 – Local and Regional Government: It is the policy of the City to cooperate with the region's various public jurisdictions on matters of mutual interest including social, economic, and environmental issues; land use policies; and private development project review.

**Consistent.** The proposed project is consistent Sacramento County General Plan Land Use Diagram (15 December 1993), which designates the project site as low density residential (1 – 12 dwelling units per acre). The proposed project does not require review by Sacramento County Local Agency Formation Council because the project site is not forming a new agency or annexing into the sphere of influence of an existing agency. As discussed under impacts LAN-1 and LAN-2, the proposed project is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments' Blueprint Preferred Scenario for the year 2050 and the SACOG Growth Principles.

The proposed project occurs within the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). Mitigation Measure AIR-1 was developed by SMAQMD for construction-related ozone precursor emissions. Implementation of these measures ensures that the project supports the implementation of the State Implementation Plan by SMAQMD.

The proposed project will receive public services from the Regional Transit Authority, the Sacramento Fire Department, the Sacramento Police and Sacramento Sheriff's departments, and Sacramento Municipal Utilities District. These agencies have had

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

the opportunity to evaluate the project in terms of design and service capabilities. Agency comments have been incorporated into project design.

The proposed project falls within the jurisdiction of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The project is therefore regulated for water quality impacts by this agency. The applicant prepared a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and obtained a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase I permit from RWQCB on 12 January 2004 (WDID 5S34C325437).

The proposed project falls within the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). The project is therefore regulated for potential California Endangered Species Act (CESA) impacts by this agency. Prior to issuance of a grading permit in August 2004, applicant demonstrated proof to the City Public Works Department that the conversion of 10.3 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat had been mitigated through the preservation of 10.3 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat off-site.

Policy 10 – Open Space and Natural Resources: It is the policy of the City to conserve and protect natural resources and planned open space areas, and to phase the conversion of agricultural lands to planned urban uses.

**Consistent.** The project site was converted from agricultural use to urban use in 1985 (City Council Resolution adopted 20 August 1985) in accordance with the Pocket Area Community Plan – South Pocket Specific Plan. Prior to issuance of a grading permit in August 2004, applicant mitigated the conversion of 10.3 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. The project retains 122 of the 167 trees surveyed by the ISA and City arborists. Approximately 200 trees occur in the Linear Parkway in the Riverlake Community Association landscape easement, which were not surveyed and because they are not going to be affected by the proposed project. The project will replace those three heritage trees removed (Tree numbers 17 and 18) or scheduled for removal from the project site (Tree Number NL #1) at a ratio of 1-inch diameter at breast height (DBH) for each 2 inches DBH of heritage trees removed. Table 6 lists the mitigation trees that are required to be planted. The proposed project protects and preserves the urban and natural environment consistent with this policy.

Policy 11 – Public Services: It is the policy of the City to provide a full range of adequate municipal services in order to meet resident and worker needs and to assure a healthy, orderly development and maintenance of its communities. It is important that these services are coordinated with the expected growth of the City.

**Consistent.** Public services, including potable water, water for fire fighting, fire protection services, law enforcement services, sewer service, storm drain service, and educational services are adequate to accommodate the proposed project. The PACP identifies three tools, Residential Construction Taxes, Assessment Districts, and Capital Improvement Programs, used to ensure funding of capital improvements for required services.

The City Public Works, Department of Utilities, and Fire Department have reviewed the proposed project and determined that the municipal services are adequate to ensure a healthy, orderly, and well-maintained community.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

Policy 12 – Smart Growth: It is the policy of the City to promote sustainable and balanced development that makes efficient and effective use of land resources and existing infrastructure by using the following Smart Growth Principles.

- Mix land uses and support vibrant city centers by giving preference to the redevelopment of city centers and transit oriented development within existing transportation corridors with vertically or horizontally integrated mixed uses to create vibrant urban places.

**Consistent.** The proposed project would provide pedestrian access, through its passive use mini-parks, to the Linear Parkway and Pocket Road. Transit Centers are located on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road and on Pocket Road at the intersection with Greenhaven Drive. Bus stops located along Pocket Road adjacent to the project site provide access to Route 3, the “Riverside Express,” for service to downtown and the local Route 226 “Pocket/Riverside Boulevard” for service to the Rush River Transit Center. Route 56 “Valley Hi “ stops at the Transit Center on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road. Route 56 also provides connecting service to the Rush River Transit Center. The Rush River Transit Center provides connecting service to Routes 2, 6, 7, 56, and 62.

- Take advantage of existing community assets by emphasizing joint use of existing facilities operated by cities, schools, countries and the state as well as take advantage of opportunities to form partnerships with private businesses and non-profits to maximize the community benefit from public and private facilities.

**Consistent.** The proposed project encourages community use of the existing Linear Parkway. The project would have ready access to the existing Garcia Bend Park. Garcia Bend Park is about one mile west of West Shore Drive on Pocket Road. Residents of the Islands at Riverlake subdivision on the north side of Pocket Road would have pedestrian access to Garcia Bend Park on existing sidewalks and cross walk at the three-way stop intersection of Windbridge Drive and Pocket Road. Residents living on the south side of Pocket Road have pedestrian access to the Park on existing sidewalks. Bicyclists could access the park using the existing striped bicycle lanes on both sides of Pocket Road.

- Create a range of housing opportunities and choices with a diversity of affordable housing near employment centers.

**Consistent.** As discussed under impact LAN-2, the original LPPT PUD Schematic Plan provided a variety of places to live. Currently R-1 zone standard single-family detached dwelling units, R-1A zone nonstandard single-family detached dwelling units, halfplexes, and apartments have been constructed in Riverlake. The proposed project offers a housing type that is different than “Single-Family (R-1)” products, halfplexes, and garden apartments. With smaller houses on smaller lots (average 1,841-square foot house on an average 3,514-square foot lot), the proposed project is expected to sell for less than the typical houses in Riverlake (average 3,230-square foot house on an average 9,107-square foot lot). The proposed project is a component of a PUD that provides housing choice and variety. The housing type proposed for this project is different than other housing types in Riverlake and is expected to be more affordable than the average Riverlake house.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

- Foster walkable, close-knit neighborhoods through a system of fully connected activity centers, streets, pedestrian paths and bike routes.

**Consistent.** The proposed project would provide pedestrian access, through its passive use mini-parks, to the Linear Parkway and Pocket Road. Transit Centers are located on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road and on Pocket Road at the intersection with Greenhaven Drive. Bus stops located along Pocket Road adjacent to the project site provide access to Route 3, the "Riverside Express," for service to downtown and the local Route 226 "Pocket/Riverside Boulevard" for service to the Rush River Transit Center. Route 56 "Valley Hi" stops at the Transit Center on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road. Route 56 also provides connecting service to the Rush River Transit Center. The Rush River Transit Center provides connecting service to Routes 2, 6, 7, 56, and 62. The project is also located within walking distance of the existing commercial shopping center at the northwest corner of Pocket Road and Greenhaven Drive. The shopping center includes, among other things, a dentist office, a coffee shop, restaurants and a gym.

- Promote distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place, including the rehabilitation and use of historic buildings.

**Consistent.** The project site is located in a distinctive, attractive community. No historic buildings are part of this project. The close association of the project with the Linear Parkway will provide a strong sense of place. The project is also required to conform to the LPPT PUD Guidelines, which will protect the character and integrity of Riverlake. The project has been evaluated pursuant to, and has been determined consistent with the City's development standards and residential design policies. (See Section >[4.2.4] Aesthetics, below.)

- Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas within the urban environment and on the urban edge.

**Consistent.** The project site is designated for residential development, not permanent open space or farmland. The proposed project maintains more of the existing Linear Parkway than previous projects approved for the project site. The project retains 122 of the 167 trees surveyed by the ISA and City arborists. Approximately 200 trees occur in the Linear Parkway in the Riverlake Community Association landscape easement, which were not surveyed and because they are not going to be affected by the proposed project. The project will replace those three heritage trees removed (Tree numbers 17 and 18) or scheduled for removal from the project site (Tree Number NL #1) at a ratio of 1-inch diameter at breast height (DBH) for each 2 inches DBH of heritage trees removed. Table 6 lists the mitigation trees that are required to be planted.

- Concentrate new development and target infrastructure investments within the urban core of the region to allow for efficient use of existing facilities, infill and reuse areas.

**Consistent.** The proposed project is located in an urbanized area of the City of Sacramento. Utilities are available to the site.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

- Provide a variety of transportation choices for people to bike, walk, take transit, or drive.

**Consistent.** The proposed project would facilitate pedestrian use, through its passive use mini-parks, to the Linear Parkway and Pocket Road. Transit Centers are located on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road and on Pocket Road at the intersection with Greenhaven Drive. Bus stops located along Pocket Road adjacent to the project site provide access to Route 3, the "Riverside Express," for service to downtown and the local Route 226 "Pocket/Riverside Boulevard" for service to the Rush River Transit Center. Route 56 "Valley Hi" stops at the Transit Center on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road. Route 56 also provides connecting service to the Rush River Transit Center. The Rush River Transit Center provides connecting service to Routes 2, 6, 7, 56, and 62. Both sides of Pocket Road have a striped bike lane.

- Make development decisions predictable, fair, and cost-effective by streamlining the development approval process.

**Consistent.** The proposed project application has been processed and evaluated according to the State Planning and Zoning Law, CEQA, and the City's planning policies and procedures.

- Encourage citizen and stakeholder participation in development decisions by fostering an open and inclusive dialogue that promotes alliances and partnerships to meet community needs.

**Consistent.** The City has provided many opportunities for dialogue between the community and the project stakeholders. Prior to the 2003 project approval, the applicant met 18 times with the Riverlake Community Association and a local group called the "Pocket Protectors" to evaluate different project design alternatives and to discuss differences in design considerations. The Pocket Protectors proposed a residential development consisting of halfplexes. The Pocket Protector's proposal is an alternative that is analyzed in Chapter 5 of this DEIR.

- Promote resource conservation and energy efficiency through water conservation and water quality practices, recycling, green building technology, cool community design features and use of solar and energy renewable technologies.

**Consistent.** The proposed project will be designed to meet energy efficiency standards of Title 24 of the Building Code.

- Create a Smart Growth Regional Vision and Plan with neighboring cities, counties and other governmental entities so that regional strategies and policies can be implemented to discourage urban sprawl and address transportation, air quality, housing, land use, loss of agricultural lands and open space and other regional issues.

**Not applicable.** This policy objective is administered on a program level. Based on the evaluation under impacts LAN-1 and LAN-2 above, the project is consistent with



**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

**Consistent.** This project helps the City meet this goal. The original LPPT PUD Schematic Plan provided a variety of residential types with different ownership opportunities to ensure housing opportunities for different economic groups. Over the last 20 years, standard R-1 zoned single-family detached houses, nonstandard R-1A zoned single-family detached houses, halfplexes, and garden apartments have been constructed in the PUD. The proposed project nearly achieves the target density of eight dwelling units per net acres that is designated by the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan for the project site. The proposed project offers a housing type that is different than "Single-Family (R-1)" products, halfplexes, and garden apartments. With smaller houses on smaller lots, the proposed project is expected to sell for less than the typical large houses on large in Riverlake. Based on the evaluation under impacts LAN-1 and LAN-2, the proposed project is consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Preferred Scenario for 2050 and the SACOG Growth Principles.

**Residential Strategy**

**Goal A: Improve the quality of residential neighborhoods Citywide by protecting, preserving, and enhancing their character.**

**Consistent.** The City of Sacramento established the Planned Unit Development (PUD) zone "to provide for the design of integrated developments. The intent of a PUD is to encourage the design of well-planned facilities, which offer a variety of housing and other land uses through creative and imaginative planning" (SCC 17.180.010). The City approved LPPT PUD (City Council Resolution dated 20 August 1985) with specific Development Guidelines (City of Sacramento 11 July 1985) that are "intended to provide for an interrelated total environment, which utilizes a common theme" (LPPT PUD Development Guidelines page 2). Adherence to the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines, the City's Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines, and City design review are expected to protect and preserve the character of the City.

**Policy 1:** Continue to target code enforcement efforts by targeting by identifying and prioritizing neighborhoods experiencing code violations.

**Not applicable.** Neither the project site nor the Riverlake in the Pocket community is currently exposed to blighting or experiencing significant code violations.

**Policy 2:** Actively promote the following existing programs that provide assistance and information on maintenance and beautification for residential development:

- Code enforcement programs and information;
- Rehabilitation programs available through the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency for single-family development;
- Rental rehabilitation programs.

**Not Applicable.** The proposed project is a new single-family alternative housing project and does not involve renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation. The Islands at Riverlake Project does not conflict with any renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation projects planned for or occurring in other parts of the City. There are no existing structures on-site that could be reused or rehabilitated.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

Policy 3: Utilize established Multiple-Family Design Guidelines in reviewing multiple-family development on a Citywide basis.

**Not Applicable.** The proposed project is a single-family alternative residential development and does not include any multiple-family housing. The Islands at Riverlake Project does not prevent the City from preparing, implementing, and enforcing design guidelines for multiple-family housing developments.

Policy 4: Promote the reuse of abandoned structures, which are sound or can be renovated for residential use to ensure neighborhood vitality.

**Not Applicable.** The proposed project is a new single-family alternative housing project and does not involve renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation. The Islands at Riverlake Project does not conflict with any renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation projects planned for or occurring in other parts of the City.

Policy 5: Continue redevelopment and rehabilitation efforts in existing target areas and identify other areas experiencing blighting conditions. Explore methods to expand public or private rehabilitation efforts in areas of opportunity or reuse identified in the SGPU EIR.

**Not Applicable.** The proposed project is a new single-family alternative housing project and does not involve renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation. The Islands at Riverlake Project does not conflict with any renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation projects planned for or occurring in other parts of the City.

Policy 6: Prohibit the intrusion of incompatible uses into residential neighborhoods through adequate buffers, screening, and zoning practices.

**Consistent.** Residents in the surrounding community have expressed concern that the project as proposed would result in the creation of a nuisance due to potential privacy intrusion and aesthetic affects due to alleged inadequate setbacks. This concern, among others, prompted the preparation of this DEIR. Based on the evaluation in >[4.2.3.2 "Land Use Compatibility"] below, it was determined that locating the backyards of single-family alternative detached dwellings adjacent to the backyards and side yards of existing single-family detached dwellings is a compatible use. The previously approved Pocket Road Manor Houses project (evaluated in Chapter 5 of this DEIR as Alternative A2) included 10-foot rear yard setbacks for two-story single-family alternative detached units abutting existing houses. For single-family alternative halfplexes on reverse frontage lots in other parts of Riverlake, rear yard setbacks were established at 7.5 feet. Reverse frontage lots occur when the backyard of a halfplex unit on a corner lot abuts the side yard of an interior lot or key lot (see Chapter 9 of this DEIR for a glossary of terms). The proposed project would have rear yard setbacks of 12 feet from the house and 10 feet from the garage. This meets or exceeds setbacks established for other reverse frontage single-family alternative R-1A zoned developments in Riverlake abutting standard single-family R-1 zoned developments. The setbacks are considered adequate to provide necessary screening and privacy for residents of both housing types. The proposed project design avoids placing two-story units adjacent to existing houses on abutting lots. This design

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

feature was included to avoid privacy intrusions resulting from locating second-story windows overlooking the adjacent houses.

Policy 7: Protect and preserve architectural, cultural, and historic structures through the existing preservation program.

**Consistent.** With implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 the project will preserve any previously unidentified architectural, cultural, and historic structures found during the course of construction.

Policy 8: Establish guidelines for residential development fronting on a major street.

**Consistent.** The proposed project is visible from Pocket Road (a major street). The LPPT PUD Development Guidelines specifies that development must address the street. The homes front a private internal street. However, the project is designed so homes appear to face both Pocket Road and the private street. An evaluation of project consistency with the City's Single-Family Residential Design Principles (City of Sacramento September 2000) is in Section 4.1 "Aesthetics, Shade, and Privacy."

**Goal B: Provide affordable housing opportunities for all income levels throughout the City.**

**Consistent.** The proposed project helps the City meet this goal. The smaller houses on smaller lots proposed for the Islands at Riverlake project are expected to be more affordable than the large houses on large lots that are typical in Riverlake. The City determined that the project is not required to provide housing affordable to low-income families. The garden apartments and halfplexes in the LPPT PUD, as well as apartments, condominiums, townhouses, and halfplexes in the Pocket community, provide a range of housing opportunities for a range of income levels.

Policy 1: Establish methods to provide more balanced housing opportunities in communities that lack a full range of housing opportunities.

**Consistent.** The Islands at Riverlake Project provides housing at a density approved under the LPPT PUD. The proposed project contributes to a range of housing opportunities that are available in the Pocket community. The project provides a housing opportunity to people who seek single-family alternative housing in the form of detached units on individually owned lots with small yards. Single-family alternative housing provides ownership opportunities different than condominiums or apartments because the lots are individually owned and there would be no shared walls.

Policy 2: Support existing programs, which provide affordable housing opportunities for lower income households and seek new ways to increase this housing type.

**Not Applicable.** The proposed project is not required by the City to provide deed-restricted affordable housing. However, the smaller houses on smaller lots proposed for the project are expected to be more affordable than the larger houses on larger lots that are typical in Riverlake. The City has programs and policies for developing, implementing, and operating programs that seek development of deed-restricted affordable housing for lower income levels.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

Policy 3: Develop a monitoring system to track residential development in each Community Plan area and to determine build out of each type of residential use category.

**Not applicable.** This policy refers to a program-level policy and is not applicable to an individual project such as the proposed project.

Policy 4: Continue to prohibit the conversion of rental housing into condominiums in Community Plan areas where the rental vacancy rate is 5% or less when measures have not been provided to mitigate the loss of rental housing in the area.

**Not applicable.** The proposed project does not involve the conversion of rental housing to condominiums.

**Goal C: Develop residential land uses in a manner, which is efficient and utilizes existing and planned urban resources.**

**Consistent.** The Islands at Riverlake Project is a residential development within the LPPT PUD. Development of this site has been anticipated since the LPPT PUD was approved in 1985. The Pocket Road Manor Houses project was approved in 1987 and the Riverlake Park Homes project was approved in 1994. This project would connect to and utilize existing road, sewer, storm water drainage, and potable water infrastructure designed and constructed to serve the maximum capacity of 2,953 dwelling units identified on the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan.

Policy 1: Identify areas where increased densities, land use changes or mixed uses would help support existing services, transportation facilities, and light rail. Then proceed with necessary General Plan land use changes for property with service capacities adequate to support more intensive residential development.

**Consistent.** The proposed project would facilitate pedestrian activity, through its passive use mini-parks, to the Linear Parkway and Pocket Road. Bus stops located along Pocket Road adjacent to the project site provide access to Route 3, the "Riverside Express," for service to downtown and the local Route 226 "Pocket/Riverside Boulevard" for service to the Rush River Transit Center. Route 56 "Valley Hi" stops at the Transit Center on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road. Route 56 also provides connecting service to the Rush River Transit Center. The Rush River Transit Center provides connecting service to Routes 2, 6, 7, 56, and 62.

The Islands at Riverlake Project does not seek a General Plan land use amendment or a zoning map change. It does seek amendments to the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines and PACP-SPSP text to clarify that the "Townhouse and Related Development" designation in those documents is intended to encompass the full range of housing products allowed under the City's R-1A zone. The SACOG Blueprint designates this site for "small lot single-family" development, which this project provides. The PUD and community plan/specific plan amendments requested as part of the project would help to clarify the types of "more intensive residential development" that the City believes are already allowed by the existing zoning map designation of the site.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

Policy 2: Identify areas of potential change where higher density development would be appropriate along major thoroughfares, commercial strips, and near light rail stations, and modify plans to accommodate this change.

**Consistent.** The residential density planned and zoned for this site is appropriate within the context of the Riverlake and the Pocket community. The Islands at Riverlake Project does not seek General Plan or Community Plan land use amendments or a zoning map change.

Policy 3: Modify the Subdivision Ordinance to accommodate smaller lot sizes for single-family development.

**Not Applicable.** This policy refers to a program-level policy and is not applicable to an individual project such as the proposed project. However, the proposed project, through R-1A zoning, accomplishes the City's goal of smaller lot sizes for single-family dwellings. Smaller lot sizes are allowed under the R-1A zoning designation of the project site.

Policy 4: Promote infill development as a means to meet future housing needs by expanding the benefits for this type of development and actively promote infill development in identified infill areas through outreach programs designed to inform the development community and property owners of this program.

**Not applicable.** This policy refers to a program-level policy and is not applicable to an individual project such as the proposed project. While the project site does not meet the City's General Plan definition of infill, it meets the definition of an "infill site" set forth in the Public Resources Code section 21061.0.5. The proposed project helps to meet future housing needs by providing 139 new residential dwelling units at a slightly lower density that was anticipated by the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan (7.15 dwelling units per net acre proposed versus 8 dwelling units per net acre anticipated).

Policy 5: Continue to support existing efforts to provide varied housing opportunities by allowing secondary units on single-family lots (Granny Flat Ordinance) and deep lot provisions which allow further development of excessively large lots.

**Not applicable.** The lot sizes and configurations for the Islands at Riverlake would not accommodate the construction of secondary units on the parcels. The proposed project would not prevent the construction of secondary units on large lots in other parts of the City.

Policy 6: Continue to support redevelopment and rehabilitation efforts that add new and reconditioned units to the housing stock while eliminating neighborhood blight and deterioration.

**Not Applicable.** The proposed project is a new single-family alternative housing project and does not involve renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation. The Islands at Riverlake Project does not conflict with renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation projects planned or occurring in other parts of the City.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

**Goal D: Maintain orderly residential growth in areas where urban services are readily available or can be provided in an efficient, cost-effective manner.**

**Consistent.** The City determined that urban services were adequate to accommodate development of 2,953 residential dwelling units when it approved the LPPT PUD. Since the PUD was approved, road, sewer, storm water, potable water facilities and infrastructure has been built and 1,658 residential dwelling units have been constructed. The proposed project would build 25 fewer residential units on the project site than were anticipated for the site under the original LPPT PUD Schematic Plan. Because Riverlake and the Islands at Riverlake have fewer residential units than were originally planned, urban services capacity is considered adequate for the proposed project.

Policy 1: Consider a joint City Council/Yolo, City Council/West Sacramento, and Sacramento County/Board of Supervisors task force to develop an effective process to ensure coordinated planning between the City and neighboring jurisdiction.

**Not applicable.** The project is not located on or next to a jurisdictional boundary. The proposed project does not preclude the City from coordinating planning efforts with neighboring jurisdictions.

Policy 2: Approve residential development only where City services are provided in a manner that meets the needs of the proposed development.

**Consistent.** Riverlake and the Islands at Riverlake will have fewer residential units than were anticipated in the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan. Public services are available and adequate to accommodate the proposed project.

**Goal E: Provide appropriate residential opportunities to meet the City's required fair share of the region's housing needs.**

**Consistent.** This project helps the City meet this goal by contributing 139 new residential opportunities to the region. The original LPPT PUD Schematic Plan provided a variety of residential types with different ownership opportunities to ensure housing opportunities for different economic groups. Over the years, standard R-1 zone houses, halfplexes, garden apartments, and senior housing have been constructed in the PUD. The proposed project nearly achieves the target density of eight dwelling units designated by the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan for the project site. The proposed project offers a housing type that is different than "Single-Family R-1" products, halfplexes, and garden apartments. The smaller houses on smaller lots in the proposed project are expected to sell for less than the typically larger houses on larger lots in Riverlake. Based on the evaluation under impacts LAN-1 and LAN-2, the proposed project is consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Preferred Scenario for 2050, the SACOG Growth Principles, and the City's Smart Growth Principles.

Policy 1: Provide housing opportunities in newly developing communities and in large mixed-use developments in an effort to reduce travel time to and from employment centers.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

**Not Applicable.** The proposed project would occur in the PACP area of Sacramento. The PACP area is approaching build out and is not considered a newly developing community. The Islands at Riverlake Project would not conflict with City planning efforts to approve residential development in large mixed-use developments.

Policy 2: Use mixed-use housing and employment centers to help meet housing needs and reduce traffic in new development within the City.

**Not Applicable.** By approving the LPPT PUD, the City determined that residential development within the PUD satisfies the balance of land uses in the Pocket community. The project site was designated for residential development in the original entitlement phase of the LPPT PUD. The City determined that any residential development not exceeding the maximum density of 8 dwelling units per acre would satisfy the housing balance in the City.

Policy 3. Establish guidelines for mixed-use projects and allow these uses in urbanized areas of the City where intensive development is planned.

**Consistent.** The LPPT PUD is a mixed-use project. The Islands at Riverlake project is a residential land use component of the PUD. The LPPT PUD Development Guidelines were approved by the City to establish mixed-use development in Riverlake.

### **Housing Element**

**Goal 1 – Housing Supply: Provide adequate housing sites and opportunities for all households.**

Policy 1.A: The City of Sacramento shall adopt policies, programs and procedures with the intent of achieving its regional fair share housing allocation of affordable housing for all income groups of the City.

**Not Applicable.** By providing 139 new homes, the Islands at Riverlake project helps meet the City's projected housing needs. The project provides homes to a range of income levels. The City determined that the project is not required to provide housing affordable to low-income families because the Pocket community provides affordable housing opportunities.

Policy 1.B: The City shall maintain an adequate supply of appropriately zoned land with public services to accommodate the projected housing needs in accordance with the General Plan as updated.

**Consistent.** The Islands at Riverlake Project is a residential development within the LPPT PUD. Development of this site at the proposed density has been anticipated since the LPPT PUD was approved in 1985. The Pocket Road Manor Houses project was approved in 1987. The Riverlake Park Homes project was approved in 1994. This development would use existing resources and services.

Policy 1.C: The City shall ensure that its adopted policies, regulations and procedures do not add unnecessarily to the cost of housing while still attaining other important City objectives.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

**Consistent.** The proposed project application has been processed and evaluated according to the State Planning and Zoning Law, CEQA, and the City's planning policies and procedures.

Policy 1.D: The City shall consider housing opportunities as part of the planning and implementation process for newly annexed or newly developing areas as well as for re-use and intensification areas.

**Not Applicable.** The proposed project is located in an incorporated area of the City. The project is not located in a newly annexed, newly developing area, or area designated for re-use and intensification.

Policy 1.E: The City shall continue to promote appropriate and compatible infill housing.

**Consistent.** Although the project site exceeds the five-acre limit to satisfy the City's definition of an "infill development," the project site meets the definition of an "infill site" set forth in Public Resources Code section 21061.0.5, and complies with the SACOG Blueprint recommendation to site new, compact residential development within the City's urban core.

Policy 1.F: The City shall continue to develop and support transit oriented residential development along transit corridors.

**Consistent.** The proposed project would facilitate pedestrian access, through its passive use mini-parks, to the Linear Parkway and Pocket Road. Transit Centers are located on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road and on Pocket Road at the intersection with Greenhaven Drive. Bus stops located along Pocket Road adjacent to the project site provide access to Route 3, the "Riverside Express," for service to downtown and the local Route 226 "Pocket/Riverside Boulevard" for service to the Rush River Transit Center. Route 56 "Valley Hi" stops at the Transit Center on Greenhaven Drive at the intersection with Pocket Road. Route 56 also provides connecting service to the Rush River Transit Center. The Rush River Transit Center provides connecting service to Routes 2, 6, 7, 56, and 62.

Policy 1.G: The City shall continue to support well designed and compatible second units and carriage homes, and other non-conventional housing opportunities such as artist live-work spaces.

**Consistent.** The LPPT PUD uses the narrative phrase "Townhouse and Related Development" to describe the range of housing types compatible with the R-1A zone. The PACP-SPSP describes Townhouse and Related Development as an alternative housing opportunity for people who do not want to live in conventional homes or apartments (PACP-SPSP 10). The City General Plan, zoning code, PACP-SPSP, and LPPT PUD do not define "Townhouse and Related Development," other than to limit the maximum density of dwelling units per net acre, while requiring R-1A housing to be compatible with R-1, as demonstrated by the requirement to obtain a Special Permit.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

The Islands at Riverlake project is a non-conventional housing opportunity because it provides for individual ownership and the increase in privacy that results from not having the common walls of an attached housing product, without requiring the upkeep of additional yard space that would be associated with R-1 standard housing developments.

Policy 1.H: The City will continue to offer and implement density bonus provisions for qualifying projects including single family, multi-family, senior housing and other types of housing.

**Not applicable.** Under Sacramento City Code Title 17, section 186, the City offers density bonuses, such as reduced minimum lot sizes, reduced minimum setbacks, increased maximum lot coverage, etc, for housing projects for lower income, very low income, and senior households. The applicant is not seeking a density bonus. The project is consistent with the density allowed in the SGPU, PACP-SPSP, LPPT PUD for "Townhouse and Related Development," and R-1A zone for this site.

Policy 1.I: The City shall continue programs to ensure the retention of mobile home parks.

**Consistent.** The proposed project is located on a vacant lot designated for Low Density Residential (4-15 dwelling units per acre). The project will not cause the loss of a mobile home park.

Policy 1.J: The City shall continue to monitor the conversion of rental housing to condominiums to protect the rental housing supply.

**Consistent.** The proposed project is located on a vacant lot designated for Low Density Residential (4-15 dwelling units per acre). The project will not cause conversion of rental housing to condominiums.

**Goal 2 – Housing Affordability: Provide housing assistance to low and moderate income households.**

Policy 2.A: The City shall continue to increase affordable housing opportunities in new growth areas by implementing the Mixed Income Housing Ordinance and other programs to ensure an equitable distribution of affordable housing throughout Sacramento communities.

**Not applicable.** The project site does not meet the definition of a new growth area. The City determined that the project is not required to provide housing affordable to low-income families because the Pocket community provides affordable housing opportunities.

Policy 2.B: The City shall support programs that increase owner-occupancy rates, such as down payment assistance and mortgage credit certificates for low-income households who are first-time home buyers.

**Not applicable.** This policy is directed to assist first-time home buyers rather than assisting builders of residential developments.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

Policy 2.C: The City shall continue to provide appropriate financial and development incentives to rehabilitate deteriorated housing and promote new development of affordable housing and to seek new sources of funding for these purposes.

**Not applicable.** The City determined that the project is not required to provide housing affordable to low-income families because the Pocket community provides affordable housing opportunities. The applicant is not seeking to take advantage of the development incentives for new development of affordable housing.

Policy 2.D: The City shall continue to support community based nonprofit organizations that develop affordable housing and provide supportive services for special needs populations.

**Not applicable.** The applicant is not a nonprofit organization.

Policy 2.E: The City and SHRA shall aggressively pursue and maximize the use of Housing Trust Fund, tax increment, and all appropriate state, federal, and private funding for the development and rehabilitation of housing affordable to very low, low, and moderate income people. Housing Trust Fund fee increases will be proposed for the first time in accordance with the provisions of the trust fund ordinance to help remedy the increasing gap in housing affordability.

**Not applicable.** Under Sacramento City Code Title 17, Section 188, the City collects fees from nonresidential development projects for the purpose of construction of new or rehabilitation of existing housing for very low to moderate income people. The Islands at Riverlake project is a residential project.

**Goal 3 – Housing Mix, Balance, and Neighborhood Compatibility: Promote a variety of housing types within neighborhoods to encourage economic diversity and housing choice.**

Policy 3.A: The City shall take into account, in future community plan updates, including fair share housing needs within each neighborhood. As appropriate, include policies that encourage development of a variety of housing types in large subdivisions.

**Consistent.** The City of Sacramento established the Planned Unit Development (PUD) zone to provide for the design of integrated developments. The intent of a PUD is to encourage the design of well-planned facilities, which offer a variety of housing and other land uses through creative and imaginative planning. The City approved LPPT PUD (City Council Resolution dated 20 August 1985) with a Schematic Plan that provides a variety of housing types, including single-family, townhouse and related development, multi-family apartments, and elderly care. On 9 October 1986, the City Planning Commission approved the rezone of corner lots in the Single-Family (R-1) designated subdivisions of Southshore and Stillwater from R-1 to R-1A for the development of halfplexes. Over the last 20 years, a variety of housing types have been constructed in the LPPT PUD. As of April 2005 in the LPPT PUD, standard sing-family detached units have been constructed on R-1 zoned lots; single-family alternative attached halfplexes have been constructed on R-1A zoned lots; nonstandard single-family detached units have been constructed on R-1A zoned lots; and apartments have been constructed. The proposed project provides a different

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

type of housing in the LPPT PUD than the housing types previously built. The project proposes modest sized homes (relative to standard single-family detached units built on R-1 zoned lots) with smaller than typical sized yards.

Policy 3.B: The City shall encourage the development of a variety of housing styles and lot sizes to accommodate residents who wish to "move-up" within their community plan area.

**Consistent.** The project provides an opportunity for people who want to own a single-family home with a small yard and do not want to own a condominium or live in an apartment.

**Goal 4 – Mitigate Governmental and Nongovernmental Constraints in the Development and Assistance of Housing.**

Policy 4.A: The City shall continue to streamline the permit application process to reduce the length of time for review and approval.

**Consistent.** The proposed project application has been processed and evaluated according to the State Planning and Zoning Law, CEQA, and the City's planning policies and procedures.

Policy 4.B: The City shall provide for early notification and consultation with appropriate neighborhood organizations to facilitate resolution of land use issues.

**Consistent.** The City provided early notification and consultation with the Riverlake Community Association, Riverlake Architectural Review Committee, and the Pocket Protectors. The City actively facilitated involvement of all the stakeholders throughout the project review and approval process. The applicant met with the RCA and community members 18 times throughout the original planning and approval process for the proposed project. Public hearings will be held regarding this DEIR and the current application for entitlements.

Policy 4.C: The City shall continue to require adequate flood protection when approving new development.

**Consistent.** The proposed project would construct 139 single-family houses in a 100-year floodplain. The project site is mapped in the A99 overlay on the FIRM.

All permits and entitlements are required to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Flood Management Plan (CMFP; Sacramento City Code Title 17, Section 156). Pursuant to the CFMP, the project would be conditioned to identify public refuge locations or have a minimum of 50% of the residential units with the entire roof having a maximum roof pitch of 4:12 or have a floor level at least one foot above the rescue flood elevation (14.4 feet). Under Sacramento City Code Title 15, Section 104, Floodplain Management Regulations, the project would be required at the time of the first Certificate of Occupancy to provide methods of protection against flood damage. Sacramento City Code Title 15 Section 108 Floodplain Risk Notification establishes mechanisms whereby persons seeking to build within the A99 zone on the FIRM may be notified of the risk of flooding.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

The flood-related risks created by locating the proposed project in a 100-year flood plain fall within the scope of the Land Use Planning Policy Within the 100-Year Floodplain (M89-054) Program EIR. Accordingly, the Findings of Fact/Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Land Use Planning Policy Within the 100-Year Floodplain in the City of Sacramento for the potentially significant impacts evaluated in the Program EIR and adoption of the Policy are applicable to the Islands at Riverlake project. Adherence to the CFMP and Sacramento City Code regulations reduces flood related risks to the maximum extent practicable and no other mitigation measures are needed.

Policy 4.D: The City shall amend the zoning ordinance to establish clear development standards, review and approval procedures for a variety of housing types, including but not limited to multi family housing and emergency shelters.

**Consistent.** The project is consistent with the development standards for the R-1A zone. A discussion of consistency with the Sacramento City Code is below. A discussion of the project's consistency with the Single-Family Residential Design Principles (City of Sacramento September 2000) is in Section 4.1 Aesthetics, Shade, and Privacy.

Policy 4.E: The City shall continue to remove barriers to new housing development through land use planning and zoning updates, permit streamlining and planning and implementation of infrastructure improvements necessary for new development.

**Consistent.** The proposed project application has been processed and evaluated according to the State Planning and Zoning Law, CEQA, and the City's planning policies and procedures. Infrastructure is available for development of the project site.

**Goal 5 – Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement**

Policy 5.A: The City shall expand the design review program to encourage residential development of high architectural and structural quality which is compatible with neighboring land uses.

**Consistent.** Projects in Riverlake undergo review by the Riverlake Community Association and Architectural Control Committee to ensure that they fit with the theme of Riverlake and are designed to the quality standards of the neighborhood. A discussion of the project's compatibility with the existing community is in Section >[4.3.1] "Land Use Compatibility" below.

Policy 5.B: The City shall continue to work with neighborhood residents in ensuring that all our neighborhoods are safe, decent and pleasant places to live and work. This includes working with schools, community oriented policing, addressing problem properties, and ensuring new development is compatible with existing neighborhoods.

**Consistent.** The City provided early notification and consultation with the Riverlake Community Association, Riverlake Architectural Control Committee, and the Pocket Protectors. The City actively facilitated involvement of all the stakeholders throughout the project review and approval process. A discussion of the project's

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

compatibility with the existing community is in Section >[4.3.1] "Land Use Compatibility" below.

Policy 5.C: As a municipal government, the City of Sacramento shall continue to develop new means of including the community and neighborhoods in the planning and delivery of public services.

**Consistent.** The City actively facilitated involvement of all the stakeholders throughout the project review and approval process.

Policy 5.D: Promote quality residential infill development in infill areas or designated infill sites through flexible development standards.

**Consistent.** Although the project site does not meet the City's General Plan definition of infill development because the site exceeds 20 acres and is not located in a designated infill area, it does meet the definition of an "infill site" set forth in Public Resources Code section 21061.0.5, and exemplifies the SACOG Blueprint recommendation to site new, compact residential development within the City's urban core.

Policy 5.E: Implement citywide single-family design guidelines in project reviews process.

**Consistent.** A discussion of project consistency with the Single-Family Residential Design Principles (City of Sacramento September 2000) is in Section 4.1 Aesthetics, Shade, and Privacy.

**Goal 6 – Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing.**

Policy 6.A: Revitalize and improve the quality of existing Sacramento neighborhoods.

**Consistent.** Adherence to the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines, site plan and design review by the Riverlake Community Association and Architectural Control Committee, City of Sacramento Planning and Building Department, and Planning Commission ensures that the character of the Riverlake and the Pocket communities are protected and preserved. Riverlake Community Association participation in the maintenance of the project would help ensure that the quality of Riverlake is maintained.

Policy 6.B: Maintain programs to retain the existing assisted housing stock (opt-out units), which may be converted to market rate housing.

**Not applicable.** The proposed project provides new, non-assisted housing on a vacant site. The project would not influence the retention of assisted housing stock.

Policy 6.C: Provide programs to preserve the existing stock of single room occupancy units (SROs) or their replacement and accessibility to SRO tenants.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

**Not applicable.** The proposed project provides new single-family alternative residential housing. No single room occupancy units are included. The project would not influence the retention of single room occupancy units.

Policy 6.D: Develop priorities for the repair, upgrading, or replacement of substandard mobile home parks.

**Not applicable.** The proposed project is located on a vacant lot designated for Low Density Residential (4-15 dwelling units per acre) in the SGPU. The project will not restrict the repair, upgrade, or replacement of substandard mobile home parks.

Policy 6.E: Monitor the conversion of rental housing to condominiums to protect the rental housing supply.

**Not applicable.** The proposed project is a new residential subdivision. It will not result in the conversion of rental housing to condominiums.

Policy 6.F: Preserve landmark and historic residential buildings within financial feasibility constraints.

**Not applicable.** The project site is vacant. There are no landmark or historic residential buildings in the project site to be preserved.

Policy 6.G: Develop a motel/hotel conversion program for permanent housing.

**Not applicable.** The project site is vacant. There is no opportunity for the conversion of any motel/hotel for permanent housing for the proposed project.

**Goal 7 – Preserve and Develop Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs.**

Policy 7.A: Provide financing for housing that serves the homeless and support programs that address the causes of homelessness.

**Not applicable.** This policy is directed toward providing assistance and support to emergency shelters and nonprofit organizations for the purpose of addressing housing the homeless.

Policy 7.B: Encourage a variety of housing programs that address special housing needs, including the disabled.

**Consistent.** No guidelines are in place to make reasonable accommodations a requirement of housing design. The project will repair or reconstruct non-ADA compliant handicapped ramps at the following locations:

- On both sides of Dutra Bend along the walkway, including the ramps on both sides of the median island;
- The northwest corner of East Shore Drive;
- The entire intersection of West Shore Drive and Pocket Road as part of the signal design and construction; and

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

- At all new driveway cuts.

**Goal 8 – Energy Conservation.**

Policy 8.A: Wherever possible, develop, incorporate and support energy conserving programs in the production and rehabilitation of housing to improve the environment and reduce household energy costs.

**Consistent.** The project will be constructed in accordance with current building practices and standards.

**Goal 9 – Promote Equal Housing Opportunity.**

Policy 9.A: Encourage economic integration, fair housing opportunity and the elimination of discrimination against households with special needs.

**Consistent.** The proposed project provides homes to a range of income levels. The project will not discriminate against households with special needs.

Policy 9.B: Increase affordable housing opportunities in new developments and implement a fair share distribution of affordable housing units throughout Sacramento communities.

**Consistent.** The City's affordable housing ordinance applies only to new growth areas. The Pocket community provides a range of housing opportunities for a range of income levels.

Policy 9.C: The City should work in conjunction with other Sacramento area jurisdictions and agencies to develop a region-wide approach to provide affordable housing for all households.

**Not applicable.** The proposed project does not preclude the City from coordinating planning efforts with neighboring jurisdictions.

**Goal 10 – Monitor and Coordinate Housing Performance.**

Policy 10.A: Monitor implementation of Housing Element objectives and measures.

**Not applicable.** Monitoring implementation of the Housing Element is a requirement on the City, not on the applicant.

Significance: The project is consistent with all of the applicable Sacramento General Plan land use goals and policies. Therefore, Impact LAN-4 is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

**4.1.4.3 Pocket Area Community Plan**

**LAN-5 Impact:** Inconsistency with the Pocket Area Community Plan (PACP) Land Use Designation could result in a potentially significant land use impact on the Pocket Community in the City of Sacramento.

**Analysis:** The project site is designated Residential (7-15 dwelling units per net acre) on the December 2003 PACP Land Use Map. The project would construct 7.15 residential units per net acre. No Community Plan land use map amendment is needed.

**Significance:** The project is consistent with the PACP Land Use Designation. Therefore, Impact LAN-5 is considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None required.

---

**LAN-6 Impact:** Inconsistency with Pocket Area Community Plan – South Pocket Specific Plan (PACP-SPSP) goals and policies could result in potentially significant land use impacts on the Pocket Community in the City of Sacramento.

**Analysis:** **Pocket Area Community Plan – South Pocket Specific Plan**

**Overall Community Growth Policy**

**Goal 1:** Set forth a specific land use plan which can be realistically implemented by:

- Utilizing the most effective and appropriate regulatory devices available to and consistent with the City's development policies.

**Consistent.** The project site was converted from agricultural use to urban use in 1985 (City Council Resolution adopted 20 August 1985) in accordance with the Pocket Area Community Plan – South Pocket Specific Plan. The City of Sacramento established the Planned Unit Development (PUD) zone to provide for the design of integrated developments. The intent of a PUD is to encourage the design of well-planned facilities, which offer a variety of housing and other land uses through creative and imaginative planning. The City approved the LPPT PUD Schematic Map and the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines (City of Sacramento 11 July 1985) when it adopted the LPPT PUD. The proposed project is consistent with the land use and density designated for the project site on the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan. The Development Guidelines are intended to provide for an interrelated total environment, which utilizes a common theme. The project is proposing an amendment to the Development Guidelines to clarify that the "Townhouse and Related development" (R-1A) designation allows the full range of residential uses allowed under the City zoning code for single-family residential alternative (R-1A). The project is consistent with the land use designation and density shown on the PACP Land Use Map. The project also proposes an amendment to the PACP to clarify that the housing products encompassed by "Townhouses and Related Development" are the range of housing products identified in the zoning code for the R-1A zone.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

Goal 2: Encourage the development of an attractive, healthy, and aesthetically pleasing living environment by:

- Encouraging suitable landscaping and design of all residential and commercial projects;

**Consistent.** The Islands at Riverlake project has been designed in accordance with the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines (City of Sacramento 11 July 1985) and the Single-Family Residential Design Principles (City of Sacramento 7 September 2000). These Guidelines require design features that enhance the attractiveness of the community such as architectural treatments, landscaping, and lighting standards. A Conceptual Landscape Plan prepared by Quadriga demonstrates that the front, side, and back yards of houses will be landscaped. The mini-parks and entryways will be landscaped and turf cell pavers (design typical provided in the Conceptual Landscaping Plan in Exhibit D of this DEIR) will be used to pave the driveways at the emergency access gates in order to soften the appearance of the hardscape.

- Providing adequate light and air easements adjoining the Sacramento River levee and I-5;

**Not applicable.** The project does not adjoin the Sacramento River levee and is located 2,000 feet west of I-5.

- Promoting a common architectural theme for each shopping center;

**Not applicable.** The project is not a shopping center.

- Requiring that all service utilities be made as attractive or unobtrusive as possible;

**Consistent.** All service utilities are underground.

- Protecting residents from excessive noise, traffic hazards, flooding and fire damage;

**Consistent.** The Islands at Riverlake Project would be built in accordance with the Sacramento City Code to ensure the safety of the development from noise, traffic hazards, and flooding and fire damage.

- And by encouraging the retention and protection of existing trees.

**Consistent.** The project retains 122 of the 167 trees surveyed by the ISA and City arborists. Approximately 200 trees occur in the Linear Parkway in the Riverlake Community Association landscape easement, which were not surveyed and because they are not going to be affected by the proposed project. The project will replace those three heritage trees removed (Tree numbers 17 and 18) or scheduled for removal from the project site (Tree Number NL #1) at a ratio of 1-inch diameter at breast height (DBH) for each 2 inches DBH of heritage trees removed. Table 6 lists the mitigation trees that are required to be planted.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

Goal 3: Provide for a wide range of residential styles and densities, which are compatible with each other and with this suburban community by:

- Controlling the concentration and location of each type of residential use;

**Consistent.** When the City approved the LPPT PUD (City Council Resolution dated 20 August 1985), the City made a finding that the concentration and location of the land use designations for each large lot subdivision was consistent with the PACP-SPSP. The Islands at Riverlake project site included parcels 21, 22, and 23. Parcels 21, 22, and 23 (the Islands at Riverlake project site) were designated for "Townhouse (R-1A)". The maximum density allowed by the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan for project site is eight dwelling units per acre. The proposed project is 7.15 dwelling units per acre. This project proposes an amendment to the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines zone to clarify that the full range of housing types allowed in the "Townhouse or related development" are the range of housing types defined in the Sacramento City zoning code: single-family attached or detached units, townhouses, cluster housing, condominiums, cooperatives or other similar projects.

- Permitting intermediate residential densities in transitional areas located between lower and higher densities;

**Consistent.** The City adopted the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan in 1985 with a finding that the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan would have less than significant environmental impacts. The project site was designated for 8 dwelling units per net acre and was located between Pocket Road and Single-Family (R-1) subdivisions that were designated for 3.7 up to 5 dwelling units per net acre. This density was considered an intermediate density. The project's proposed density is 7.15 dwelling units per net acre (139 residential units on the project site). The proposed number of dwelling units is 25 units less than the maximum number of dwelling units allowed under the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan. Because the project's proposed density is close to and does not exceed the maximum allowed density, it is considered consistent with the intermediate density designation.

- Encouraging well designed and constructed housing projects;

**Consistent.** The City adopted the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines to control the quality of development in Riverlake. The project includes a request to amend the PUD Development Guidelines to clarify that the "Townhouse and Related Development" (R-1A) designation is intended to allow the full range of housing products allowed under the R-1A zone. Other than this request, the proposed project has been designed to be consistent with the Development Guidelines. Projects in Riverlake undergo review by the Riverlake Community Association and Architectural Control Committee to ensure that they fit with the theme of Riverlake and are designed to the quality standards of the neighborhood.

The Riverlake Community Association withdrew endorsement of the proposed project in 2003 because the City required modifications to the private street alignment. The Riverlake Community Association endorsed an early design that allowed a 25-foot wide street alignment. The City conditioned the project to provide a four-foot-wide sidewalk in a public utilities easement on the interior lots. To provide the sidewalk,

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

the street width was reduced from 25 feet wide to 22 feet wide (9-foot wide travel lanes and two-foot-wide rolled curb and gutter on each side to provide 20 feet of level surface). The Riverlake Community Association withdrew its endorsement because of the reduced street width. No comment letter was received from the Riverlake Community Association in response to the Notice of Preparation.

- Preventing the intrusion of incompatible uses into residential areas;

**Consistent.** The City approved residential development on these lots in 1985. The proposed project is a residential project in a residential area.

- And by requiring adequate setback, height, and area considerations in the placement of residential structures on a site.

**Consistent.** The project site is zoned R-1A. In the R-1A zone (SCC Title 17.60.020), the minimum yard requirements, maximum lot coverage and minimum lot area per dwelling unit shall be the same as that specified in the R-1 zone, except that the planning commission may vary the provisions in their review and determination of the required special permit. In no case, shall the density of a project in the R-1A zone exceed 15 dwelling units per net acre.

For the R-1 zone (SCC Title 17.60.020), maximum height is 35 feet; the minimum front yard setback is variable not to exceed 25 feet (not applicable in Riverlake because the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines specify a minimum 20-foot front yard setback); the minimum rear yard setback is 15 feet; the minimum interior side yard setback is 5 feet; the minimum street side, side yard setback is 12.5 feet; maximum lot coverage is 40%; and the minimum lot size in square feet is 5,200 square feet.

The project site is zoned R-1A because the shape of the property does not allow development of the site at the specified density (7-15 dwelling units per acre in the PACP-SPSP) with the R-1 development standards. Of particular community concern by the project opponents for the Islands at Riverlake project has been the rear yard setbacks of the interior lots adjacent to existing R-1 single-family houses.

Since the LPPT-PUD was adopted in 1985, the City has established rear yard setbacks for R-1A reverse frontage lots with R-1A halfplex units abutting R-1 standard houses. As provided in the Chapter 9 "Glossary" in this DEIR, "Reverse frontage lots" is the situation where the rear lot line of a corner lot is contiguous to the side lot line of the adjacent interior lot (SCC Section 17.16.010). On 9 October 1986, the City Planning Commission approved P86-395 to rezone the corner lots in Southshore from R-1 to R-1A and P86-396 to rezone the corner lots in Stillwater to R-1A. Under the Land Use project evaluation for these projects, the staff report states, "The applicant has requested a special permit, under a special permit to establish halfplex design criteria for halfplexes in the LPPT project." The special permit application, P86-432, was approved by the City Planning Commission on 31 October 1986. The approved project P86-432 was for halfplex development the corner lots of Dutra Bend, Cobble Shores, Handover Bend (now known as Bridgeview), Southshore, and Stillwater only. The minimum rear yard setback for reverse frontage lots in these subdivisions was set at 7.5 feet for the first floor and 15 feet for the second floor. The minimum side yard setback was set at 5 feet and the minimum street side yard setback was set at 12.5 feet.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

Bridgeview, Southshore, and Dutra Bend are adjacent to the project site (Figure 4 Riverlake Lot Map).

In 1988, the City Planning Commission approved halfplexes (P88-136) with required minimum rear yard setbacks of 10 feet. The City Planning Commission approved the following halfplexes projects based on the 7.5-foot rear yard setbacks established in the P86-432 approval: P88-364, P89-98, P89-99, P91-121, P92-209, and P92-136). The City Planning Commission approved the following halfplexes projects based on the 10-foot rear yard setbacks established in the P88-136 approval: P89-208, P92-209, P92-210, and P92-211.

The first subdivision proposed for the Islands at Riverlake project site included three separate applications (P87-129, P87-130, and P87-131). The City Council approved these projects, the "Pocket Road Manor Houses," on 10 May 1987. The Pocket Road Manor Houses were designed so that the residences were in three-unit clusters, with one two-story detached unit and another single-story unit attached to a two-story unit. The site plan showed the two-story detached unit located adjacent to the internal property line at places and a private road adjacent to the internal property line in other places (Figure 12 Pocket Road Manor Houses Site Plan). The rear yard setback established for the two-story detached unit was 10 feet, less than the setback proposed for the Islands at Riverlake project. A setback of five feet from the internal property line was established for the private road. This DEIR evaluates the previously approved Pocket Road Manor Houses project as Alternative 2 in Chapter 5 "Alternatives to the Proposed Project."

The Pocket Road Manor Houses project applicant requested that the City Planning Commission approve a two-year time extension in 1991. Between the time that the Pocket Road Manor Houses project was approved and the hearing in 1991, all 18 houses in Dutra Bend adjacent to the project site south of Pocket Road were constructed; 23 of the 29 houses in Southshore adjacent to the project site north of the Pocket Road were constructed; and 10 of the 11 houses in Bridgeview adjacent to the project site west of West Shore Drive were constructed. Table 4 lists the number of stories for each of these houses, describes the orientation of the house on the lot, and provides an estimated setback from the property line. No changes were proposed for the project, and the City Planning Commission approved the extension on 26 September 1991.

The rear yard setback from existing R-1 residential units proposed for the Islands at Riverlake project is 12 feet for the house and 10 feet for the garage. The City Planning Commission has approved R-1A residential rear yard setbacks for reverse frontage lots with halfplexes abutting standard R-1 lots ranging from 7.5 feet to 10 feet for the first floor and 15 feet for the second story of two-story units. The proposed project is within the range of previously approved reverse frontage lot setbacks for subdivisions abutting the project site and within the range of previously approved reverse frontage lot setbacks in the other Riverlake subdivisions.

Goal 4: Provide for safe, convenient, balanced and attractive commercial facilities to meet the needs of the South Pocket and adjacent neighborhoods:

- Prohibiting the development of strip commercial projects;
- Making shopping centers accessible to automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian users;

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

- Locating neighborhood and community shopping centers, business and professional office complexes, and highway commercial uses in service areas which do not duplicate one another;
- Ensuring that the quantity and function of commercial developments are closely related to the needs of the South Pocket and surrounding area residents; and by
- Ensuring that commercial developments have design and landscape features that are in harmony with their surrounding residential areas.

**Not applicable.** The Islands at Riverlake Project is a residential development and does not include commercial land uses.

Goal 5: Provide a safe, balanced, and efficient circulation system for motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by:

- Requiring adequate street widths to serve the anticipated needs of the South Pocket;

**Consistent.** The Islands at Riverlake Project proposes to construct a private road to provide access to the new residential units. The total width of the proposed road is 22 feet from outside edge of rolled curb to outside edge of rolled curb. Beginning from the outside edge of the rolled curb the curb measures one foot, the gutter measures one foot, and the travel lane measures nine feet, providing a total of 20 feet of level surface across the road. No on-street parking would be allowed. A four-foot wide sidewalk would be located in a public utilities easement on the interior lots.

The City standard local-residential street section is 53 feet wide. Beginning at the outside edge of the right-of-way, a standard local-residential street section consists of: a sidewalk measuring five feet, a planter strip measuring 6.5 feet, a parking lane measuring seven feet (gutter included in the parking lane width), and a travel lane measuring eight feet. Excluding the parking width, the total width for both travel lanes in standard local-residential streets is 16 feet. The Islands at Riverlake project proposes a private street with a total width for travel lanes of 18 feet, and no on-street parking will be allowed. Table 7 is a comparison of the City standard residential-local street section with the proposed private street section.

Table 7. Comparison of Standard Street Section and Proposed Subdivision Modification

	Range of Average Daily Traffic	Sidewalk (ft)	Planter measured to face of curb (ft)	Curb Type	Parking Lane (ft)	Bike Lane (ft)	Travel lanes (ft)	Median (ft)	Half Street (ft)	Total Right of Way Dedication (ft)
City Standard Local - Residential	0-4000	5	6.5	Vert	7	0	8	N/A	26.5	53
Proposed Subdivision Modification	Less than 4,000	4*	0	2 ft Rolled	0	0	9	N/A	11/15*	26**

Vert = Vertical curb; N/A = Not applicable

\* The street side fronting on Pocket Road would be 11 feet wide. The street side fronting on the interior lots would be 15 feet wide including the sidewalk.

\*\* There would be no right-of-way dedication to the City. The total of 26 feet includes 5-foot wide public utilities easement in which the sidewalk is located.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

Turn radii were designed in accordance with California Fire Code Section 902.2.2.3--Turning radius, which requires the turning radius of a fire apparatus access road shall be as required for an SU-30 design vehicle. The Federal Highway Administration defines an SU-30 design vehicle as a single unit truck. In "A Policy on the Geometric Design of Highways and Streets" (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Chapter 11) it states that a curb return radius of 40 feet provides a moderate speed turn for passenger vehicles (P) and a low-speed turn for SU-30 vehicles with minor lane encroachment. A curb return radius of 50 feet provides a moderate speed return for vehicles up to the size of semitrailers. The Islands at Riverlake project provides a curb return radius of 45. The City Public Works and City Fire Department reviewed the proposal and determined that the access proposed for the project will be sufficient for safety and convenience, provided that on-street parking is prohibited. The City Fire Department has final review and approval authority over the final improvement plans prior to issuance of the building permit.

Public comments on the Notice of Preparation requested that traffic circulation be evaluated in general and one comment requested that circulation at the intersection of East Shore Drive with Pocket Road be addressed (Michael and Catherine Pleschner email dated 29 March 2005, page 1). Traffic and circulation impacts were evaluated in the Initial Study prepared for this DEIR. The results of the analysis are provided above in section 4.1 "Less than Significant Impacts." With respect to the impact of the Islands at Riverlake project, the left turn from East Shore Drive onto Pocket Road functions within acceptable design parameters established by standard civil engineering design standards. The project would not connect to East Shore Drive, so the project does not change the East Shore Drive/ Pocket Road geometry nor increase traffic on East Shore Drive. The project is not expected to significantly impact the intersection.

Traffic counts conducted by the City of Sacramento on 10 April 2002 and 18 June 2002 revealed that the existing peak hour volumes and the average daily trips were approximately half of Pocket Road's designed capacity. The City estimated the number of vehicle trips and their distribution to the ingress/egress intersections along Pocket Road. Given the available capacity of Pocket Road and the dispersion of site trips between the five new driveways and West Shore Drive ingress/egress, impacts at any one location are not expected to rise to a level of significance. Section >[#] of this DEIR is an evaluation of potential transportation and circulation impacts and mitigation measures.

- Integrating the function of streets and off-street circulation ways with those of the surrounding urbanized neighborhoods;

**Consistent.** The project provides a four-foot sidewalk on one side of the private street located in a public utilities easement on the interior lots. Broom-finished concrete walkways through the mini-parks provide a connection with the City's sidewalk in the Linear Parkway. A three-foot wide broom-finished concrete pathway connects each house fronting Pocket Road with the walkway in the mini-parks. No direct pathway connection with the City sidewalk in the Linear Parkway would be provided from the houses fronting Pocket Road.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

- Designing streets with adequate bikeway corridors where off-street bikeways cannot be provided;

**Not applicable.** SCC section 18.04.190, Standard Street Sections, provides the right-of-way improvement standards applicable to land dedicated to the City for City streets. Street sections are graded by their range of average daily traffic. Local-residential has the lowest average daily traffic ranging from 0 to 4,000 daily trips. The highest average daily traffic rating is 6 Lane Arterial, ranging from 27,000 up to 48,000 daily trips. Pocket Road is designated a 4 Lane Arterial-No Parking with an average daily trip rating ranging from 14,000 up to 27,000 daily trips. The City does not require bike lanes for Local-Residential, Local-Commercial, or Local-Industrial streets. The City requires a six-foot wide bike lane be provided for Collector Minor-No Parking and larger streets. The range of average daily traffic for Collector Minor-No Parking is 4,000 up to 7,000 daily trips. The proposed private street would have average daily traffic below 4,000 trips. Therefore, the private road does not provide bike lanes.

There are bike lanes on both sides of Pocket Road, a 4 Lane Arterial-No Parking street, which would be accessible to residents of the proposed project via the proposed project's mini-parks.

- Linking commercial facilities and public facilities that generate high human activity with major and collector streets, and with park-open space corridors;

**Consistent.** The linear parkway provides linkage with commercial facilities east of the project site and Garcia Bend Park approximately one mile west of the project site and the project provides new connections to the Linear Parkway.

- Requiring that commercial and multiple family developments provide adequate off-street parking facilities;

**Not applicable.** The project is a single-family alternative residential subdivision, not commercial or multiple-family residential.

- Supporting and encouraging future bus service in the South Pocket with special emphasis on park and ride facilities;

**Consistent.** Bus service exists on Pocket Road adjacent to the project site. There are no park and ride facilities proposed for the project site.

- And by providing suitable access to the Sacramento River.

**Consistent.** The project is not adjacent to the Sacramento River. Garcia Bend Park provides access to the river and the proposed project is connected with Garcia Bend Park via existing sidewalks.

Goal 6: Provide park-open space, library, school, and fire station facilities to properly service and enhance the South Pocket and affected surrounding area by:

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

- Ensuring that these facilities are well placed to maximize their use and of sufficient size;

**Not applicable.** Public services and facilities are available to serve the proposed project. This project does not generate the need for new public service facilities.

- Requiring that the facilities have attractive landscaping and blend architecturally with the surrounding area;

**Not applicable.** Public services and facilities are available to serve the proposed project. This project does not generate the need for new public service facilities.

- Interfacing development with the Sacramento River in a manner which promotes the best use of this recreation resource;

**Not applicable.** The project does not interface with the Sacramento River.

- Encouraging multiple use of public facilities wherever possible;

**Consistent.** Currently the City's Linear Parkway is used by walkers, joggers, dog walkers, and cyclists. It is expected that residents of the proposed project would also use the Parkway for these purposes.

- And by ensuring that a continuous park-open space system is provided which links public facilities and activity centers wherever possible.

**Consistent.** Parks required by the increase of population were determined and provided by the LPPT PUD Master Plan. Garcia Bend Park, a community park approximately one mile west of the project site on Pocket Road, is accessible to the Islands at Riverlake Project by foot and by bicycle. Public services and facilities are available to serve the proposed project.

**Townhouses and Related Development (such as Cluster and Row Housing)**

Policy 1: Densities of townhouse, cluster, and row house developments should not exceed an average of eight units per net acre.

**Consistent.** The Islands at Riverlake Project would construct 139 units on 19.44 net acres. The density would be 7.15 units per net acre. This would also be consistent with the current PACP Land Use Map (December 2003), which designates the site for 7 – 15 dwelling units per net acre.

Policy 2: Townhouse developments should be designed to conform to major and collector street patterns.

**Consistent.** The Islands at Riverlake Project conforms to the pattern of Pocket Road, a major street. The Project also conforms to the collector street West Shore Drive. The proposed 22-foot wide private street would have ingress and egress access to Pocket Road via five new driveways and through a connection with West Shore

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

Drive. Emergency access would be available to the City Fire Department via East Shore Drive and Dutra Bend Drive.

Policy 3: Townhouse developments should be compatible with and not adversely affect the existing or proposed developments on surrounding parcels.

**Consistent.** The City General Plan, PACP-SPSP, and zoning code do not define the full range of housing products allowed under the "Townhouse and Related Development" designation, other than to limit the maximum density of dwelling units per net acre, while requiring R-1A housing to be compatible with R-1 development. The General Plan and zoning code define R-1A development as single-family individually owned attached or detached residences and might include, among other housing types, townhouses, cluster houses, and condominiums. The proposed project includes an amendment to the PACP-SPSP to clarify that the term "townhouse and related development" is intended to encompass the full range of housing products allowed under the R-1A zone. R-1A development is typically considered compatible with R-1 development. It is often used as a transition or buffer between R-1 standard lots and more dense or intense land uses such as major arterials, apartments, commercial, or retail.

"Townhouses and related development" housing products serve as alternative housing opportunities for people who do not want to live in conventional homes or apartments (PACP-SPSP 10). Because townhouses and related development are typically more compact than the traditional residential subdivision development, the PACP-SPSP requires that careful consideration should be given to location and design as it affects adjoining properties (PACP-SPSP 10 - 12). The townhouses and similar development types should be located along major and collector streets, or adjacent to apartments or commercial/office complexes. The proposed project is located along a major street and adjacent to offices. Parcels of unusual configuration are also appropriate for these uses (PACP-SPSP 12). City found the designation appropriate for the project site when it approved the Schematic Plan in 1985.

Policy 4: Site development plans for townhouses should integrate structures, common and private open spaces, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, parking, and other site features in such a way as to produce a development which provides for all desirable residential features and environmental amenities.

**Consistent.** The proposed project satisfies this policy by providing a site plan that integrates with existing development.

Policy 5: Townhouse developments adjacent to I-5 noise sources should be approved in accordance with noise standards and criteria established in the Noise Section of the PACP-SPSP.

**Not applicable.** The Islands at Riverlake Project is not adjacent to I-5 noise sources. No significant noise impacts were identified in "Environmental Noise Analysis, Islands at Riverlake Subdivision" (Brown-Buntin Associates 2002).

Policy 6: Townhouse developments located adjacent to the Sacramento River Parkway and the canal-parkway should conform to the generalized design concepts

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

shown in Diagram 1 and expressed in the Parks and Open Space Section of the PACP-SPSP.

**Not applicable.** The Islands at Riverlake Project is not located adjacent to the Sacramento River Parkway or the canal-parkway.

**Significance:** The project is consistent with the applicable land use goals and policies of the PACP-SPSP. The requested amendment to the text of the PACP-SPSP clarifies the long-standing interpretation of the City that the "townhouse and related development" designation overlying properties zoned R-1A is intended to allow the full range of housing types allowed under the R-1A zone. The amendment does not, therefore, pose a risk of generating any significant physical environmental impacts. Therefore, Impact LAN-6 is considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None required.

#### 4.1.4.4 LPPT PUD Schematic Map and Development Guidelines

**LAN-7 Impact:** Inconsistency with the LPPT PUD Schematic Map could result in a potentially significant land use impacts.

**Analysis:** **L and P – Pacific Teichert Planned Unit Development Schematic Plan**

The LPPT PUD Schematic Plan created 26 parcels and lists the net acreage of each parcel. The project site is parcel numbers 21 (5.4 net acres), 22 (11.2 net acres), and 23 (3.9 net acres). Approximately 1.06 net acres were removed for the Dutra Bend Drive intersection with Pocket Road. Therefore, the net acreage of the Islands at Riverlake project site, by which density consistency is calculated, is 19.44 net acres. Land uses are designated for each parcel. The Schematic Plan defines the maximum density for each parcel based on the net acreage. There are four types of residential uses designated in the LPPT PUD: Single Family (R-1), Townhouse (R-1A), Garden Apartment (R-2B), and Elderly Housing/Care Facility (R-4 and R-3). In Riverlake, eight parcels, including the three large parcels that make up the Islands at Riverlake project site, were designated for Townhouse R-1A. This project proposes an amendment to the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines that would clarify that the housing products allowed under the "Townhouse and related development" designation<sup>5</sup> are the same as those housing products allowed under the R-1A zone: single-family attached or detached units, townhouses, cluster housing, condominiums, cooperatives or other similar projects.

Density is a measurement of the number of dwelling units within a unit of area. The City of Sacramento bases its land use plans on density designations. The SGPU designates the project site as "Low Density Residential" (4 – 15 residential dwelling units per net acre). It designates the project site as "Medium Density Residential" (7 – 15 dwelling units per net acre). The LPPT PUD Schematic Plan designates the project site as "Townhouse (R-1A)" (8 dwelling units per net acre).

<sup>5</sup> The LPPT PUD Schematic Plan land use designation for the project site is "Townhouse (R-1A)" and the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines refer to "Townhouse or related development." It is the understanding of the City that no inconsistency was intended.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

To evaluate the residential land use density proposed in this project for consistency with the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan, it is necessary to establish a relationship of the project within the context of residential land use density in Riverlake. Using publicly available data from the Sacramento County Assessor's website, buildout of the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan was documented. The planning staff reports, City Council and City Planning Commission findings were reviewed for each project approved in Riverlake. The literature review was intended to document the land use decisions that were made as the Schematic Plan was implemented over time. Table 8 compares the original Schematic Plan with the number of units built as of April 2005.

Table 8. LPPT PUD Schematic Plan Build Out of Residential Land Uses

Schematic Map Parcel #	Adopted Land Use	Adopted Zoning	Acreage	Max. Assumed Density (du/acre)	Number of Dwelling Units	Neighborhood	Existing Conditions							Total Vacant Parcels	Existing Density (du/na)	
							Total Existing Parcels	Single R-1	Single R-1A	Halfplex R-1A	Duplex R-1A	Apt. R-2B	Total Dwelling Units			
1	Elderly Care	R-4	7	45	315	Northland	26	15	1	4				20	6	1.81*
2	Garden Apartment	R-2B	6.7	21.7	145	The Landing	1				145			145	4	21.7
3	Single Family	R-1	18.1	5	93	Bridgeview	118	70		44				114		6.3**
24	Townhouse	R-1A	5	10	50	Merged into Bridgeview										
4	Single Family	R-1	39.5	5	204	Southshore	141	102	8	29				139	3	3.5
5	Single Family	R-1	33.9	3.7	127	Cobble Shores	171	114	4	40	2			160	11	4.7
6	Townhouse	R-1A	18.2	15	183	Westshore	44	32	4	4				40	5	2.2
7	Single Family	R-1	28.9	3.8	112	Stillwater	113	78	15	10				103	10	3.6
8	Townhouse	R-1A	7.3	10	73	Stillwater A&B	36		36					36	0	4.9
9	Multifamily	R-3	11.4	29.7	339	Marina Cove	51	42	5					47	4	4.1
13	Recreation Center	R-1	3.1			Marina Cove										
10	Garden Apartment	R-2B	3.2	21.7	69	Northside	1							69		21.7
11	Garden Apartment	R-2B	7.5	21.7	183	The Crossing	1							163		21.7

Note: The existing density calculation is based on dividing the net acreage by the number of constructed dwelling units.

\* Density calculation includes 4-net acre Lot 20 that changed from Elderly Care (R-3) to Single Family (R-1).

\*\* Density calculation includes 5-net acre Lot 24 that changed from Townhouse and related (R-1A) to Single Family (R-1).

Table 8. LPPT PUD Schematic Plan Build Out of Residential Land Uses (continued)

Schematic Map Parcel #	1985 Schematic Plan										Existing Conditions				
	Adopted Land Use	Adopted Zoning	Acreage	Max. Assumed Density (du/acre)	Number of Dwelling Units (assumed on plan?)	Neighborhood	Total Existing Parcels	Single R-1	Single R-1A	Halfplex R-1A	Duplex R-1A	Apt. R-2B	Total Dwelling Units	Total Vacant Parcels	Existing Density (du/na)
12	Townhouse	R-1A	11.7	10	117	Eastshore	49	29	6			35	14	3	
14	Specialty Commercial	C-1 Restricted	4.7			The Village									
15	Single Family	R-1	38	3.7	137	Dutrabend	150	108	34	2		147	4	3.9	
16	Garden Apartment	R-2B	8.9	21.7	193	Shore Park	1				193	193		21.7	
17	Garden Apartment	R-2B	9.2	21.7	200	Shore Park	1				200	200		21.7	
18	Townhouse	R-1A	15	10	150	Oakshore	56	42	6			52	4	3.5	
19	Daycare	R-1	0.5												
20	Elderly	R-3	4	29.7	119	Merged into Northland									
21	Townhouse	R-1A	5.4	8	43	Islands at Riverlake	3						3		
22	Townhouse	R-1A	11.2	8	90	Islands at Riverlake	2						2		
23	Townhouse	R-1A	3.9	8	31	Islands at Riverlake	1						1		
25	Lake	A-08	30.3												
26	Lake	A-08	0.8												
Totals			333.4		2973		966	603	109	138	2	770	1658	71	5

Note: The existing density calculation is based on dividing the net acreage by the number of constructed dwelling units.

\* Density calculation includes 4-net acre Lot 20 that changed from Elderly Care (R-3) to Single Family (R-1).

\*\* Density calculation includes 5-net acre Lot 24 that changed from Townhouse and related (R-1A) to Single Family (R-1).

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

The LPPT PUD Schematic Plan identified that the maximum number of dwelling units for the plan area was 2,973. Of that original number, 737 dwelling units could have been Townhouse (R-1A) development (164 dwelling units designated for the Islands at Riverlake parcels). Approximately 25% of the maximum number of dwelling units shown on the original Schematic Plan could have been Townhouse (R-1A) development (6% of the total Townhouse (R-1A) units were designated for the Islands at Riverlake parcels). As of April 2005, there were 1,658 constructed dwelling units including standard R-1 detached units, nonstandard R-1A detached units, nonstandard R-1A attached units, and apartments. No Townhouse (R-1A) or Elderly Care housing types been built.

There are 71 vacant parcels in Riverlake:

- 34 vacant parcels are zoned R-1 for development of standard detached housing units;
- 29 vacant parcels are zoned R-1A for development of nonstandard detached and attached housing units;
- One parcel is zoned R-4 for development of apartments at a density of 45 units per net acre;
- One parcel is zoned R-3 for development of elderly care at a density of 29.7 dwelling units per acre; and
- Six parcels are zoned R-1A for development of townhouse and related at a density of eight dwelling units per net acre.

The approximate maximum development potential for the vacant parcels in the current LPPT PUD is 407 residential dwelling units including standard R-1 houses; nonstandard R-1A detached and attached houses; apartments; elderly care facility; and townhouses and related. The Islands at Riverlake project proposes 139 dwelling units. If approved, the approximate maximum development potential for the vacant parcels in the current LPPT PUD would be 382. If the Islands at Riverlake project were approved, the total number of dwelling units that could be built in the LPPT PUD is approximately 2,040 (382 future dwelling units plus 1,658 existing dwelling units). This number of dwelling units is 69% of the maximum number of dwelling units contemplated by the LPPT PUD in 1985.

The Schematic Plan has been amended 12 times since the LPPT PUD was approved in 1985. Of the 12 amendments, five of the amendments were to change a Townhouse (R-1A)-designated parcel to a Single-Family (R-1) designation. On 5 August 1987, the first Townhouse (R-1A) designation change was approved by City Council for the first five-net-acre Bridgeview project (P87-267). The Bridgeview project required a Schematic Plan amendment because with an average lot size of 8,905 square feet, the project did not achieve the density requirements of Townhouse (R-1A) and the housing product proposed was a standard residential subdivision consistent with the R-1 zone. Therefore, the Bridgeview project (P87-267) also required a zone change from R-1A to R-1. On 10 February 1989, the City Council approved three more LPPT PUD Schematic Plan designation changes from Townhouse (R-1A) to Single-Family (R-1): 1) West Shore (89-097); 2) Oak Shore (P89-098); and 3) East Shore (P89-099). These projects rezoned from R-1A to R-1 for the detached houses on standard sized lots and retained R-1A zoning on the corner lots proposed for halfplex units. The final LPPT PUD Schematic Plan Townhouse (R-1A) designation change to

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

Single-Family (R-1) was approved by the City Council on 14 December 1995 for the 7.3 net-acre Stillwater project (P95-066). In this case, the Schematic Plan designation Townhouse (R-1A) was changed to Single-Family (R-1) but the underlying R-1A zone was retained for all the lots. Retaining the R-1A zone was required because the Stillwater project could not be built in accordance with the R-1 standard setbacks and the houses exceeded the 40% lot coverage allowance. At this time, the Islands at Riverlake project site is the only location in the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan area to retain the Townhouse (R-1A) Schematic Plan designation. In the 20-year history of the LPPT PUD, no Townhouse (R-1A) housing has been constructed.

Environmental impacts resulting from the five Townhouse (R-1A) re-designation to Single-family (R-1) projects were evaluated and approved with Negative Declarations. The reduction of total dwelling units resulting from the re-designation was considered a less than significant impact because the projects achieved the minimum density requirements of the General Plan (4 – 15 dwelling units per net acre for low density residential).

The maximum density for subdivisions designated Single-Family (R-1) on the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan is 5 dwelling units per net acre. At 7.15 dwelling units per net acre, the Islands at Riverlake project is less dense than the 8 dwelling units per net acre maximum density allowed for these parcels and more than the maximum density for the Single-Family (R-1) designation. No Schematic Plan map amendment is needed.

Significance: The project is consistent with the LPPT PUD Schematic Map designation for the project site. Therefore, Impact LAN-7 is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

---

LAN-8 Impact: Inconsistency with LPPT PUD Development Guidelines could result in potentially significant land use impacts.

Analysis: **L and P – Pacific Teichert Planned Unit Development Guidelines**

The Development Guidelines set development standards for the different types of projects that can be developed in the areas designated on the Schematic Map. The Islands at Riverlake project meets the density standards of the Townhouse (R-1A) Schematic Plan designation. In contrast, the West Shore, East Shore, Oak Shore, Bridgeview, and Stillwater projects required Schematic Plan amendments because the proposals did not achieve the density requirements of the designated area. In all of those cases, the City found that the projects were designed to the standards of the Development Guidelines for Single-family R-1 developments. However, the Development Guidelines do not define "Townhouse or related development." On page 2 of the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines it states, "These guidelines are intended to act as a supplement to existing City Ordinances and shall prevail when more specific than the City Ordinance." Therefore, the Islands at Riverlake project seeks to amend the Development Guidelines to clarify that the "Townhouse and Related Development (R-1A)" designation is intended to encompass the City zoning code's definition of "R-1A—Single-Family Alternative Zone," which includes single-

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

family attached or detached units, townhouses, cluster housing, condominiums, cooperatives and other similar projects.

The following is a consistency evaluation of the general development standards that are required in the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines for all projects in Riverlake.

1. To provide adequate natural light, pure air, and safety from fire and other dangers.

**Consistent.** The proposed project is designed to ensure adequate natural light is provided to the one and two story houses. Only single-story houses would be built adjacent to existing residential units to reduce potential shade impacts.

The project would not cause significant emissions of criteria air pollutants.

The project would be built in accordance with the Comprehensive Flood Management Plan to reduce exposure to flood hazards. The project would be built in accordance with SCC section 15.36, Uniform Fire Code, to limit exposure of people to fire or other hazards.

2. To enhance the value of land and structures within and adjacent to the project.

**Consistent.** The proposed project would increase the value of the project site. The City believes that the design and type of housing product proposed for the project would also enhance the values of the land and structures adjacent to the project, by changing the existing project site from an undeveloped vacant lot to a fully developed residential subdivision. Based on the evaluation in Section >[#] of this DEIR, the project is considered consistent with the City's Single-Family Residential Design Principles (SFRDP). The City expects that projects developed in accordance with SFRDP have a positive impact on the value of adjacent houses.

3: To minimize congestion due to vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the project area.

**Consistent.** Based on the evaluation of traffic and circulation in the Initial Study and design review by the City of Sacramento Traffic Division, the project is not expected to result in significant traffic congestion. The project would construct the following intersection improvements at existing intersections to alleviate existing circulation delays:

- A traffic signal at the intersection of Pocket Road and West Shore Drive.
- A left turn pocket would be cut into the median on Pocket Road, east of East Shore Drive.
- The Pocket Road median east of Dutra Bend Drive would be reduced by approximately 75 feet to increase stacking capacity for left-in/left-out movements.
- The Pocket Road median east side of Coleman Ranch Way would be reduced by approximately 75 feet to increase stacking capacity for left-in/left-out movements.



**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

consistent with SCC Title 17, Zoning. Impact LAN-9 is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

#### **4.1.5 Compatibility with Adjacent Land Uses**

This section evaluates the compatibility of the project with adjacent land uses. Permitting a project that is incompatible with existing land use or planned growth in the vicinity or approving a project that is incompatible with long-term uses on adjacent properties would result in significant land use impacts. To evaluate whether the Islands at Riverlake project is compatible with land uses in Riverlake and particularly with existing houses abutting the project site, the City's previous findings of compatibility for other projects locating R-1A housing types adjacent to R-1 housing types were reviewed. The density, mass/bulk, and setbacks proposed for the Islands at Riverlake were compared with approved R-1A products in adjacent Riverlake subdivisions. Density is the number of dwelling units per net acre. In the City of Sacramento density relates to the General Plan, Community Plan, and Planned Unity Development Schematic Plan land use designation maps. Mass/bulk is the relationship of the height of a building with the amount of lot area that the building covers. A setback is the distance measured from the nearest part of a building to a property line to the property line. The zoning code provides minimum setbacks for standard R-1 lots but setbacks for nonstandard R-1A housing products are decided on a case-by-case basis when the City considers issuing a special permit. By determining if the proposed density, mass/bulk, and setbacks, of the Islands at Riverlake project is consistent with R-1A housing products approved and constructed in the LPPT PUD, compatibility with adjacent properties can be evaluated. Inconsistency with previously approved and constructed R-1A housing density, mass/bulk, and setbacks would result in a determination that the proposed project is incompatible with adjacent houses and a finding of significance.

**LAN-10 Impact:** Constructing houses at the proposed density of 7.15 dwelling units per net acre could be incompatible with existing land use or planned growth in the vicinity or with existing long-term uses on adjacent properties.

#### **Analysis: Proposed Density as It Relates to Plans**

Housing density is the number of residential dwelling units within a unit of area. In the City of Sacramento, density is measured as the number of dwelling units within a net acre. The LPPT PUD Schematic Plan created 26 parcels and lists the net acreage of each parcel. The project site is parcel numbers 21 (5.4 net acres), 22 (11.2 net acres), and 23 (3.9 net acres). Approximately 1.06 net acres were removed for the Dutra Bend Drive intersection with Pocket Road. Therefore, the net acreage of the Islands at Riverlake project site, by which density consistency is calculated, is 19.44 net acres. Housing density is related to the land use designations provided on the General Plan, Community Plan, and in this case, on the Planned Unit Development Schematic Plan land use maps. As evaluated under LAN-3 Impact, the proposed 7.15 dwelling units per net acre is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of "Low Density Residential" (4 – 15 dwelling units per net acre). As evaluated under LAN-5 Impact, the proposed density is consistent with the Community Plan designation of "Medium Density Residential" (7 – 15 dwelling units per net acre). As evaluated under LAN-7 Impact, the proposed project is consistent with the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan designation for "Townhouse and related" (8 dwelling units per net



**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

following approval of the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan, subdivisions obtained approval to zone corner lots R-1A and Special Permits to construct halfplex units on the R-1A lots. The Bridgeview subdivision currently has 70 single-family R-1 developed lots, 44 single-family alternative R-1A halfplex units, three R-1 vacant lots and one vacant R-1A lot, totaling 118 lots and 114 residential dwelling units. Housing density, including the vacant lots, is 5.1 dwelling units per net acre, exceeding slightly the maximum assumed density.

Southshore is Lot 4 (39.5 net acres) on the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan map. Lot 4 was designated Single Family (R-1) with a maximum assumed density of 5 dwelling units per net acre. Southshore currently has 102 single-family R-1 developed lots, 8 single-family alternative (R-1A) detached developed lots, 29 single-family alternative R-1A halfplex units, and three R-1 vacant lots, totaling 141 lots and 139 residential dwelling units. Housing density, including the vacant lots, is 3.6 dwelling units per net acre, 0.4 units less than the General Plan, consistent with the Community Plan designation of 3 to 6 dwelling units per net acre, and 1.4 dwelling units below the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan designation.

Dutra Bend is Lot 15 (38 net acres) on the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan map. Lot 15 was designated Single Family (R-1) with a maximum assumed density of 3.7 dwelling units per net acre. Dutra Bend currently has 108 single-family R-1 developed lots, 3 single-family alternative (R-1A) detached developed lots, 34 single-family alternative R-1A halfplex units, a duplex on an R-1A lot, and four R-1 vacant lots, totaling 150 lots and 147 residential dwelling units. Housing density, including the vacant lots, is 3.9 dwelling units per net acre, slightly less than the General Plan designation, consistent with the Community Plan designation of 3 to 6 dwelling units per net acre, and slightly above the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan designation.

The Bridgeview and Dutra Bend subdivision are achieving the density objectives of the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan. Bridgeview is 0.1 unit over the mark and Dutra Bend is 0.1 unit under the mark. The subdivisions are meeting the density goal by incorporating single-family residential alternative R-1A halfplex units within the subdivision. As stated above, the Islands at Riverlake proposed density of 7.15 dwelling units per net acre is consistent with the housing densities provided in the General Plan, Community Plan, and LPPT PUD Schematic Plan density designations. Because Bridgeview and Dutra Bend are building out in accordance with the density designations indicated on City plans and the project proposes density consistent with the same plans, the project density is compatible with density on abutting properties in Bridgeview and Dutra Bend.

Southshore is not achieving the density objectives of the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan by 1.4 dwelling units per net acre. Like the Southshore subdivision, the Islands at Riverlake proposed density of 7.15 dwelling units per net acre is below the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan designation by 0.85. Because the proposed density is consistent with the land use designations and proposes development less dense than is possible, the proposed density is considered compatible with the density on abutting properties in Southshore.

**Significance:** Because the proposed density is consistent with densities identified in the General Plan, Community Plan, and LPPT PUD Schematic Plan; is consistent with previous findings and planning decisions made in other parts of the LPPT PUD, and is



**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

Table 9. LPPT PUD Average Mass/Bulk Statistics.

Riverlake R-1 & R-1A Neighborhoods	R-1 Standard			R-1A Alternative			Neighborhood		
	FAR*	FAR* + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)
Bridgeview Average	0.347	0.427	0.304	0.471	0.573	0.350	0.409	0.500	0.327
Southshore Average	0.385	0.474	0.326	0.492	0.600	0.382	0.438	0.537	0.354
Dutra Bend Average	0.329	0.406	0.305	0.383	0.489	0.343	0.356	0.448	0.324
Oakshore Average	0.339	0.416	0.303	0.427	0.515	0.310	0.430	0.517	0.329
Westshore Average	0.394	0.471	0.311	0.348	0.497	0.336	0.371	0.484	0.323
Cobble Shores Average	0.333	0.408	0.296				0.333	0.408	0.296
Eastshore Average				0.343	0.424	0.327	0.396	0.481	0.331
Marina Cove Average	0.396	0.479	0.322				0.396	0.479	0.322
Stillwater Average	0.374	0.451	0.302	0.482	0.565	0.328	0.428	0.508	0.315
Stillwater A&B Average				0.417	0.506	0.347	0.417	0.506	0.347
Islands at Riverlake Average				0.540	0.658	0.455	0.540	0.658	0.455

\*Note: The FAR, FAR+Garage, and BCA is identified for the individually owned lots. Private roads and open space is not included.

Several general conclusions can be drawn from the statistics in Table 9. The FAR, FAR plus Garage, and BCA figures are higher for R-1A alternative development than for R-1 standard development. The reason for the higher mass/bulk statistics is that R-1A development can exceed the 40% lot coverage limit set for the R-1 zone. The average lot-size for R-1 standard development in the LPPT PUD is 8,745 square feet and the average lot-size for R-1A alternative development is 5,041 square feet (Table 4). The average Riverlake detached unit is 3,130 feet with an average 31% BCA (unit covers ± 2,711 square feet on average) and the average Riverlake R-1A development

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

is 4,673 square feet with an average 47% BCA (unit covers  $\pm$  2,369 square feet on average). Cobble Shores has the lowest average FAR plus Garage and the largest lots Southshore has the highest average FAR plus Garage and the eighth largest lots out of 10. Referencing Table 4, there is a preponderance of two-story units in the LPPT PUD, 758 versus 176 single-story units.

The range of variation between the highest R-1 average FAR plus Garage (Marina Cove) and the lowest R-1 average (Dutra Bend) is 0.073. The range is higher for R-1A developments. The variation between the highest R-1A average FAR plus Garage (Southshore) and the lowest R-1A average (Eastshore) is 0.176. Combining R-1 and R-1A reveals a range of 0.129 FAR plus Garage between the highest (Southshore) and the lowest (Cobble Shores). In the subdivisions that have R-1 standard units and R-1A alternative units, Bridgeview, Southshore, Dutra Bend, Oakshore, Westshore, and Stillwater, the greatest difference between R-1 FAR plus Garage and R-1A FAR plus Garage is 0.146 in Bridgeview (0.427 for R-1 versus 0.573 for R-1A). The subdivision with the least difference between R-1 and R-1A FAR plus Garage is Westshore with a 0.026 difference (0.471 for R-1 versus 0.497 for R-1A). The average difference between R-1 FAR plus Garage and R-1A FAR plus Garage in subdivisions that have both housing products is 0.099.

The Islands at Riverlake proposed average FAR, FAR plus Garage, and BCA would be the highest of any of the other R-1A Alternative development types in the LPPT PUD. The 0.658 FAR plus Garage proposed by the Islands at Riverlake project exceeds the average Southshore R-1A FAR plus Garage by 0.058.

The reason that the proposed FAR, FAR plus Garage, and BCA averages are higher for the proposed project is related to lot size and BCA and not to the actual size of the structures.

In order to achieve the proposed density of 7.15 dwelling units per net acre, the Islands at Riverlake lots are smaller than typical R-1A lots in other LPPT PUD subdivisions. The proposed lots are generally wide and shallow and range from approximately 3,015 square feet to 4,187 square feet. The Islands at Riverlake lots range from 2,026 square feet to 845 square feet less than the R-1A average lot-size of 5,041 square feet.

The dwelling units proposed by the Islands at Riverlake are smaller than the average R-1A units in the LPPT PUD. The average Riverlake R-1A dwelling unit is 4,673 square feet. The proposed dwelling units would range from 1,428 liveable square feet to 2,244 liveable square feet (3,245 square feet to 2,249 square feet less than the LPPT PUD R-1A average).

Regardless of the smaller sized dwelling units, the average Islands at Riverlake BCA exceed the average BCA for other R-1A developments in the LPPT PUD. The average BCA for R-1A products in the LPPT PUD is 0.338 and the average BCA for the Islands at Riverlake project is 0.455.

The conclusion to be drawn from comparing the mass/bulk statistics of the proposed project with other R-1A developments in the LPPT PUD is that the reason that the mass/bulk statistics is higher for the Islands at Riverlake project is the density requirement. If the density requirement were reduced, the lot area could be increased

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

and the FAR statistics would go down. If the density requirement were increased, the lot area would be further decreased and the FAR would go up.

The alternatives analysis in Chapter 5 illustrates this relationship between mass/bulk statistics and lot area. Alternative A5 "Zero Lot Line" has the highest mass/bulk statistics of all the alternatives including the proposed project. Alternative A5 would have the smallest average lot size. For each evaluated alternative there is a direct proportional response to average lot size and the lot size increases or decreases as the density of the development changes. The lowest mass/bulk statistics are exhibited for the R-1 Rezone project, which, with 5,200-square-foot lots, would have the largest lot area.

The City has approved Special Permits for the construction of R-1A housing products adjacent to R-1 housing products. The mass/bulk statistics of approved R-1A housing products ranges up to a high of a 0.800 FAR, a 0.931 FAR plus Garage, and a 0.652 BCA. The average mass/bulk proposed by the Islands at Riverlake is less than the high FAR plus Garage value for all but two subdivisions: Stillwater and Eastshore. Because the average mass/bulk proposed by the project, resulting from placing modest sized units on small lots, is within the range of mass/bulk of other R-1A products previously approved by the City, the proposed mass/bulk is considered compatible with existing land use or planned growth in the vicinity of the LPPT PUD.

**Proposed Mass/bulk as It Relates to Existing and Abutting Houses**

To evaluate compatibility of the proposed mass/bulk with existing and abutting houses, the relationship of the R-1 standard and R-1A alternative mass/bulk statistics were compared for each adjacent subdivision, Bridgeview, Southshore, and Dutra Bend. The difference between the R-1 standard and R-1A alternative for adjacent subdivisions are in Table 10. The FAR, FAR plus Garage, and BCA were calculated for each existing house abutting the project site. These statistics were averaged together with the other abutting parcels in the same adjacent subdivision (Bridgeview, Southshore, and Dutra Bend). These statistics are provided in Table 11 for a comparison with the R-1A mass/bulk statistics in the same subdivision. Islands at Riverlake mass/bulk statistics are compared with the abutting existing houses mass/bulk statistics in Table 12. Table 13 is a comparison of the statistical differences between R-1 and R-1A housing types; abutting parcels and R-1A housing types for each subdivision (Bridgeview, Southshore, and Dutra Bend); and the Islands at Riverlake and the abutting parcels.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

Table 10. Difference that R-1A Mass/Bulk Statistics Exceed R-1 Statistics

Riverlake R-1 & R-1A Neighborhoods	R-1 Standard			R-1A Alternative			Difference that R-1A Exceeds R-1		
	FAR*	FAR* + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)
Bridgeview Average	0.347	0.427	0.304	0.471	0.573	0.350	0.124	0.146	0.046
Southshore Average	0.385	0.474	0.326	0.492	0.600	0.382	0.107	0.126	0.056
Dutra Bend Average	0.329	0.406	0.305	0.383	0.489	0.343	0.054	0.083	0.038

Table 11. Difference that R-1A Mass/bulk Statistics Exceeds Abutting Parcels Statistics.

	Abutting Lots			R-1A Alternative			Difference that R-1A Exceeds Abutting Lots		
	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)
Bridgeview Average	0.350	0.430	0.310	0.471	0.573	0.350	0.121	0.143	0.04
Southshore Average	0.354	0.444	0.303	0.492	0.600	0.382	0.138	0.156	0.079
Dutra Bend Average	0.337	0.416	0.356	0.383	0.489	0.343	0.001	0.073	-0.013

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

Table 12. Difference that Islands at Riverlake Mass/bulk Statistics Exceeds Abutting Parcels Statistics.

	Abutting Lots			Islands at Riverlake			Difference that Islands at Riverlake Exceeds Abutting Lots		
	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)
Bridgeview									
Average	0.350	0.430	0.310	0.540	0.658	0.455	0.190	0.228	0.145
Southshore									
Average	0.354	0.444	0.303	0.540	0.658	0.455	0.186	0.214	0.152
Dutra Bend									
Average	0.337	0.416	0.356	0.540	0.658	0.455	0.203	0.242	0.099

Table 13. Comparison of Statistical Differences.

	Difference that R-1A Exceeds R-1			Difference that R-1A Exceeds Abutting Lots			Difference that Islands at Riverlake Exceeds Abutting Lots		
	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)	FAR	FAR + Garage	Building Coverage (BCA)
Bridgeview									
Average	0.124	0.146	0.046	0.121	0.143	0.040	0.190	0.228	0.145
Southshore									
Average	0.107	0.126	0.056	0.138	0.156	0.079	0.186	0.214	0.152
Dutra Bend									
Average	0.054	0.083	0.038	0.001	0.073	-0.013	0.203	0.242	0.099

**Bridgeview**

Based on the statistics in Tables 10 – 13 it can be concluded that in Bridgeview, the average FAR plus Garage is 0.146 higher for R-1A than R-1, 0.143 higher for R-1A than the houses abutting the project site, and 0.228 higher for the Islands at Riverlake project than the houses on abutting parcels. The average the Islands at Riverlake FAR plus Garage is 0.085 higher than it is for other R-1A developments in the Bridgeview subdivision.

The mass/bulk statistics for houses on abutting lots in Bridgeview are consistent with mass/bulk statistics for R-1 standard development. Referring to Table 4, the

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

Bridgeview subdivision has relatively modest sized houses (average 2,903 square feet as compared with the Riverlake average 3,508-square foot) on average 8,575-square foot lots (8,987 is the Riverlake average sized lot). Smaller houses on larger lots result in a lower FAR. Also relevant is that the R-1A halfplex units are similar in size to the R-1A standard units (2,095 livable square feet on average 4,618-square foot lots). The Islands at Riverlake project has a higher FAR plus Garage than the abutting parcels because the designated density requires smaller lots than the abutting lots. The proposed dwelling units would range from 1,428 liveable square feet to 2,244 liveable square feet (1,475 square feet to 659 square feet less than the average sized house on abutting lots). Although the proposed houses are smaller than the abutting houses the BCA is 0.145 higher than the abutting parcels. This is a function of the smaller sized lots in the Islands at Riverlake project.

**Southshore**

Based on the statistics in the tables, the average FAR plus Garage for Southshore is 0.126 higher for R-1A than R-1, 0.156 higher for R-1A than the houses abutting the project site, and 0.214 higher for the Islands at Riverlake project than the houses on abutting parcels. The average Islands at Riverlake FAR plus Garage is 0.058 higher than it is for other R-1A developments in the Southshore subdivision.

The mass/bulk statistics for abutting houses in Southshore indicate that the houses are consistent with mass/bulk statistics for R-1 standard development. Referring to Table 4, the Southshore subdivision has slightly larger houses and lots than the Bridgeview subdivision (average 3,035 livable square feet as compared to 2,903 livable square feet and average 8,653-square foot lots as compared to 8,575-square foot lots). The R-1A halfplex units and R-1A lots are smaller in size than the Bridgeview halfplex units and R-1A lots. This is relevant because the BCA for the R-1A lots is only 0.056 more than the R-1 lots and 0.079 greater than the parcels abutting the project site.

The proposed dwelling units would range from 1,428 liveable square feet to 2,244 liveable square feet (1,607 square feet to 791 square feet less than the average sized house on abutting lots). Although the proposed houses are smaller than the abutting houses the BCA is 0.214 higher than the abutting parcels. This is a function of the smaller sized lots in the Islands at Riverlake project.

**Dutra Bend**

Based on the statistics in the tables, the average FAR plus Garage for Dutra Bend is only 0.083 higher for R-1A than R-1, 0.073 higher for R-1A than the houses abutting the project site, and 0.242 higher for the Islands at Riverlake project than the houses on abutting parcels. This indicates that the R-1A alternative units have very similar mass/bulk as the R-1 houses. The average Islands at Riverlake FAR plus Garage is 0.169 higher than it is for other R-1A developments in the Dutra Bend subdivision.

The lots in Dutra Bend are on average larger than Bridgeview and smaller than Southshore and the average livable square footage is smaller than Bridgeview and Southshore. Referring to Table 4, Dutra Bend has more single-story units than any other in the LPPT PUD (42 out of 145 dwelling units are single-story). This relates to FAR and FAR plus Garage because the mass/bulk values relate the vertical relationship of buildings to area of lot coverage.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

The dwelling units proposed for the Islands at Riverlake project would range from 1,428 liveable square feet to 2,244 liveable square feet (1,619 square feet to 803 square feet less than the average sized house on abutting lots). Although the proposed houses are smaller than the abutting houses the BCA is 0.099 higher than the abutting parcels. This is a function of the smaller sized lots in the Islands at Riverlake project. The density designation in the LPPT PUD requires smaller lots to achieve the number of units.

**Significance:** The dwelling units proposed by the Islands at Riverlake project are smaller than the average sized dwelling unit located on abutting parcels. The mass/bulk statistics have a proportional relationship to lot size. The proposed lot sizes are smaller than the average lot sizes of abutting parcels due to the density required by the LPPT PUD Schematic Plan. Mass/bulk statistics are directly proportional to lot sizes. Therefore, the Islands at Riverlake mass/bulk statistics are higher than abutting parcels due to the density requirement. However, the average mass/bulk statistics for the proposed project is slightly higher than the difference between the average mass/bulk statistics of abutting parcels and other R-1A alternative developments in the same subdivisions. The proposed mass/bulk of the Islands at Riverlake project is within the range of other previously approved and constructed R-1A development abutting R-1 development. Because the City previously determined the range of mass/bulk of those other R-1A alternative housing products compatible with the abutting R-1 standard housing products, the proposed mass/bulk is considered compatible. Therefore, LAN-11 Impact is considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None required.

---

**LAN-12 Impact:** Providing less than R-1 standard 15-ft rear yard set backs could cause the proposed project to be incompatible with long-term uses on adjacent properties.

**Analysis:** The development guidelines provided in the Sacramento City Code section 17.60.020 state that for the R-1 zone the maximum height is 35 feet; the maximum front yard setback is 25 feet (20-foot minimum setback is required in Riverlake pursuant to the LPPT PUD Development Guidelines); the minimum rear yard setback is 15 feet; the minimum interior side yard setback is 5 feet; the minimum street side, side yard setback is 12.5 feet; maximum lot coverage is 40%; and the minimum lot size in square feet is 5,200 square feet.

The Sacramento City Code section 17.60.020 states that for the R-1A zone, the minimum yard requirements, maximum lot coverage and minimum lot area per dwelling unit shall be the same as that specified in the R-1 zone, except that the planning commission may vary the provisions in their review and determination of the required special permit.

For the interior lots (lots north of the private road on the north side of Pocket Road and lots south of the private road on the south side of Pocket Road) the houses front the private road. Five plans are possible: 7110 and 7120 (the two single-story plans) and 5710, 5713, and 5730 (the two-story plans). There are three possible lot dimensions for the interior lots: 64 x 53 feet, 67 x 53 feet, and 79 x 53 feet. The single-story plans could only be built on the 79 x 53 lot and the two-story plans can be

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

built on any sized lot. The minimum rear yard setback for all plans located on the interior lots is 12 feet from the main house to the interior property line and 10 feet from the garage to the interior property line. Two plans, 5710 and 5713, would have 11-foot front yard setbacks from the new private road and three plans, 5730, 7110, and 7120 would have a 9-footback from the new road. Side yard setbacks for all plans on the 64 x 53 lot is 3.5 feet; for the 67 x 53 lot the side yard setbacks are 6 feet and four feet; and the side yard setbacks for the 79 x 53 lot are 3.5 feet and 5 feet for plans 7110 and 7120, 11 feet and 12 feet for plans 5710, 5713, and 5730. Table 5 is the House Plan/Lot Size and Setback Matrix for all plans on the interior and Pocket Road fronting lots. The single-story houses would be a maximum of 16 feet high and the two-story houses would be a maximum of 24.5 feet high.

The interior lots of the Islands at Riverlake project abuts 59 existing houses, one vacant lot, and one office building. As noted in Section 4.1.1 Environmental Setting, one house in Coleman Ranch (not a Riverlake subdivision) is adjacent to the westernmost boundary of the project site on the south side of Pocket Road; 18 houses in Dutra Bend (a Riverlake subdivision) abut the southern boundary project site south of Pocket Road; 29 houses and one vacant lot in Southshore (a Riverlake subdivision) are adjacent to the project site on the north side of Pocket Road between West Shore and East Shore drives; 10 abutting houses are in Bridgeview (a Riverlake subdivision); and one house in Lake Crest Village (not a Riverlake subdivision) is adjacent to the western boundary of the site north of Pocket Road. The Islands at Riverlake project abuts 24 side yards and 35 back yards. To assist analysis of setbacks, the Islands at Riverlake parcels were compared to the adjacent lots in Bridge View, Southshore, and Dutra Bend neighborhoods. The existing setbacks were measures using AutoCAD functions with a 1-inch = 0.25 meter per pixel aerial photograph dated 2002. The aerial photo measurement is based on edge of eave line to the existing fence. Field measurements may result in slightly different values.

Table 14 provides the Islands at Riverlake lot number and proposed rear yard setback. The table provides information about the existing houses adjacent to the project site including housing type, number of stories, orientation of the house on the lot, and the setbacks measured from the aerial photograph. The distance between the existing house and the Islands at Riverlake is calculated for each abutting parcel. With the information in the table, the estimated distance between buildings can be compared with the minimum distance between buildings using standard R-1 zone setbacks.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

40 Environmental Evaluation

Table 14. Proposed Setbacks and Estimated Adjacent Setbacks

Islands at Riverlake Project		Existing Houses Adjacent to Project Site				Distance Between Buildings Garage and House
Lot Number	Rear Yard Setback	Adjacent House Type	Number of Stories	Rear or Side Yard	Set Backs Estimated	
44	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
45 & 46	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
46 & 47	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	25 ft	35 & 37 ft
47 & 48	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	27 ft	37 & 39 ft
49	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	12 ft	22 & 24 ft
50	10 & 12 ft	Halfplex	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
52	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
53 & 54	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
55 & 56	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
56	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Side	25 ft	35 & 37 ft
57	10 & 12 ft	VACANT	N/A	N/A	N/A ft	N/A
57 & 58	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	26 ft	36 & 38 ft
59	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	15 ft	25 & 27 ft
60	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Rear	12 ft	22 & 24 ft
61	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	25 ft	35 & 37 ft
62	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	31 ft	41 & 43 ft
63	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	42 ft	52 & 54 ft
64	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	45 ft	55 & 52 ft
65	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
66 & 67	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
68 & 69	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	8 ft	18 & 20 ft
70 & 71	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
72	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	29 ft	39 & 41 ft
73	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	12 ft	22 & 24 ft
NONE	N/A	Detached	2	Rear	12 ft	N/A
74	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	15 ft	25 & 27 ft
74 & 75	10 & 12 ft	Halfplex	2	Side	10 ft	20 & 22 ft
76 & 77	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	8 ft	18 & 20 ft
78 & 79	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
81	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
82 & 83	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	5 ft	15 & 17 ft
84	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	7.5 ft	17.5 & 19.5 ft
85	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Side	2 ft	12 & 14 ft
87	10 & 12 ft	Halfplex	2	Side	10 ft	20 & 22 ft
88	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	28 ft	38 & 40 ft
89	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	15 ft	25 & 27 ft
90 & 91	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	15 ft	25 & 27 ft
92	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	30 ft	40 & 42 ft
93	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	15 ft	25 & 27 ft
94	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Side	18 ft	28 & 30 ft

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

Table 14. Proposed Setbacks and Estimated Adjacent Setbacks (continued)

Islands at Riverlake Project		Existing Houses Adjacent to Project Site				
Lot Number	Rear Yard Setback	Adjacent House Type	Number of Stories	Rear or Side Yard	Set Backs Estimated	Distance Between Buildings Garage and House
NONE	N/A	Detached	1	Rear	18 ft	N/A
1	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Rear	16 ft	26 & 28 ft
2	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Rear	29 ft	39 & 41 ft
3	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	30 ft	40 & 42 ft
3 & 4	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	17 ft	27 & 29 ft
4 & 5	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Rear	27 ft	37 & 39 ft
5 & 6	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	33 ft	43 & 45 ft
6 & 7	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	20 ft	30 & 32 ft
7 & 8	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	17 ft	27 & 29 ft
8	10 & 12 ft	Halfplex	2	Side	15 ft	25 & 27 ft
9	10 & 12 ft	Halfplex	1	Side	51 ft	61 & 63 ft
9 & 10	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	32 ft	42 & 44 ft
10	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	32 ft	42 & 44 ft
11	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Rear	27 ft	47 & 49 ft
12	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Rear	18 ft	28 & 30 ft
12 & 13	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Rear	21 ft	32 & 34 ft
13 & 14	10 & 12 ft	Detached	2	Rear	26 ft	36 & 38 ft
14	10 & 12 ft	Detached	1	Rear	20 ft	30 & 32 ft

If the Islands at Riverlake project were built with a standard R-1 rear yard setback, the minimum expected distance from the new houses to an existing house would be 30 feet for adjacent rear yard houses (15 feet rear yard setback plus 15 feet rear yard setback) and 20 feet for adjacent side yard houses (5 feet side yard setback plus 15 feet rear yard setback). Of the 35 adjacent lots with abutting back yards, 11 existing houses would be located closer to the proposed project than the R-1 standard minimum distance of 30 feet between houses. Three of the existing houses (one single-story) would be located within 24 feet of a new single-story house (six-foot reduction) and 22 feet of a new garage (eight-foot reduction). Five of the existing houses would be located within 27 feet of a new single-story house (three-foot reduction) and 25 feet of a new garage (five foot reduction). One existing single-story house would be located within 28 feet of a new single-story house (two-foot reduction) and 26 feet of a new garage (four foot reduction). Two existing two-story houses would be located within 29 feet of a new single-story house (one-foot reduction) and 27 feet of a new garage (three-foot reduction). The remaining 24 rear yard adjacent houses would have at least the R-1 minimum distance of 30 feet between buildings.

Of the 24 adjacent lots with abutting side yards, 13 existing houses would be located closer to the proposed project than the R-1 standard minimum of distance of 20 feet. All of these houses are two-story. One existing house would be located within 14 feet of a new single-story house (six-foot reduction) and 12 feet of a new garage (eight-foot reduction). Twelve existing houses would be located within 17 feet of a new single-story house (three-foot reduction) and 15 feet of a new garage (five-foot

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

reduction). The remaining 11 side yard adjacent houses would have the R-1 minimum distance of 20 feet between buildings.

There are four design features and one existing regulation that reduce impacts resulting from locating new houses next to 24 existing houses with less than the R-1 minimum distance between buildings:

1. The project proposes only single-story units on the lots abutting these 22 existing houses, as well as for all lots abutting existing houses. This design feature ensures that no second-story windows overlook the existing house.
2. The rear yard setbacks proposed by the project are greater than minimum rear yard setbacks approved for reverse lot R-1A halfplex developments in Riverlake and a previously approved project for the project site. As evaluated under LAN-4 Impact in Section 4.1.4.2 "Sacramento General Plan, Residential Strategy, Goal A, Policy 6, for halfplexes on reverse lots the rear yard setback were established at 7.5 feet. The project proposed 12-foot setback from the house and 10-foot setback from the garage exceeds this previously used standard. The first project approved for the project site, the Pocket Road Manor Houses project, provided a 10-foot rear yard setback for a single-family alternative detached dwelling unit abutting lots with existing houses.
3. The 6-foot high good neighbor fence provides privacy to residents when they are in the yard. It also provides sightline screening when looking out from the first floor windows.
4. The lots are situated so that the lot lines are staggered. Houses would not be directly in line with one another.
5. The Riverlake Community Association requires five 15-gallon trees be planted in each yard in Riverlake. The interior lots of the Islands at Riverlake project will have landscaped front yards. Between 1 and 2.5 Riverlake Community Association approved shade trees will be planted in the front yards. The responsibility of planting the remaining 4 to 2.5 trees would be the new homeowner's. Riverlake Community Association approved trees planted by the new homeowners in the backyards would increase screening between the new houses and the existing houses. A copy of the Riverlake Community Association Approved Shade and Palm Tree List (January 2004) is in Exhibit E of this DEIR.

Significance: With the design features and existing regulations incorporated into the project and because the proposed rear yard setbacks meet or exceed the rear yard setbacks established for R-1A halfplexes on reverse frontage lots, and in many instances, exceed setbacks of existing R-1 homes, LAN-11 is considered a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: None required.

#### **4.1.6 Mitigation Measures**

No significant impacts were identified. No mitigation measures are needed.

**PRELIMINARY ADMIN REVIEW DRAFT  
SUBJECT TO REVISION (27 MAY 2005)**

4.0 Environmental Evaluation

## **4.2 Air Quality**

### **4.2.1 Environmental Setting**

The Islands at Riverlake project is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The climate of the SVAB is Mediterranean, with mild, rainy winter weather from November through March, and warm to hot, dry weather from May through September.

The air quality of a region is determined by the air pollutant emissions (quantities and type of pollutants measured by weight) and by ambient air quality (the concentration of pollutants within a specified volume of air). Air pollutants are characterized as primary and secondary pollutants. Primary pollutants are those emitted directly into the air, for example carbon monoxide (CO), and can be traced to a single pollutant source. Secondary pollutants are those pollutants that form through chemical reactions in the atmosphere, for example reactive organic gasses (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOX) combine to form ground level ozone, or smog.

### **4.2.2 Regulatory Setting**

The SVAB is subject to federal, state, and local regulations. Both the federal Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board classify the SVAB as a non-attainment for ozone (ROG and NOX) and PM10 (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter). The California Air Resources Board designated CO as attainment.

The Federal Clean Air Act of 1977, established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). Primary standards are set to protect public health. These standards are divided into primary and secondary standards. Primary standards are designed to protect public health and secondary standards are designed to protect other values. Because of the health-based criteria identified in setting the NAAQS, the air pollutants are termed "criteria" pollutants. California has adopted its own, more stringent, ambient air quality standards (CAAQS).

#### **Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District**

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws. The SMAQMD published, "Guide to Air Quality Assessment" (SMAQMD July 2004) to assist local lead agencies evaluate potential air quality impacts from development projects. The Guide provides methodologies to estimate emissions and describes mitigation measures to reduce the amount of emissions.

The SMAQMD District Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust will apply during the construction phases of the project. District Rule 403 states that:

A person shall take every reasonable precaution not to cause or allow the emissions of fugitive dust from being airborne beyond the property line from which the emission originates, from any construction, handling or storage activity, or any wrecking, excavation, grading, clearing of land or solid waste disposal operation. Reasonable precautions shall include, but are not limited to:

- Use, where possible, of water or chemicals for control of dust in the demolition of existing buildings or structures, construction operations, the construction of roadways or the clearing of land.
- Application of asphalt, oil, water, or suitable chemicals on dirt roads, materials stockpiles, and other surfaces which can give rise to airborne dusts;