

**65th STREET
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Draft Minutes**



I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:05 p.m. by Vice Chairperson David Sikich.

II. ROLL CALL

RAC Members Present: Chandra Clady, Steven R. Jones, Gary A. Little, Marcia Maleske, Maggie O'Mara, David O'Toole, Dave Sikich, Christopher Wilson

RAC Members Absent: Robbie Abelon, Mel Billingsley, Matthew Altier, Fred Arnold, Betty Lopez, J.D. Stack

Staff Present: Gregory Ptucha, SHRA

III. INTRODUCTIONS

RAC members introduced themselves to the audience, including new member David O'Toole, who was confirmed by City Council to occupy the position formerly occupied by Linda Shafer. Audience members introduced themselves.

IV. APPROVAL OF RAC MEETING MINUTES

The minutes of the May 4, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved as submitted on a motion made by Mr. Little that was seconded by Ms. Clady.

V. REDEVELOPMENT ITEMS

A. Election of RAC Secretary (Fill Vacancy)

Mr. Sikich reminded those present that this item was carried over from the May 4, 2006 meeting. The RAC's options for filling the vacancy were described in Attachment 2 of the agenda packet. These were also summarized by staff. It was noted that the current officers were elected at the October 20, 2006 meeting. After discussion, Mr. Little put forth a motion that the Secretary position remain vacant until the next normal election cycle for officers (i.e., either October/November 2006 or, alternatively, the January 8th end-of-term date for members of this RAC). The motion was approved 7:1:0, with Marcia Maleske voting in opposition.

B. 7935 Cucamonga Avenue Entitlements Application

RAC staff Greg Ptucha introduced the application, which involves entitlements to construct a 4,900 square foot maintenance/storage building on 0.78 acres in a heavy industrial/solid waste overlay (M-2S-SWR) zone. The applicant, Mr. Scott Kuhnen, President, Recycling Industries, was introduced.

The application's key elements were described in Attachment 2 of the RAC's meeting packet. The lot size is 34,217 square feet. The entire lot is paved (concrete) and is used for storage by Recycling Services, Inc. Proposed construction is for a 21-foot tall pre-fabricated concrete structure the applicant says will be used solely for maintenance and storage purposes and not for recycling activity. The building has been in planning since 2004, and preliminary work was completed pursuant to a building permit issued for site work in March 2005. Mr. Wilson inquired about why the first permit was issued in 2005 if the required Special Permit had not been processed. It was explained that the city's Zoning Administrator determined that the Special Permit was required due to the proposal's relationship as accessory to the primary place of business on the other side of Cucamonga Avenue. This Zoning Administrator determination occurred after the first permit was issued. Mr. O'Toole asked for further confirmation of the activities that would occur at the subject parcel activities, i.e., equipment storage and repair only.

It was noted that the parcel is adjacent to the former CA Youth Authority site that is planned for redevelopment as a "faculty village" for staff employed at nearby CA State University at Sacramento. This prompted discussion about the likelihood of significant land use changes in the immediate area, and how the City's General Plan process (currently underway) addresses impending changes in development patterns.

The applicant states that neighboring businesses are supportive, and that the Power Inn Business and Transportation Association (BTA) endorsed the application on April 18, 2006. Mr. Sikich described how the proposal had been reviewed by a committee of the Power Inn Business and Transportation Association (BTA). That committee had recommended approval of the application on the condition that significant landscaping improvements be made, including the planting of trees. Mr. Kuhnen had agreed to those conditions.

There was discussion about how the structure will improve the current condition of the site. Mr. Sikich then made a motion to recommend that the City approve the application on the condition that landscaping and tree plantings be required in a manner that is consistent with the BTA's previous action. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jones and approved unanimously.

C. Proposed Half-plexes, 3012, 3020 & 3030 Redding Avenue

It was noted that a "pre-application" meeting between the project sponsor's representatives and City staff (and Agency staff) occurred in November 2005. These meetings are conducted to identify obvious issues that, hopefully, can be resolved before the application is formally submitted.

Staff Greg Ptucha then gave an overview of the application by property owner Jeff Cookson to merge three single family parcels and subdivide them into fourteen half-plex lots and one common lot for interior circulation as a private street. The three existing lots are just over one acre in size when combined. The existing R-1 (Single-family) zoning is requested to change to R-1A (Single-family alternative), which allows more density. The proposed half-plexes would be 2-stories and included approximately 1,300 square feet of living space.

Ms. Jennifer Daw, Project Manager for the firm of Holloway, Rasmusson & Molodanof was introduced. She said the project has been discussed with City staff for more than one year. She presented site plans and elevations for the proposal, and described how the (14) half-plexes were planned to be sold in the range of \$350,000 to \$400,000. There are no plans for a homeowners' association. In its place would be a maintenance agreement between unit buyers for the very limited common area, which would consist primarily of a private street and paved walkways leading to units.

Ms. Clady and other RAC members inquired about façade design and materials and how they might be improved. The project's relationship to the Verge apartments and the planned detention basin/passive park were discussed. Ms. Daw said the City preferred that no fencing separate the development from the adjacent basin/park property. This sparked considerable discussion about "eyes-on-the-street" urban planning versus privacy and security concerns.

Mr. O'Toole inquired about why extra exterior parking spaces were being provided when the plan calls for 2 indoor stalls per unit and official parking requirements require only 1.5 stalls per unit.

Greg Ptucha summarized comments received from City of Sacramento Development Services planning staff. These pertain to the issues below, which will reportedly cause significant redesign of the proposal:

- Unit density is considered to be too high.
- Need for private outdoor space for the dwelling units.
- A change from tandem parking to adjacent two-car garages that diminishes the architectural interest of the facades.
- Issues raised previously by the city departments of Transportation, Fire, and, Utilities that are not reflected in the current plan.
- A suggestion by Council person McCarty that these parcels might better be used as park land to be incorporated into the adjacent detention basin/park.

Ms. O'Mara expressed serious concerns about the lack of outdoor play areas for children. Audience member Roxanne Fuentes suggested that the area was historically low-density, and this should be maintained by reducing the proposed density by 50%. Neighboring property owner Gary Baskeen asserted the proposed density was too high. In response to a question, Ms. Daw said that attached townhomes (compared to half-plexes) were considered, but that they were rejected as infeasible.

Ms. Clady and Mr. O'Toole commented on affordability of the units. Mr. Wilson then stated the RAC must offer comments if the committee expects its concerns to be addressed before the applicant returns. Mr. Wilson then offered a motion in recognition that the project would likely return to the RAC after modifications expected to be required by the City. With that in-mind, the motion recognized the project as having merit, and would support City of Sacramento Development Services planning staff in their view the unit density is a little too high. A friendly amendment called attention for improvements to façade design (side elevations), and also recommended that the Fire Department and Utility Department be flexible as it relates to street width requirements and movements for Fire Department emergency equipment. The motion passed 7:1:0, with Ms. O'Mara voting in opposition.

D. Proposed Sacramento State University TRAM (bus rapid transit)

Ms. Brigett L. Reilly of University Enterprises, Inc. (CSUS) was introduced. Ms. Reilly presented an introductory video about the university's master plan for development, called "Destination 2010." The video described growth objectives involving:

1. Student excellence;
2. A "welcoming" campus;
3. A dynamic environment; and
4. Community support.

Ms. Reilly offered background on the tram project, which began as a possible streetcar system that would utilize antique cars. When this proved infeasible, alternatives were considered. Ms. Reilly showed a video about the current plan to create a rubber-wheeled tram (or, "bus rapid transit") system that would circulate on the university campus using a dedicated right-of-way. The intent is to provide frequent service that would create an attractive alternative for faculty, staff, students and campus visitors to reach the campus from Regional Transit's 65th Street light rail station. A major objective is to eliminate the need for a new, fourth parking structure on campus that would store approximately 3,500 cars. It is hoped that the tram would also serve the "faculty village" being conceived for a site east of the UPRR tracks and south of Folsom Boulevard. When off-campus, the tram would share public streets with other traffic.

Ms. Reilly pointed to existing systems in Eugene, Oregon and in Las Vegas, Nevada. Sacramento State projects construction costs totaling \$20 million. Initial funding of \$924,000 has been approved by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) through the 2006 round of its Community Design Capital Grant Program. Ms. Reilly indicated that the requisite memorandum of understanding with SACOG might be finalized by August. The scope of work will include design, engineering and environmental issues.

There were questions about the planned frequency of service and cost to ride. Ms. Reilly said that a committee is studying all transportation fees on-campus and possible pricing for the tram. The university plans to operate the service through its parking division.

Ms. O'Mara inquired about how bicycle and pedestrian access would be improved in conjunction with the tram system. Ms. Reilly responded that one way this might be achieved is through construction of a tunnel under the UPRR levee to connect 65th Street with the campus.

E. Redevelopment Concepts for Former CA Youth Authority Property

Ms. Reilly described how Sacramento State University purchased the former California Youth Authority facility about one year ago. The site is approximately 25 acres in size and is located in an industrial area south of Folsom Boulevard and east of the UPRR tracks. Ms. Reilly noted the university's desire to acquire additional land abutting the site. The project is being pursued by University Enterprises, an university affiliate.

The area surrounding the site lacks transportation connections to the university campus and to the 65th Street/University Transit Village area. Ms. Reilly described the university's support for a proposed link for Ramona Avenue to extend into the campus.

The university's desire is to develop a mix of housing types on the site for rent or sale to the faculty and staff. The hope is to offer affordable accommodations that will allow the university to compete more effectively for faculty. There would also be retail/service and office space to complement and support the residential units. A schematic layout was presented that included a "main street" retail/commercial component, with moderate density housing adjacent, and single-family detached housing at the perimeter. A total of 400 to 500 dwellings are envisioned. None of the units would be used as student housing. New student housing will be planned for on-campus locations.

Bids for demolition of the existing CYA buildings have been solicited. The timetable would have the first units occupied in 2008-09. The current plan would result in the university maintaining title to the underlying fee interest in the real estate. The housing units themselves would be sold with covenants that would be designed to maintain affordability upon re-sale. Since the university does not pay real estate taxes, the buyers (or renters) would pay “possessory interest” taxes in lieu of traditional real estate taxes. These would add to tax increment for the redevelopment area.

University Enterprises will be seeking a private development partner for purposes of developing the faculty village. A request for proposals (or qualifications) will be circulated this summer.

There was discussion about how the university, as a state-chartered entity, is not subject to land-use and other regulatory controls enacted by local governments such as the City of Sacramento. However, Ms. Reilly said the university will seek “input” from local officials.

Possible public- and private-sector financing sources were identified. Ms. O’Mara suggested that Walk Sacramento be consulted for advice on pedestrian-friendly designs/features. Mr. Wilson inquired about sewer connections and infrastructure generally.

Ms. Reilly said the former CYA facility housed up to 1,000 residents in single-person units, so there might not be a net increase in demand for sewer connections.

Ms. Reilly was thanked for her presentations.

F. Redevelopment Area Update

Staff Gregory Ptucha provided the following updates:

Detention Basin: The CA i-Bank loan application was approved on May 23, 2006. As a result, the City plans to file for an “Order of Possession” no later than June 13, 2006. If issued by Superior Court, that would allow the City to take title to the property.

Target Corporation Site: A “charrette” has been scheduled for June 6, 2006 to consider alternatives to the schemes already suggested by Target. It was explained that Target has not formally submitted anything yet, so there meetings are considered “pre-application” meetings that normally only include City staff, although Agency staff have been invited.

Circulation Plan: A meeting occurred where SACOG’s Greg Chew described the challenges of confirming funding sources to allow various projects to proceed. Memoranda of understanding will be created between SACOG and grant recipients. City staff (Planning and DOT) are working with SHRA staff to develop a scope of work for this project.

Financing District: City Planning is considering a proposal to establish an infrastructure fee assessment district for the north transit village area, based on the 2004 infrastructure assessment study and the 2005 financing analysis.

University Garage: Code enforcement engaged professional land surveyors to identify the property lines for the parcel occupied by this business. This has allowed the City to confirm how many vehicles are parked on public property. Code enforcement is attempting to get the owner to comply voluntarily.

6800 Folsom & 1601- 69th St. Application (Off-site accessory parking). City staff plan to recommend against the proposal. However, staff will propose approval of an alternative that

will provide the maximum parking stalls allowed under current code, with the remainder of the 69th Street parcel to be landscaped. The application has shifted from the Planning Commission to the Zoning Administrator for hearing and decision-making.

VI. COMMUNICATION FROM RAC MEMBERS AND PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

1. Ms. O'Mara suggested that City Department of Parks and Recreation representatives be invited to the next (July) RAC meeting to discuss the department's "vision" for park facilities to serve the redevelopment area.
2. Ms. Maleske asked for updated RAC rosters to be distributed.
3. Greg Ptucha said that RAC members would be asked about pending schedule conflicts for the last half of 2006, to confirm the ability to achieve quorums at meetings.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

At approximately 8:15 pm, the meeting adjourned upon unanimous vote on a motion by Mr. Little and a second by Ms. Clady.