PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
July 20, 2022
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
6:30 p.m.
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, California 95630

Effective July 7, 2022, the City of Folsom is returning to all in-person City Council, Commission, and Committee meetings. Remote participation for the public will no longer be offered. Everyone is invited and encouraged to attend and participate in City meetings in person.

CALL TO ORDER PLANNING COMMISSION: Bill Miklos, Ralph Peña, Barbara Leary, Daniel West, Bill Romanelli, Justin Raithel, Eileen Reynolds

Any documents produced by the City and distributed to the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available at the Community Development Counter at City Hall located at 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California and at the table to the left as you enter the Council Chambers. The meeting is available to view via webcast on the City’s website the day after the meeting.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: The Planning Commission welcomes and encourages participation in City Planning Commission meetings and will allow up to five minutes for expression on a non-agenda item. Matters under the jurisdiction of the Commission, and not on the posted agenda, may be addressed by the general public; however, California law prohibits the Commission from taking action on any matter which is not on the posted agenda unless it is determined to be an emergency by the Commission.

MINUTES

The minutes of the July 13, 2022 Special Meeting will be presented for approval at the next scheduled meeting on August 3, 2022.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. PN 21-322, Bidwell Place Tentative Parcel Map and Determination that the Project is Exempt from CEQA

A Public Hearing to consider a request from Ardie Zahedani for approval of a Tentative Parcel Map application to subdivide an existing 3.24-acre property located at 403 and 425 East Bidwell Street into two individual parcels. The zoning classification for the site is C-2, while the General Plan land-use designation is CC (EBC). This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in accordance with Section 15315 (Minor Land Divisions) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Project Planner: Josh Kinkade/Applicant: Ardie Zahedani)
2. PN 22-032: Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Planned Development Permit Modification, Design Review and Determination that the Project Remains Exempt from CEQA

A Public Hearing to consider a request from Toll Brothers, Inc. for approval of a Planned Development Permit Modification and Design Review for 211 previously approved residential lots located within Phase 3 of the Toll Brothers Subdivision located at the southeast corner of Oak Avenue Parkway and Mangini Parkway within the Folsom Plan Area (APN: 072-0060-112). The General Plan land use designation for the project site is SFHD, while the Specific Plan land use designation is SP-SFHD-PD. An Addendum to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan EIR/EIS has previously been approved for the Toll Brothers project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This Planned Development Permit and Design Review does not result in substantial changes to the Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch project, and no additional environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Kathy Pease/Applicant: Toll Brothers, Inc.)

3. DRCL22-00096, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 Subdivision Residential Design Review and Determination that the Project is Exempt from CEQA

A Public Meeting to consider a request from Taylor Morrison Homes for approval of a Design Review application for 218 traditional single-family residential homes located within Villages 1-3 of the previously approved Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project. The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for 10 individual master plans. Five distinct California heritage-themed architectural styles and 15 color and material alternatives are incorporated among the 10 master plans. The zoning classification for the site is SP-SFHD PD, while the General Plan land-use designation is SFHD. The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in accordance with Government Code section 65457 and section 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines. (Project Planner: Josh Kinkade/Applicant: Taylor Morrison Homes)

4. DRCL22-00126, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Village 4 Subdivision Residential Design Review and Determination that the Project is Exempt from CEQA

A Public Meeting to consider a request from Taylor Morrison Homes for approval of a Design Review application for 42 traditional single-family residential homes located within Village 4 of the previously approved Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project. The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for three individual master plans, four distinct California heritage-themed architectural styles and 12 color and material alternatives are incorporated among the three master plans. The zoning classification for the site is SP-MLD PD, while the General Plan land-use designation is MLD. The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in accordance with Government Code section 65457 and section 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines. (Project Planner: Josh Kinkade/Applicant: Taylor Morrison Homes)

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

5. Targeted Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Housing Study – Results and Recommendations

A Public Workshop regarding the Targeted Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Housing Study with a discussion regarding results and recommendations. The study area consists of the East Bidwell Street Corridor, Glenn and Iron Point Road Light Rail Stations, and the Folsom Plan Area. (Project Planner: Desmond Parrington/City of Folsom)

PLANNING COMMISSION / PLANNING MANAGER REPORT

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for August 3, 2022. Additional non-public hearing items may be added to the agenda; any such additions will be posted on the bulletin board in the foyer at City Hall at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Persons having questions on any of these items can visit the Community Development Department during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.) at City Hall, 2nd Floor, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California, prior to the meeting. The phone number is (916) 461-6203 and FAX number is (916) 355-7274.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a disabled person and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in the meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at
Requests must be made as early as possible and at least two-full business days before the start of the meeting.

### NOTICE REGARDING CHALLENGES TO DECISIONS

The appeal period for Planning Commission Action: Any appeal of a Planning Commission action must be filed, in writing with the City Clerk’s Office no later than ten (10) days from the date of the action pursuant to Resolution No. 8081. Pursuant to all applicable laws and regulations, including without limitation, California Government Code Section 65009 and or California Public Resources Code Section 21177, if you wish to challenge in court any of the above decisions (regarding planning, zoning and/or environmental decisions), you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing(s) described in this notice/agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the City at, or prior to, the public hearing.
Planning Commission Staff Report
50 Natoma Street, Council Chambers
Folsom, CA 95630

Project: Bidwell Place Tentative Parcel Map
File #: PN 21-322
Request: Tentative Parcel Map Approval
Location: 403 and 425 East Bidwell Street
Parcel(s): 071-0190-060 and 071-0190-061
Staff Contact: Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner, 916-461-6209
jkinkade@folsom.ca.us

Property Owner
Name: St. Anton Communities
Address: 1801 I St. Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95811

Applicant
Name: Ardie Zahedani
Address: 1801 I St. Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95811

Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion recommend approval of a Tentative Parcel Map application to subdivide an existing 3.24-acre property located at 403 and 425 East Bidwell Street into two individual parcels (PN 21-322), based on the findings included in this report and subject to the attached conditions.

Project Summary: The proposed project includes a Tentative Parcel Map (PN 21-322) to subdivide an existing property of approximately 3.24 acres in size located at 403 and 425 E. Bidwell St. into two individual parcels. The two newly created parcels will be the 1.11-acre Parcel 1, consisting of an existing Bank of America building and parking lot and the 2.07-acre Parcel 2, consisting of the previously approved Bidwell Place Apartments project and a portion of an existing parking lot. A 3,036-square-foot right-of-way dedication easement is located on the street frontage of the project.

Table of Contents:
1 - Description/Analysis
2 - Background
3 - Proposed Conditions of Approval
4 - Vicinity Map
5 - Narrative for Bidwell Place Apartments Project
6 - Tentative Parcel Map, dated December 2021, revised March 2, 2022
7 - Photographs of the Project Site
8 – Public Comments Received
Submitted,

PAM JOHNS
Community Development Director
ATTACHMENT 1
DESCRIPTION/ANALYSIS

APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL
The applicant, Ardie Zahedani, is requesting approval of a Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) to subdivide an existing 3.24-acre property located at 403 and 425 E. Bidwell St. into two individual parcels. The current parcel consists of an existing Bank of America building and the previously approved (but undeveloped) Bidwell Place Apartments project. While there are two existing parcel numbers associated with the proposed project, these parcels only exist for assessment purposes and have not been subdivided.

The two newly created parcels will be the 1.11-acre Parcel 1, consisting of the Bank of America building and parking lot and the 2.07-acre Parcel 2, consisting of the future Bidwell Place Apartments project and a portion of an existing parking lot. A 3,036-square-foot right-of-way dedication easement is located on the street frontage of the project. The proposed TPM is included as Attachment 6 to this staff report. Access to Parcel 2 is provided via an existing driveway from East Bidwell Street and access to Parcel 1 is proposed to be provided from an access easement located on Parcel 2. The applicant is also proposing to dedicate a pedestrian access easement on Parcel 1, private drainage easements on Parcel 2, and a public access easement across both parcels, as illustrated on Attachment 6. New water and sewer connections are proposed for Parcel 2 from East Bidwell Street. No additional development is proposed with this Tentative Parcel Map.

POLICY/RULE
Tentative Parcel Map review for the Planning Commission is covered by Section 16.24 of the Folsom Municipal Code. Tentative Parcel Map entitlements require approval by the Planning Commission.

ANALYSIS
General Plan Consistency
The General Plan land use designation for the project site is CC (Community Commercial) within the East Bidwell Corridor (EBC) Overlay. The EBC Overlay designation gives property owners along the East Bidwell Corridor the flexibility to develop sites with a mixture of commercial and residential uses that are mutually compatible along East Bidwell Street. The EBC General Plan designation allows for density of 20-30 dwelling units per acre. The proposed project would result in 75 dwelling units on a 2.07-acre parcel, resulting in 36.2 dwelling units per acre, which is above the maximum allowed density of the EBC overlay.
Pursuant to FMC Section 17.102.030(A)(3)(a) and Government Code Section 65915(f), the State Density Bonus Law, the amount of density increase to which a project applicant is entitled shall vary according to the amount by which the project’s percentage of affordable housing units exceeds specified percentages. An amendment to the State Density Bonus Law that took effect on January 1, 2020, now mandates that housing projects (like the approved apartment project) where all of the units are affordable to low-, very low- and moderate-income residents, receive a density increase of up to 80% above the maximum residential density otherwise allowed. (Gov. Code § 65915(f)(3)(D).) The projected density for the project after the TPM is processed is approximately 36.2 dwelling units per acre, which is 6.2 units more than what is permitted in the EBC Overlay. The City’s Density Bonus Ordinance and the recent amendment to the State Density Bonus Law allow affordable housing projects to be constructed at densities in excess of what is permitted under the EBC Overlay General Plan land use designation and specifically require approval of the projected density bonus needed for this project.

In addition, per Gov. Code Section 65589.5(j)(3) of the Housing Accountability Act, the receipt of a density bonus shall not constitute a valid basis on which to find a proposed housing development project inconsistent, not in compliance, or not in conformity with any applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or similar provision. This requirement is consistent with Government Code Section 65915(f)(5) of the State Density Bonus Law, which states that “the granting of a density bonus shall not require, or be interpreted, in and of itself, to require a general plan amendment, zoning change, or other discretionary approval.” Therefore, even if the Tentative Parcel Map results in the project having a higher density than what is permitted in the EBC Overlay, the project would not be required to go through a re-zone or a general plan amendment, as the law does not view density bonus as a valid basis for finding inconsistency between the project and the zoning ordinance or the General Plan.

Zoning Code Consistency
The project site is zoned C-2 (General Commercial) in the Folsom Municipal Code (FMC). In the FMC, the C-2 zone does not have any standards for minimum lot area or lot width, building coverage, front yard or side yard setbacks. The C-2 standard has a 12-foot rear yard setback requirement. As shown on the proposed TPM, the existing building on Parcel 1 would be located 68 feet from the proposed rear property line and the approved apartment buildings would be located a minimum of 19 feet from the rear property line. The proposed TPM would therefore meet all zoning standards established for the C-2 zone.

Parking
Under the proposed TPM, the applicant is providing a total of 167 parking spaces, including 120 spaces on the residential parcel and 47 spaces on the Bank of America parcel. The parking areas will be separated with tubular metal fencing to facilitate parking enforcement between commercial and residential uses. Per FMC Section
17.57.040, Off-Street Parking Requirements, multifamily structures and complexes are required to have 1.5 spaces per unit. By those standards, the applicant would be required to provide 113 parking spaces. As the proposed project provides 120 parking spaces for the 75-unit apartment complex, the applicant exceeds the required parking in the FMC by 7 parking spaces.

The Multifamily Design Guidelines provide the following parking ratio recommendations:

- One bedroom: 1.5 on-site parking space per unit; and
- Two bedrooms: 1.75 on-site parking spaces per unit.
- 0.2 spaces per unit for guest parking

Under these standards, the project would be required to have 120 resident parking spaces and 15 guest parking spaces, whereas only 120 parking spaces are being provided. However, Government Code Section 65915(b)(1) requires the City to approve reduced parking ratios if a project includes specified percentages of affordable housing units. As relevant to this project, Government Code section 65915(p)(1) states that the City shall not require a vehicle parking ratio, inclusive of parking for persons with a disability and guests that exceeds the following ratios:

- Zero to one bedroom: One onsite parking space per unit
- Two bedrooms: 1 ½ onsite parking spaces per unit

Using these standards, the proposed apartment project is required to provide 89 parking spaces whereas 120 parking spaces are being provided. As stated in the Density Bonus discussion above, the proposed project meets the density bonus requirements based on the percentage of housing being available for lower income households and the project being conditioned to retain continued affordability of all very low- and low-income rental units for 55 years or longer. As such, the apartment project is consistent with the parking standards of Government Code Section 65915 and is not required to meet the Multifamily Design Guidelines parking ratio recommendations because those recommendations are inconsistent with state law for density bonus projects like this one.

As stated above, the existing Bank of America building will retain 47 parking spaces. The FMC states that retail commercial uses, banks, financial institutions, and office/service-type commercial uses require one parking space per 200 square feet of gross floor area. The Bank of America building is 6,289 square-feet in size, resulting in the requirement of 31 parking spaces. The proposed TPM would therefore result in the commercial parcel meeting the parking requirements established by the FMC.

**Tentative Parcel Map**

As referenced earlier within this report, the applicant is requesting approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide the 3.24-acre project site into two separate parcels
with the intent of allowing each parcel to be sold and operated independently from the other parcel. Both parcels meet or exceed the minimum standards for the C-2 zone in terms of lot size and lot width.

As shown in the proposed TPM (Attachment 6), access to the proposed Parcel 2 is from an existing driveway from East Bidwell Street. Access to the proposed Parcel 1 (which includes the existing bank building and associated parking lot) is from a proposed reciprocal access easement on Parcel 2. Proposed Parcel 1 also includes a 10-foot pedestrian access easement from East Bidwell Street. Finally, a 6-foot-wide public access easement is proposed on the eastern boundary of both parcels. Staff has determined that the proposed parcels, which are located in an urbanized area within the City, have adequate provision in terms of access and parking and supports the proposed access points shown on the TPM as conditioned.

On Proposed Parcel 1, the parcel map shows 7-foot-wide private drainage easements on the western and eastern edges of the parcel and a 10-foot-wide private drainage easement on the southern edge of the parcel. An existing 15-foot drainage easement to the east of the proposed building is proposed to be abandoned as part of this map.

A 3,036-square foot right-of-way dedication easement is also proposed on the north end of the parcel adjacent to East Bidwell Street.

Dry utilities (electrical, gas, telephone, etc.) are accessible to both parcels on East Bidwell Street. Staff has conditioned that future dry utility connection services for new buildings be placed underground at the project site (Condition No.17). Existing water and sewer connections exist for Proposed Parcel 1 from East Bidwell Street and new water and sewer connections are proposed from East Bidwell Street for Proposed Parcel 2. Staff supports these proposed easements and has conditioned that the owner/applicant dedicate private easements for utilities, drainage, water, and sanitary sewer on the Parcel Map (Condition No. 11). As a result, staff has determined that, as conditioned, the submitted TPM meets all requirements as set forth in Chapter 16.24 (Parcel Maps) of the FMC, as well as the requirements of the State Subdivision Map Act.

**Parkland Dedication In-Lieu Fees**

FMC Section 16.32.040 requires that all residential subdivisions pay parkland dedication in-lieu fees (Quimby) based on type of dwelling and average density per dwelling unit. Because the project requires a parcel map, it is therefore subject to this fee. As such, staff has provided Condition No. 6, which states that the owner/applicant shall be responsible to pay for 1.358-acres of Quimby fees in accordance with the Folsom Municipal Code, Section 16.32.040, and that payment shall be made prior to recordation of a Final Map for the subdivision.

Because this fee was not previously anticipated, the additional fees placed a financial burden on the project which the affordable housing project cannot absorb. At its May 10,
2022 meeting, Folsom City Council adopted a resolution approving a supplemental affordable housing loan in the amount of $588,265.55 to Bidwell Place, LP to pay the levied Quimby parkland dedication in-lieu fees and offset this financial burden on the project. This loan will go directly towards the payment of the Quimby fee and will not provide any additional financial benefit to the project.

Public Comments
The required public notification efforts (an advertisement in the Folsom Telegraph and direct mailing to all property owners within 300 feet of the project site) has resulted in one comment letter that has been included in Attachment 8. No other comments have been received from Folsom property owners, residents or special interest groups as of publication of this staff report.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
This property was not involved in a division of a larger parcel in the last two years. The property does not have an average slope greater than 20 percent. The property division is in conformance with the General Plan and Zoning, and no variances or exceptions are required. In addition, all services and access to the proposed parcels are provided to local standards. Therefore, the project is exempt from environmental review under section 15315 (Minor Land Divisions) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Based on staff’s analysis of this project, none of the exceptions in Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines apply to the use of the categorical exemption in this case.

RECOMMENDATION/PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
Move to approve the Bidwell Place Tentative Parcel Map project creating two (2) parcels as illustrated in Attachment 6, based on the following findings included in the report (Findings A-L) and subject to the attached conditions of approval (Conditions 1-18).

GENERAL FINDINGS
A. NOTICE OF HEARING HAS BEEN GIVEN AT THE TIME AND IN THE MANNER REQUIRED BY STATE LAW AND CITY CODE.

B. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE AND ALL APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE.

CEQA FINDINGS
C. THE PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UNDER SECTION 15315 (MINOR LAND DIVISIONS) OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) GUIDELINES.
D. THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF SUCCESSIVE PROJECTS OF THE SAME TYPE IN THE SAME PLACE OVER TIME IS NOT SIGNIFICANT IN THIS CASE.

E. NO UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST TO DISTINGUISH THE PROPOSED PROJECT FROM OTHERS IN THE EXEMPT CLASS.

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP FINDINGS

F. THE PROPOSED TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP, TOGETHER WITH THE PROVISIONS FOR ITS DESIGN AND IMPROVEMENT, IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE ZONING CODE, THE CITY’S SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE, OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE, AND THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT IN THAT THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WILL ENSURE THAT THE PROJECT IS DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH CITY STANDARDS.

G. THE DESIGN OF THE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP IS NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE OR SUBSTANTIALLY AND AVOIDABLY INJURE FISH OR WILDLIFE OR THEIR HABITAT.

H. THE DESIGN OF THE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP IS NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SERIOUS PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY PROBLEMS.

I. THE DESIGN OF THE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH EASEMENTS FOR ACCESS THROUGH OR USE OF PROPERTY WITHIN THE PROPOSED TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP.

J. THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED.

K. THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE PROPOSED DENSITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

L. SUBJECT TO SECTION 66474.4 OF THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT, THE LAND IS NOT SUBJECT TO A CONTRACT ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA LAND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1965 (COMMENCING WITH SECTION 51200 OF THE GOVERNMENT CODE).
BACKGROUND
The Bank of America building was constructed in 1981, along with all the project site improvements. In 2017, St. Anton Communities acquired a 4.2-acre portion of the neighboring Folsom Cordova Unified School District parcel and developed the Bidwell Pointe Apartments (PN17-045). Bidwell Pointe is a 140-unit mixed-use, mixed-income master planned apartment community. On May 6, 2020, the Planning Commission approved a Design Review application for development of a 75-unit, 100% affordable rental housing community to be known as Bidwell Place (PN 20-013). As part of that approval, a lot line adjustment was required to be completed to modify parcel lines at the project site prior to grading or site improvements. At the time, it was believed that the project site consisted of two separate parcels. However, during the building permit process, staff found that while two parcels exist on the project site for assessment purposes, no evidence of two parcels being subdivided was found. As such, staff required the applicant to seek approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to facilitate the legal creation of two parcels.

At its May 10, 2022 meeting, Folsom City Council adopted a resolution approving an affordable housing loan in the amount of $588,265.55 to Bidwell Place, LP to pay for the levied Quimby parkland dedication in-lieu fees associated with the development.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION
CC (Community Commercial with EBC (East Bidwell Corridor Overlay) Overlay

ZONING DESIGNATION
C-2, Central Business

ADJACENT LAND USES/ZONING
North: East Bidwell Street with existing commercial buildings (C-2) and residential buildings beyond (R-2)
South: Kohls Shopping Center (C-2/PD)
East: Existing commercial uses (C-3)
West: Existing Bidwell Pointe Apartments (MU)

SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The 3.24-acre project site contains one commercial structure and is partially developed, and the remainder of the lot is undeveloped.

APPLICABLE CODES
FMC Chapter 17.22: Commercial Land Use Zones
FMC Chapter 16.24, Parcel Maps
Subdivision Map Act

FMC Chapter 16.32, Dedications,
Reservations and Development Fees
ATTACHMENT 3
Proposed Conditions of Approval
## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR
**BIDWELL PLACE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP**
**(PN21-322)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>GENERAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.        |                    | The applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below:  
- Tentative Parcel Map, dated December 2021, revised March 2, 2022  
The project is approved for Bidwell Place Tentative Parcel Map, which includes subdividing an existing 3.24-acre parcel into two individual parcels. Implementation of the project shall be consistent with the above-referenced items as modified by these conditions of approval. | M | CD (P)(E) |
| 2.        |                    | The project approval granted under this staff report shall remain in effect for two years from final date of approval (July 20, 2024). Failure to obtain the relevant building (or other) permits within this time period, without the subsequent extension of this approval, shall result in the termination of this approval. | M | CD (P) |
3. The owner/applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul any approval by the City or any of its agencies, departments, commissions, agents, officers, employees, or legislative body concerning the project. The City will promptly notify the owner/applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. The City may, within its unlimited discretion, participate in the defense of any such claim, action or proceeding if both of the following occur:

- The City bears its own attorney’s fees and costs; and
- The City defends the claim, action or proceeding in good faith

The owner/applicant shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement of such claim, action or proceeding unless the settlement is approved by the owner/applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND FEE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The owner/applicant shall pay all applicable taxes, fees and charges at the rate and amount in effect at the time such taxes, fees and charges become due and payable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. If applicable, the owner/applicant shall pay off any existing assessments against the property, or file necessary segregation request and pay applicable fees. | M | CD (E) |
6. As a condition of approval of the final parcel map, the owner/applicant shall pay parkland dedication in-lieu fees (Quimby) for 1.358-acres in accordance with the Folsom Municipal Code, Section 16.32.040. Pursuant to FMC Section 16.32.040(K), payment of such fees shall be made prior to the issuance of any building permit for any building or structure to be located upon any one of the lots in the parcel map. Because of unanticipated circumstances surrounding the various entitlements required for development of the Bidwell Place project, the owner/applicant received design review approval and was issued a building permit before the owner/applicant or the City was aware that a map would be required for development of the Bidwell Place project. As a result, payment of parkland dedication in lieu fees was not made prior to the issuance of any building permit. Pursuant to FMC Section 16.32.040(B), as a condition of approval of the final parcel map, payment of the parkland dedication in lieu fees described in this condition shall be made prior to recordation of a Final Parcel Map for the subdivision.

7. The City, at its sole discretion, may utilize the services of outside legal counsel to assist in the implementation of this project, including, but not limited to, drafting, reviewing and/or revising agreements and/or other documentation for the project. If the City utilizes the services of such outside legal counsel, the applicant shall reimburse the City for all outside legal fees and costs incurred by the City for such services. The applicant may be required, at the sole discretion of the City Attorney, to submit a deposit to the City for these services prior to initiation of the services. The applicant shall be responsible for reimbursement to the City for the services regardless of whether a deposit is required.

8. If the City utilizes the services of consultants to prepare special studies or provide specialized design review or inspection services for the project, the applicant shall reimburse the City for actual costs it incurs in utilizing these services, including administrative costs for City personnel. A deposit for these services shall be provided prior to initiating review of the Final Map, improvement plans, or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable.

MAP REQUIREMENTS

9. The owner/applicant shall provide a digital copy of the recorded Parcel Map (in AutoCAD format) to the Community Development Department.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>The owner/applicant shall provide the Folsom-Cordova Unified School District with a copy of the recorded Parcel Map.</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td><strong>The owner/applicant shall dedicate private easements for utilities, drainage, water, and sanitary sewer on the Parcel Map.</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td><strong>The owner/applicant shall dedicate a reciprocal access easement for common use of the access point on East Bidwell Street for both proposed parcels which shall substantially conform to the exhibit referenced below, provided as Attachment 6 to this staff report:</strong>  &lt;br&gt;  • Tentative Parcel Map, dated December 2021, revised March 2, 2022</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td><strong>The owner/applicant shall dedicate a 12.5-foot-wide public utility easement along the parcel map frontage of East Bidwell Street. The public utility easement dedication shall be shown on the parcel map.</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td><strong>Public and private improvements, including roadways, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, bicycle lanes and trails, streetlights, underground infrastructure and all other improvements shall be provided in accordance with the current edition of the City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards.</strong></td>
<td>I, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td><strong>The owner/applicant shall coordinate the planning, development and completion of this project with the various utility agencies (i.e., SMUD, PG&amp;E, etc.).</strong></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td><strong>For any improvements constructed on private property that are not under ownership or control of the owner/applicant, a right-of-entry, and if necessary, a permanent easement shall be obtained and provided to the City prior to issuance of a grading permit and/or approval of improvement plans.</strong></td>
<td>G, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td><strong>Future dry utility connection services (electrical, gas, telephone, etc.) for new buildings shall be placed underground at the project site.</strong></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td><strong>Each parcel shall have an independent water and sanitary sewer service which does not encroach into any other parcel and connects directly to the right-of-way. Prior to the issuance of building permits, any existing sanitary sewer or water service which encroaches into another parcel shall be relocated in accordance with the City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards.</strong></td>
<td>I, G, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>WHEN REQUIRED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD (P) Community Development Department Planning Division</td>
<td>I Prior to approval of Improvement Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Engineering Division</td>
<td>M Prior to approval of Final Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Building Division</td>
<td>B Prior to issuance of first Building Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Fire Division</td>
<td>O Prior to approval of Occupancy Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW Public Works Department</td>
<td>G Prior to issuance of Grading Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Park and Recreation Department</td>
<td>DC During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Police Department</td>
<td>OG On-going requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ATTACHMENT 5
Narrative for Bidwell Place Apartments Project
General Project Description
January 24, 2020

Bidwell Place – A Workforce Housing Community

Bidwell Place is a 75-unit affordable rental housing community with a diverse mix of unit sizes and types for residents with incomes between 30% and 80% of the Area Median Income.

The applicant, St. Anton Communities, is a locally based, privately-owned affordable and market-rate housing developer with more than 8,000 units developed throughout California, including the Granite City (completed 2013) and Bidwell Pointe (completed 2019) apartments in Folsom. This proposed new community, “Bidwell Place,” is a Transit Oriented Development (“TOD”) with a pedestrian focus, within walking proximity to a variety of grocery stores, retail shopping and restaurants, including the thriving Sutter Street business district. It also benefits from proximity to the Historic Folsom Light Rail Station and access to bicycle trail and pedestrian walkways.

Based on market data accumulated through their recently-completed adjacent project, St. Anton Communities introduces a “studio” unit concept in Bidwell Place, designed for the unmet housing demand of entry-level working professionals. In addition, Bidwell Place also provides some Extremely Low Income units to create a broad range of workforce housing options for the community. The residential units are indistinguishable from market-rate housing and will have access to a variety of amenities, programs and classes targeted toward the enrichment and growth of the community and the residents of Bidwell Place.

In addition to the open spaces and gathering areas proposed at Bidwell Place, the future residents have full access to all amenities offered in St. Anton’s recently-completed Bidwell Pointe project.

SITE

The ±3.24 acre site located at 403 E. Bidwell Street holds a one-story commercial building which is half-occupied by a banking center. The back portion of the site is unpaved vacant land. St. Anton has executed agreements with the existing tenant to stay-in-place during and after construction of the new workforce housing community. The project circulation and parking plan is designed to enable both the housing and commercial space to operate independently with little to no disruption.

The back half of the commercial building, which has been vacant for years, will be demolished to create more open space and parking for the community, while the banking center stays in place. In addition, cosmetic improvements are planned for the banking center to create a consistent aesthetic scheme between the housing community and the center.

The proposed new apartment construction and reuse of an existing commercial center is the highest and best use of this vacant property and will yield deeply needed affordable housing while maintaining the mixed-use character of the Bidwell corridor. The project perfectly aligns with the Folsom General Plan land use designation for this area, East Bidwell Corridor (EBC) Overlay.
ZONING AND ENTITLEMENT
The project’s parcel is within the EBC Overlay, which allows development per Mixed-Use standards. It allows for residential density of 20-30 dwelling units per acre with commercial uses along major commercial corridors. Bidwell Place’s proposed density is ±23 du/acre, which falls within the permitted density.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION
The project consists of three at-grade walk-up (3 story) wood-frame buildings. The buildings’ dynamic façade includes modern and unique design elements to stimulate activity and movement and is in harmony with the surrounding area and the newly-developed Bidwell Pointe project.

UNITS, PARKING AND COMMERCIAL SPACE
Based on data obtained during Bidwell Pointe’s lease-up, St. Anton developed a unit mix for Bidwell Place based on up-to-date demand in the immediate submarket. Bidwell Place offers studio, one, and two-bedroom floor plans and provides 167 parking spaces of which 120 will be designated for the residential units and 47 will be exclusively for Bank of America’s use. The parking areas will be fenced to facilitate parking enforcement between commercial and residential uses.
FEATURES AND AMENITIES

Units:

- Studio, one, and two bedroom floor plans
- Washer/dryer hookups in all units
- Laundry room access
- Patio or balcony
- Wall to wall flooring
- White vertical blinds
- Fully equipped kitchens
- Designer cabinetry
- Double stainless steel sinks
- Quartz counter tops
- Dishwasher
- Refrigerator
- Self-cleaning oven range
- Built-In Microwave
- Garbage disposal
- Large bathrooms
- Shower/tub combos
- Sheet vinyl flooring
- Mirrored medicine cabinets

Common Areas:

- Access to:
  - Leasing office
  - Fully equipped communal kitchen
  - Business Center
  - Fitness Center
  - Community room
  - Swimming pool
  - BBQ and sun deck
  - Tot Lot
- Social activities
- Garden landscaping
- Bike racks
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TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP
BIDWELL PLACE
APN 071-0190-060 & 061
403 & 425 EAST BIDWELL STREET, FOLSOM, CALIFORNIA
GRADING PLAN
SHEET 2 OF 3
DECEMBER 2021
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Public Comments Received
To: City council via Deputy City Clerk for distribution to council, Staff, City Engineers

cc: Sacramento DA, USBR abutting Neighbor

From: Laurette Laurent

June 9, 2022

Re: Agenda Totally LACKING Signed/Sealed City Engineer Report & Recommendations

Re: DISTRIBUTION is necessary [by staff] of Previously Submitted Analysis of BOTH PN 21-322, and non-existent "USPT22-00101"

Context: agenda LACKs Mandatory Legal Information under State and Federal Laws. Worse yet, agenda pretends in writing that the PC citizen members have "POWERS" to Subdivide Land, REZONE land, and FAIL to REPORT such contemplated Changes of Value/infrastructure/ Area impacts, to Sacramento County Legal Authorities who Record such Actions.

In sum, this "document" is an insult to Law & Order Enforcers, such as Prof. Lic. Engineers.

As City Engineer Documents subject of my PRA Requests have NEVER been provided, don't know who has that Title at this time.

The PC and city Dev. Staff are NOT engineers, and Have Zero Authority to Make Legal Decisions such as EXEMPTIONS from CEQA. In ONE case, there is a Potential Change of Land Use behind a Subdivision Map Action.

PC has NO legal Authority to make such decisions, and staff are Misleading them in a rather obvious potential Malfeasance Practice/Policy.

If our elected and appointed "leaders" and their chosen staff perpetuate this again, they are Accountable under Multiple Sections of State Laws. Not the least is the Subdivision Map Act, Govt Code 65000 et seq, B&P, and many more.

Act at YOUR OWN PERIL should be at Top of ALL Signed & Sealed Reports delivered to private citizens appointed to conduct Public Hearings and to HEAR and HEED Objections.
Previously an expert analysis of the rather preposterous Public Notice on Agenda for "USPT22-00101" which is clearly IN direct Violation of State Laws and is NOT a legally enacted "Planned Unit" nor C PD Zone. It is clearly a General Plan Commercial Neighborhood Usage -- and does not have any Right to be at this extremely dangerous intersection of TWO Killer Folsom "city Streets" -- including the Substandard "Folsom Lk Crossing STREET" where horrific deaths continue to occur.

How can private citizens, city Licensed Professionals, and employees, consider themselves ABOVE Responsibility for Obeying & enforcing laws. They hold PUBLIC HEARINGS.

Expert Analysis was submitted for BOTH these PN 21-322 and USPT 22 -00101
folsom.ca.us SEARCHRESULTS --- NOTHING
Disregard FORWARDING these documents to City Engineer and Traffic Engineers, and PW Director --- at your OWN PERIL.
Disregard CA and Federal Laws at your own peril.

Ask what the heck is a "USPT 22 001012"
Is this willful continued Obfuscation of Public Documents?
Is this some sort of confusing FEDERAL classification?
It does have a Huge Impact on Federal Agency Assets and Employees.

To: FOIsom Dev. top "manager", what does Prof. Lic. Engineer Under YOU, have in his signed/sealed Eng. Report for both of these?
How can you dare to ignore the state and federal laws?
Who TOLD you this city can Over-Ride higher Laws thusly?

Please answer, because it's time to File formal Complaints in pursuit of
ENFORCEMENT of these Objections by a proper Authority.

63 dead innocent people, who died on city property --- is ENOUGH.

----- Forwarded Message -----  
From: Karen Sanabria <ksanabria@folsom.ca.us>  
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022, 03:31:39 PM PDT  
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting 6-15-22 Agenda

Hello,

Please see attached the Agenda for the Planning Commission Meeting on 6-15-22.

Thank you,

Karen Sanabria  
Community Development  
City of Folsom  
50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630  
ksanabria@folsom.ca.us  
916-461-6203  
www.folsom.ca.us
Planning Commission Staff Report
50 Natoma Street, Council Chambers
Folsom, CA 95630

Project: Toll Brothers Phase 3 Lots 1-211
File #: PN-22-032
Requests: Planned Development Permit Modification and Design Review
Location: The Toll Brothers Phase 3 Subdivision is located in Mangini Ranch in the Folsom Plan Area at the southeast corner of Oak Avenue Parkway and Mangini Parkway.

Staff Contact: Kathy Pease, AICP, Contract Planner, 916-812-0749
kpease@masfirm.com

Property Owner
Toll West Inc.
110 Woodmere
Suite 120
Folsom, CA 95630

Applicant
Toll Brothers of Northern California
6800 Koll Center Parkway
Suite 320
Pleasanton, CA 94566

Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion approve the following entitlements, based on the proposed Findings (A-V) and subject to Attachment 4 Conditions of Approval (1-24):

- Planned Development Permit Modification and Design Review

Project Summary: The proposed project involves the following actions associated with a proposed residential development:

- **Planned Development Permit Modification and Design Review** to allow up to a maximum of 39 homes to have a lot coverage of 53 percent for the 60 x 105 product single-story homes and design review of architecture and designs for 211 proposed homes.

These proposed actions are described in detail and analyzed later in this report.
Table of Contents:

Attachment 1 - Background and Setting
Attachment 2 - Project Description
  • Planned Development Permit Modification and Design Review
Attachment 3 - Analysis
  • Planned Development Permit Modification and Design Review
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Submitted,

__________________________________________
PAM JOHNS
Community Development Director
A. Background: Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan

The proposed Project site is part of the approved Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP), a comprehensively planned community that proposes new development based on “Smart Growth” and Transit Oriented Development principles.

The FPASP, approved in 2011, is a development plan for over 3,500 acres of previously undeveloped land located south of Highway 50, north of White Rock Road, east of Prairie City Road, and adjacent to the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line in the southeastern portion of the City.

The FPASP includes a mix of residential, commercial, employment and public uses, complemented by recreational amenities including a significant system of parks and open space, all within proximity to one another and interconnected by a network of “complete streets”, trails and bikeways. The Specific Plan is consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Principles and the requirements of SB 375 (Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act).

The project site is part of a larger area including Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Maps approved by the Planning Commission on February 19, 2020, and by the City Council on March 10, 2020, which included a total of 1,222 residential dwelling units. Of the 1,222 housing units, 1,011 are age-restricted active-adult units (844 single-family high-density [SFHD] active adult units and 167 multi-family low density [MLD] active adult units). The proposed Project includes the remaining 211 conventional (non-age restricted) dwelling units, located in the western portion of the project area.

The Single-Family High Density (SFHD) zoning designation provides for development at 4.0 to 7.0 units per acre. An excerpt from the FPASP Land Use Map is shown in Figure 1. The proposed land use designations are consistent with the Folsom General Plan.
B. Physical Setting

The proposed Project is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Oak Avenue Parkway and Mangini Parkway, within the Folsom Plan Area.
APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL

The Applicant is requesting approval of a Planned Development permit and Design Review to allow the development of 211 single family homes on a 42.5-acre site. This Attachment provides project information on the requested approvals:

A. Planned Development Permit – Development Standard Deviation and Design Review

The Project subdivision layout is shown in Figure 2. (A more detailed version of the subdivision map is included as Attachment 6 to this staff report).

The Applicant is requesting a minor modification to the Planned Development Permit standards to exclude the covered patio on the 60 x 105 single story lots from the lot coverage requirements.
FIGURE 2: PROPOSED SUBDIVISION LAYOUT
The proposed subdivision features minimum lot sizes of 4,725 square feet (45’x 105’) or 6,300 square feet (60’ x 105’). All lots will meet the standard 15-foot-wide setback in the front yard (and street side yard for corner lots) and minimum rear yard setbacks. As shown in the following figure, homes are setback a minimum of 15-feet in the front yard and rear yards would be a minimum of 16-feet. Many lots exceed the minimum setbacks required by the zoning district.

**FIGURE 3, PROPOSED LOTTING EXAMPLE**

The subdivision uses standard public street right-of-way dimensions, including an internal roadway system with attached sidewalks on both sides of the street.
B. Planned Development Permit- Development Standards and Design Review

The Planned Development Permit is designed to allow greater flexibility in the design of a project than otherwise possible through strict application of the land use regulations. The Planned Development Permit process is designed to encourage creative and efficient uses of land. The following are proposed as part of the Applicant’s Planned Development Permit:

- Development Standard Modification
- Building Architecture and Design

Development Standards

The Project has been designed to meet all minimum setback and lot size requirements. However, the Applicant is requesting that the outdoor covered living area/patio be excluded from the lot coverage calculation for the 60 x 105 lots for single story homes in order to maintain a 50% overall lot coverage. All other proposed product types would meet the lot coverage.

The following table outlines the SFHD Development Standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed Project (with covered living area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size Corner Lot</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porch Setback</td>
<td>12.5 Feet</td>
<td>12.5 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Primary Structure Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Garage Setback</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>5 Feet/5 Feet</td>
<td>5 Feet/5 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
<td>16 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 shows the proposed lot dimensions. There are two product types. Lots that are 45 x 105 (Oak Trails) are shown in orange and lots that are 60 x 105 (Heritage Trails) are shown in green.
Building Architecture and Design
The Project includes the construction of 211 single family homes. All master plans have both single story and two-story configurations. All homes feature a downstairs bedroom.

Four architectural styles are proposed:

- Spanish Colonial
• Italian Villa
• Modern Farmhouse
• Modern Craftsman

There are three plan types for Oak Trails and four plan types for the Heritage Trails neighborhood. Each plan type comes in four architectural styles, with a variety of colors and materials as shown in the Applicant’s submittal (Attachment 7).

The Applicant’s submittal describes the architectural styles as follows:

• **Italian Villa** – The Italian Villa was based on formal and rigidly symmetrical palaces of the Italian Renaissance. Although residential adaptation generated less formality, traditional classical elements such as the symmetrical façade, squared tower entry forms, arched windows and bracketed eaves persisted as the enduring traits of this style. It includes the use of stucco, low pitch hip roofs with enclosed flat eave overhangs and cornice accents, and large-scale stone accents.

• **Modern Farmhouse** – Blending traditional farmhouse forms and features with a more modern variety of materials, details, and compositions. This style combines the use of traditionally massed farmhouse gable-end shape with modern exterior materials such as stucco, board and batten and textured stone. Exterior colors seek a balance of crisp white and grey accents with natural tones and materials.

• **Modern Craftsman** - Is a fresh take on the traditional architectural style. Balanced asymmetrical masses and deep roof overhangs are essential. Recessed and corner window compositions with wood tile accents are strongly encouraged. Material palette includes stucco, with accents of stone and wood tile.

• **Spanish Colonial** – This style is an adaptation of the Spanish Colonial style. It combines low-pitched gable roofs with “S” shaped building tile, use of stucco, use of decorative recessed accents wall corbels at gable roofs and windows with decorative trim.

Example illustrations of the four architectural styles and sample floor plans applied to the designs are shown in Figures 5 through 22 on the following pages.
FIGURE 5: FRONT ELEVATION STREET SCENE EXAMPLE

AZUL SPANISH COLONIAL  KRUGER MODERN FARMHOUSE  RAMONA ITALIAN VILLA  VOLCAN MODERN CRAFTSMAN

FIGURE 6: OAK TRAILS GREENSTONE ELEVATIONS

SPANISH COLONIAL  ITALIAN VILLA

MODERN CRAFTSMAN  MODERN FARMHOUSE
FIGURE 7: OAK TRAILS GREENSTONE FLOORPLAN
FIGURE 8: OAK TRAILS HAYDUKE ELEVATIONS

- Spanish Colonial
- Italian Villa
- Modern Craftsman
- Modern Farmhouse
FIGURE 10: OAK TRAILS INCA ELEVATIONS
FIGURE 11: OAK TRAILS INCA FLOORPLAN

* First Floor = 1,802 SQFT.
* Second Floor = 1,890 SQFT.
* Total = 3,692 SQFT.

Lot Coverage:
39.8% Conditioned + Garage + Porch
4.0% Outdoor Living Area
2,760 SF / 6,305 SF Lot = 43.5% Coverage
FIGURE 12: HERITAGE TRAILS AZUL ELEVATIONS
FIGURE 13: HERITAGE TRAILS AZUL FLOORPLAN
FIGURE 14 HERITAGE TRAIS KRUGER ELEVATIONS
FIGURE 16: HERITAGE TRAILS RAMONA ELEVATIONS
FIGURE 18: HERITAGE TRAILS VOLCAN ELEVATIONS
FIGURE 19: HERITAGE TRAILS VOLCAN FLOORPLAN

* Net Floor = 1,799 SQ FT
  * Second Floor = 1,993 SQ FT
  * Total = 3,792 SQ FT

Lot Coverage:
40.1% Conditioned + Garage + Porch
4.4% Outdoor Living Room
2,749 SQ FT, 3,330 SF Lot = 44.1% Coverage
All lots will have a minimum 15-foot front yard with landscaping proposed as shown in Figures 20 and 21. It should be noted that while the Figures show green area, no turf is proposed. The green area will include drought tolerant shrubs and ground cover and mulch. Further, Condition No. 10 includes a provision that no turf will be allowed in the front yard.
FIGURE 21: 60 x 105 FRONT YARD LANDSCAPING

FIGURE 22: 45 x 105 FRONT YARD LANDSCAPING
ATTACHMENT 3
ANALYSIS

The following sections provide an analysis of the Applicant’s proposal. Staff’s analysis addresses the following:

A. Planned Development Permit Modification and Design Review
B. Conformance with relevant Folsom General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Objectives and Policies

A. Planned Development Permit- Development Standard Deviations and Design Review

Development Standard Deviations

As noted earlier within this staff report, the Project is proposing a deviation from the development standards established by the FPASP for the SFHD land use category for lot coverage as shown in Table 2. The Applicant’s intent with the subject application is to create a unique set of development standards that will accommodate the development of 211 single-family detached homes.

Pursuant to Folsom Municipal Code section 17.38.080, in a planned development district, the regulations of the underlying zone relating to height, setback, lot area and coverage, parking and other provisions may be varied when such deviation will result in improved design of the development and will permit desirable arrangements of structures in relation to parking areas, parks and parkways, pedestrian walks and other such features.

In considering the Planned Development Permit, the proposed development project must be designed to provide open space, circulation, off-street parking and other conditions in such a way as to form a harmonious, integrated project of sufficient quality to justify exceptions to the normal regulations. The Folsom Central District Design Guidelines state: “Wherever possible, outdoor living space is encouraged.” The proposed covered outdoor living space is consistent with the Design Guidelines by providing this use.

Approval of the Planned Development Permit Modification would not set a precedent because it is consistent with other approved projects in the City, including within the FPASP. The City has allowed the exclusion of covered patio areas from the lot coverage calculation for outdoor covered living area for Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Villages 8 & 9 (51 percent), Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Villages 3 to 5 (55%) and Russell
Ranch (55%).

The Toll Brothers Phase 3 project within Mangini Ranch allows a maximum of 50 percent lot coverage. The proposed single-story plan with the patio if it is counted would result in 53 percent lot coverage, which is less than approved elsewhere in the FPASP as noted above. Therefore, this request would allow up to 39 homes with the California room (covered patio) to have a lot coverage of 53-percent. Condition No. 20 would limit the number of homes allowed to meet the 53-percent coverage.

According to the Applicant, 110 homes are proposed in the 60 x 105 subdivision, and of those, it is anticipated that 25-35 percent of the homes will be single story. This means the modification of the lot coverage would only be for approximately 39 homes. Out of the entire 211 home subdivision this would represent approximately 18 percent of the Project.

The Project would allow the Applicant to achieve its intent to provide a luxury outdoor un-air-conditioned living space, which is common in Folsom. There is high residential demand currently and the Applicant believes this product would meet the demand.

Staff further believes that because the covered patio has minimal walls and massing it would not create a significant aesthetic impact and provides additional architectural interest to the rear of the homes.

Staff has reviewed the Project and determined that the Project is proposing a product that provides adequate open space, circulation, off-street parking and that provides a quality neighborhood. Because the coverage request is only for a small percentage of the entire project site, restricted to a maximum of 39 units, and is less than allowed in other areas of the Folsom Area Specific Plan (i.e., Russell Ranch which allows up to 55 percent coverage) staff is recommending approval of this request.

Proposed Residential Designs

The Project is located within the central portion of the Folsom Plan Area; thus, it is subject to the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines, which were approved by the City Council in 2015, and amended in 2018. The Design Guidelines are a complementary document to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Community Guidelines.

The following are the general architectural principles intended to guide the design of the Folsom Ranch, Central District to ensure quality development:

- Provide a varied and interesting street scene.
- Focus of the home is the front elevation, not the garage.
- Provide a variety of garage placements.
• Provide detail on rear elevations where visible from the public streets.
• Choose appropriate massing and roof forms to define the architectural styles.
• Ensure that plans and styles provide a degree of individuality.
• Use architectural elements and details to reinforce individual architectural styles.

The Design Guidelines require that specific homes within a subdivision that meet the definition of an “edge condition” lot are required to incorporate enhanced architectural details on the rear and side building elevations, like the enhanced architectural details provided on the front building elevation of the home. As shown in Figure 23, the rear elevation of homes includes balconies, windows and covered patio areas that will provide interest.

![FIGURE 23: EXAMPLE REAR ELEVATIONS](image)

In evaluating the proposed project, staff also took into consideration building and design elements that could be considered unique to the Folsom Plan Area. Staff has determined that the proposed architectural styles and master plans do include many unique building and design elements and are consistent with the Folsom Ranch Design Guidelines. Based on this analysis, staff forwards the following design recommendations to the Commission for consideration:

1. This approval is for three master plans for the Oak Trails neighborhood and four master plans for the Heritage Trails neighborhood with four architectural styles with
color and material options. The Applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached building elevations dated May 9, 2022.

2. The design, materials, and colors of the single-family residential units shall be consistent with the approved building elevations, materials samples, and color schemes to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

3. The Community Development Department shall approve the individual lot permits to assure no duplication or repetition of the same house, same roof-line, same elevation style, side-by-side, or across the street from each other.

4. All mechanical equipment shall be ground-mounted and concealed from view of public streets, neighboring properties and nearby higher buildings.

5. Decorative light fixtures, consistent with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines and unique to each architectural design theme, shall be added to the front elevation of each Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

6. A minimum of one street tree shall be planted in the front yard of each residential lot within the subdivision. A minimum of two trees are required along the street-side of all corner lots. All front yard irrigation and landscaping shall be installed prior to a Building Permit Final.

These recommendations listed above are included in the conditions of approval presented for consideration by the Planning Commission (Condition No. 20).

**D. Parking and Pedestrian and Bicycle Access.**

The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan requires that single-family residential units located within a Single-Family High Density (SFHD) designated area provide two covered parking spaces per unit. The FPASP also requires that single-family residential units located within an SFHD designated area provide a minimum of 0.8 guest parking spaces per unit.

As shown on the submitted residential schematic design (Attachment 5), each home will include a two-car attached garage, thus meeting the covered parking requirement of the FPASP. There will also be the opportunity for parking spaces in driveways which are 20-feet deep, which would allow two off-street uncovered spaces which, exceeds the minimum of 0.8 parking spaces required by the FPASP.

Figure 24 below shows the proposed Class I (shown in red) and Class II (shown in blue) bike trails that will provide access to the subdivision. Two paseos will provide direct access to the Class 1 trail open space area to the east.
FIGURE 24, CLASS I AND CLASS II BIKE TRAILS
E. Inclusionary Housing

The Applicant proposes to comply with Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 17.104 (Inclusionary Housing) by paying in-lieu fees per Municipal Code Section 17.104.060(G). An Inclusionary Housing Agreement was previously approved by the City Council for the Project. Homes within the subdivision will be sold at market prices. Fees paid by the Applicant will help provide affordable housing elsewhere in the city.

J. Conformance with Relevant General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Objectives and Policies

The following is a summary analysis of the project’s consistency with the Folsom General Plan and with key policies of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

**GP and SP OBJECTIVE H-1 (Housing)**
To provide an adequate supply of suitable sites for the development of a range of housing types to meet the housing needs of all segments of the population.

**GP and SP POLICY H-1.1**
The City shall ensure that sufficient land is designated and zoned in a range of residential densities to accommodate the City’s regional share of housing.

**Analysis:** The City provides residential lands at a variety of residential densities as specified in the General Plan and in the Folsom Municipal Code. The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan includes specialized zoning (Specific Plan Designations) that are customized to the Plan Area as adopted in 2011 and as Amended over time. The FPASP provides residential lands at densities ranging from 1-4 dwelling unit per acre (SF), 4-7 dwelling units per acre (SFHD), 7-12 dwelling units per acre (MLD), 12-20 dwelling units per acre (MMD), 20-30 dwelling units per acre (MHD), and 9-30 dwelling units per acre (MU).

The Phase 3 Toll Brothers Subdivision project is designated SFHD and is proposed to be developed at 6 units per acre, which is within the density range for the SFHD designation.
SP POLICY 4.1
Create pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods through the use of a grid system of streets where feasible, sidewalks, bike paths and trails. Residential neighborhoods shall be linked, where appropriate, to encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel.

Analysis: The Project proposes a single-family neighborhood with a system of local streets linked with sidewalks and connection to the open space to the south. Biking and walking will be accommodated within the Project and will be connected via external sidewalks and Class I and Class II bicycle lanes with nearby neighborhoods, parks, schools, and open space trails with Class I bicycle trails.

SP POLICY 4.4
Provide a variety of housing opportunities for residents to participate in the home-ownership market.

Analysis: The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan provides home ownership opportunities within the SFHD (Single-Family High Density) land use category. The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Toll Brothers Subdivision project is consistent with this policy in that it will provide detached single family home ownership opportunities within the SFHD designation zoned parcels at a more affordable price point than in other, less dense residential developments.

SP OBJECTIVE 7.1 (Circulation)
Consistent with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 and the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375), create a safe and efficient circulation system for all modes of travel.

SP POLICY 7.1
The roadway network in the Plan Area shall be organized in a grid-like pattern of streets and blocks, except where topography and natural features make it infeasible, for the majority of the Plan Area in order to create neighborhoods that encourage walking, biking, public transit, and other alternative modes of transportation.

Analysis: Consistent with the requirements of the California Complete Streets Act, the FPASP identified and planned for hierarchy of connect “complete streets” to ensure that pedestrian, bike, bus, and automobile modes are travel are designed to have direct and continuous connections throughout the Plan Area. Every option, from regional connector roadways to arterial and local streets, has been carefully planned and designed. Recent California legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (AB 32 and SB 375) has resulted in an increased market demand for public transit and housing located closer to service needs and employment centers. In response to these changes, the FPASP includes a regional transit corridor that will provide public transportation links between the major commercial,
public, and multi-family residential land uses in the Plan Area.

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Toll Brothers Project has been designed with multiple modes of transportation options (vehicles, bicycle, walking, access to transit) and internal street organized pattern consistent with the approved FPASP circulation plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides that residential projects which are consistent with an approved Specific Plan for which an EIR was prepared are exempt from a requirement to prepare additional environmental analysis. CEQA Guidelines section 15182(c) provides specific criteria to determine whether this exemption applies:

(c) Residential Projects Implementing Specific Plans.

(1) Eligibility. Where a public agency has prepared an EIR on a specific plan after January 1, 1980, a residential project undertaken pursuant to and in conformity to that specific plan is exempt from CEQA if the project meets the requirements of this section. Residential projects covered by this section include but are not limited to land subdivisions, zoning changes, and residential planned unit developments. [CEQA Guidelines section 15182]

An Addendum is appropriate where a previously certified EIR has been prepared and some changes or revisions to the project are proposed, or the circumstances surrounding the project have changed, but none of the changes or revisions would result in significant new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, consistent with CEQA Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15164 and 15168. An Addendum was approved at the time the Small Lot Vesting Tentative Map for the subdivision was approved.

It is the City's judgment, that the Addendum and the previously prepared environmental document fully addresses all of the impacts of the proposed project. All mitigation measures applicable to the project still apply and no new mitigation measures are required. The scope of this proposed project does not constitute a substantial change to what was approved at the time of the Small Lot Vesting Tentative Map, so no further environmental review is required, as stated in CEQA Guidelines section 15162.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the proposed Project, based on the proposed Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval attached to this
PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

• Move to approve the Toll Brothers Phase 3 Project Planned Development Permit Modification to allow no more than 39 single story homes for the 60 x 105 lots to have a lot coverage of 53 percent and approve Design Review of the Applicant’s master plan residential designs as shown on Attachment 5 (Schematic Designs); and

These approvals are based on the findings (Findings A-V) and subject to the conditions of approval (Conditions 1-24) attached to this report.

GENERAL FINDINGS

A. NOTICE OF HEARING HAS BEEN GIVEN AT THE TIME AND IN THE MANNER REQUIRED BY STATE LAW AND CITY CODE.

B. THE PROJECT IS GENERALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN, AND THE FOLSOM RANCH CENTRAL DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES.

CEQA FINDINGS

C. THE CITY, AS LEAD AGENCY, PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AND IN 2018 AN ADDENDUM TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT.

D. THE CITY HAS DETERMINED THAT THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 TOLL BROTHERS PROJECT IS UNDERTAKEN TO IMPLEMENT AND IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

E. THE CITY HAS DETERMINED THAT THE IMPACTS OF THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 TOLL BROTHERS SUBDIVISION PROJECT ARE ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED BY THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AND ASSOCIATED MITIGATION MEASURES AND THAT THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65457 AND CEQA GUIDELINES 15182(c).

F. NONE OF THE EVENTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 21166 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE OR SECTION 15162 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES HAVE
G. THIS PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM CEQA IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65457 AND SECTION 15182 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FINDINGS

H. THE PROPOSED PROJECT COMPLIES WITH THE INTENT AND PURPOSES OF CHAPTER 17.38 (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT) OF THE FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE AND OTHER APPLICABLE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY.

I. THE PROPOSED PROJECT COMPLIES WITH THE INTENT AND PURPOSES OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND FOLSOM AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

J. THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF THE CITY.

K. THE MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS PROPOSED BY THIS PROJECT WILL RESULT IN A DEVELOPMENT THAT IS SUPERIOR TO THAT OBTAINED BY RIGID APPLICATION OF THE STANDARDS BY PROVIDING AN OUTDOOR LIVING AREA.

L. THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS DESIGNED TO PROVIDE OPEN SPACE, CIRCULATION, OFF-STREET PARKING, AND OTHER CONDITIONS IN SUCH A WAY AS TO FORM A HARMONIOUS, INTEGRATED PROJECT OF SUFFICIENT QUALITY TO JUSTIFY EXCEPTIONS TO THE NORMAL REGULATIONS.

M. WITH RESPECT TO PROJECT DESIGN, THE PHYSICAL, FUNCTIONAL, AND VISUAL COMPATIBILITY BETWEEN THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND EXISTING AND FUTURE ADJACENT USES AND AREA CHARACTERISTICS IS ACCEPTABLE.

N. THERE WILL BE AVAILABLE PUBLIC FACILITIES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO WATER, SEWER AND DRAINAGE TO ALLOW FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT SITE IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE PROPOSAL AS CONDITIONED,

O. THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT CAUSE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN MITIGATED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL.
P. THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT CAUSE UNACCEPTABLE VEHICULAR TRAFFIC LEVELS ON SURROUNDING ROADWAYS AND THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL PROVIDE ADEQUATE INTERNAL CIRCULATION INCLUDING INGRESS AND EGRESS.

Q. THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT BE DETERIMENTAL TO THE HEALTH, SAFETY, AND GENERAL WELFARE OF THE PERSONS OR PROPERTY WITHIN THE VICINITY OF THE PROJECT SITE AND THE CITY AS A WHOLE.

R. ADEQUATE PROVISION IS MADE FOR THE FURNISHING OF SANITATION SERVICE AND EMERGENCY PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES TO THE PROJECT.

S. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AND FOLSOM PLAN AREA EIR/EIS AND THE RESIDENTIAL UNITS APPROVED BY THE SMALL LOT VESTING TENTATIVE MAPS. ACCORDINGLY THE PROPOSED PROJECT’S WATER DEMAND CAN BE ACCOMODATED BY THE CITY’S EXISTING WATER SUPPLY ALLOCATED TO SERVE THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA.

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

T. THE PROJECT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AND THE APPLICABLE ZONING ORDINANCES.

U. THE PROJECT IS GENERALLY IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE FOLSOM RANCH CENTRAL DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES AND THE PROPOSED DESIGN STANDARD DEVIATIONS REQUESTED THROUGH THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PROCESS AS A PART OF THIS PROJECT APPLICATION.

V. THE BUILDING MATERIALS, TEXTURES, AND COLORS OF THE PROJECT WILL BE COMPATIBLE WITH SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT AND CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL DESIGN THEME OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.
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Conditions of Approval
### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE TOLL BROTHERS PHASE 3 PROJECT (PN 22-032)

**LOCATED ON THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF MANGINI PARKWAY AND OAK PARKWAY AND NORTH OF WHITE ROCK ROAD**

**PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT-DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEVIATION AND DESIGN REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition of Approval</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Final Development Plans</strong>&lt;br&gt;The owner/applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Toll Brothers Project Narrative dated May 9, 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td>G, I, B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Conceptual Front Yard Landscaping, dated May 5, 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Residential Schematic Design, dated December 20, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Color and Materials Board and Specifications, dated May 4, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Wall and Fence Exhibit and Details, dated January 24, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Planned Development Permit and Design Review, are approved for the development of a 211-unit single-family residential subdivision. Implementation of the project shall be consistent with the above referenced items and these conditions of approval. The project approvals granted under this staff report (Planned Development Permit &amp; Residential Design Review) shall remain in effect for two years from final date of approval (July 6, 2024). Failure to obtain the relevant building (or other) permits within this time period, without the subsequent extension of this approval, shall result in the termination of this approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Plan Submittal</strong>&lt;br&gt;All civil engineering, improvement, and landscape and irrigation plans, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval to ensure conformance with this approval and with relevant codes, policies, standards and other requirements of the City of Folsom.</td>
<td></td>
<td>G, I</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Validity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The term of the Planned Development Permit and approved Inclusionary Housing Agreement shall track the term of the Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, as may be extended from time to time pursuant to Section 16.16.110.A and 16.16.120 of the Folsom Municipal Code and the Subdivision Map Act.</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ARDA and Amendments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall comply with all provisions of Amendments No. 1 and 2 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement and any approved amendments thereafter by and between the City and the owner/applicant of the project.</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall participate in a mitigation monitoring and reporting program pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 2634 and Public Resources Code 21081.6. The mitigation monitoring and reporting measures identified in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan FEIR/EIS have been incorporated into these conditions of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. These mitigation monitoring and reporting measures are identified in the mitigation measure column. Applicant shall fund on a Time and Materials basis all mitigation monitoring (e.g., staff and consultant time).</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>POLICE/SECURITY REQUIREMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall consult with the Police Department in order to incorporate all reasonable crime prevention measures. The following security/safety measures shall be considered:</td>
<td>G, I, B</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A security guard on-duty at all times at the site or a six-foot security fence shall be constructed around the perimeter of construction areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Security measures for the safety of all construction equipment and unit appliances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Landscaping shall not cover exterior doors or windows, block line-of-sight at intersections or screen overhead lighting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GRADING PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Walls/Fences/Driveways</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Walls/Fences/Driveways</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The final location, design, height, materials, and colors of the walls and fences shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department to ensure consistency with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines.</td>
<td>G, I, B, OG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The location of the fencing shall remain in perpetuity as shown and installed originally by the Applicant (i.e., fence may not be moved into the PUE on side/corner lots).</td>
<td>CD (P)(E), FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No more than one driveway is allowed per residence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prepare Traffic Control Plan.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>Prepare Traffic Control Plan.</strong></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to construction, a Traffic Control Plan for roadways and intersections affected by construction shall be prepared by the owner/applicant. The Traffic Control Plan prepared by the owner/applicant shall, at minimum, include the following measures:</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintaining the maximum amount of travel lane capacity during non-construction periods, possible, and advanced notice to drivers through the provision of construction signage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintaining alternate one-way traffic flow past the lay down area and site access when feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heavy trucks and other construction transport vehicles shall avoid the busiest commute hours (7 a.m. to 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. on weekdays).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A minimum 72-hour advance notice of access restrictions for residents, businesses, and local emergency response agencies. This shall include the identification of alternative routes and detours to enable for the avoidance of the immediate construction zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A phone number and City contact for inquiries about the schedule of the construction throughout the construction period. This information will be posted in a local newspaper, via the City’s web site, or at City Hall and will be updated on a monthly basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>State and Federal Permits</strong>&lt;br&gt;The owner/applicant shall obtain all required State and Federal permits and provide evidence that said permits have been obtained, or that the permit is not required, subject to staff review prior to approval of any grading or improvement plan.</td>
<td>G, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANDSCAPE/TREE PRESERVATION REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Landscaping Plans</strong>&lt;br&gt;Final landscape plans and specifications shall be prepared by a registered landscape architect and approved by the City prior to the approval of the first building permit. Said plans shall include all on-site landscape specifications and details including a tree planting exhibit demonstrating sufficient diversity and appropriate species selection to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. The tree exhibit shall include all street trees, accent trees, parking lot shading trees, and mitigation trees proposed within the development. Said plans shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s declarations and restrictions pertaining to water conservation and outdoor landscaping. Landscaping shall meet shade requirements as outlined in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan where applicable. The landscape plans shall comply and implement water efficient requirements as adopted by the State of California (Assembly Bill 1881) (State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance) until such time the City of Folsom adopts its own Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance at which time the owner/applicant shall comply with any new ordinance. Shade and ornamental trees shall be maintained according to the most current American National Standards for Tree Care Operations (ANSI A-300) by qualified tree care professionals. Tree topping for height reduction, view protection, light clearance or any other purpose shall not be allowed. Specialty-style pruning, such as pollarding, shall be specified within the approved landscape plans and shall be implemented during a 5-year establishment and training period. The owner/applicant shall comply with city-wide landscape rules or regulations on water usage. The owner/applicant shall comply with any state or local rules and regulations relating to landscape water usage and landscaping requirements necessitated to mitigate for drought conditions on all landscaping in the Phase 3 Toll Brother Subdivision project. No turf shall be allowed in the front yards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ARCHITECTURE/SITE DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20.</th>
<th>The Phase 3 Toll Brothers Subdivision project shall comply with the following architecture and design requirements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. This approval is for three master plans for the Oak Trails neighborhood and four master plans for the Heritage Trails neighborhood with four architectural styles with color and material options. The Applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached building elevations dated May 9, 2022.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The design, materials, and colors of the single-family residential units shall be consistent with the approved building elevations, materials samples, and color schemes to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Community Development Department shall approve the individual lot permits to assure no duplication or repetition of the same house, same roof-line, same elevation style, side-by-side, or across the street from each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. All mechanical equipment shall be ground-mounted and concealed from view of public streets, neighboring properties and nearby higher buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Decorative light fixtures, consistent with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines and unique to each architectural design theme, shall be added to the front elevation of each Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. A minimum of one street tree shall be planted in the front yard of each residential lot within the subdivision. A minimum of two trees are required along the street-side of all corner lots. All front yard irrigation and landscaping shall be installed prior to a Building Permit Final.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. No more than 39 single story homes (60 x 105 Oak Trails product) with the outdoor California rooms (covered patio area) are allowed up to 53-percent lot coverage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Prior to issuance of the 137th building permit within Traditional Subdivision portion of the Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch project, the owner/applicant shall begin construction of the private amenity and maintain continual progress until completion.

22. The owner/applicant shall include the maintenance of all graded subdivision trails and completed Class I trail parallel to Mangini Parkway within the responsibility of the development Homeowner's Association (HOA) until the Open Space is deeded to the City. The City shall not incur any maintenance responsibility or expense as a result of these trails until the transfer of Open Space ownership to the City is complete.

23. **Trash/Recycling Containers and Air Conditioner Screening**
   
   Trash, recycling, and yard waste containers shall be placed behind the side yard fence so that they are not visible from the public right-of-way to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. In addition, air conditioning units shall also be placed behind the side yard fence or located in the rear yard so that they are not visible from the public right-of-way to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

24. **Toll Brothers at Mangini Ranch Project Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP)**

   The owner/applicant shall implement all the applicable mitigation measures from the FPASP as amended by the Revised Proposed water Supply Facility Alternative (November 2012), Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 backbone Infrastructure Mitigated Negative Declaration (December 2014), the Westland Eagle Specific Plan Amendment (September 2015) and the Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch Project Addendum 2019.
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Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch Oak Trails and Heritage Trails Project Narrative
Residential Schematic Design, dated May 9, 2022.
Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch
Modern Farmhouse
Blending traditional farmhouses and features with a more modern variety of materials, details and compositions, the Modern Farmhouse style was created to bring a more contemporary expression to a traditionally rural aesthetic. This progressive approach to home design takes time-honored architectural characteristics and updates them with an eclectic and modern feel. This style combines the use of a traditionally massed farmhouse gable-end shape with modern exterior materials such as stucco, board and batten and textured stone. Exterior colors seek a balance of crisp white and grey accents with natural tones and materials. This style strikes a balance between traditional elements and modern textures to provide a familiar sense while mining forward-looking design and quality.

Modern Farmhouse Design Characteristics
The design characteristics provide essentials for massing, scale and proportion, and building materials for understanding this style. They are:

- Steek, clean geometric forms
- A combination of steep and low-slope roofs, typically with a gable end
- Standing seam metal roof accents over entry and porch elements
- Use of transom windows and expansive glass walls
- Exterior materials to combine a balanced mix of board and batten, stone, and brick

Italian Villa
The Italian Villa was one of the most fashionable architectural styles in the United States in the 1860's. Appearing on architect-designed landmarks in larger cities, the style was based on formal and rigidly symmetrical palaces of the Italian Renaissance. Although residential adaptations generated less formality, traditional classical elements, such as the symmetrical façade, squared tower entry forms, arched windows, and bracketed eaves persisted as the enduring traits of this style. With the emergence of French limestone as a popular building material, it become an integral part of the Italianate vocabulary, embellishing homes with a strong presence at key locations of the home.

Italian Villa Design Characteristics
The design characteristics provide essentials for massing, scale and proportion, and building materials for understanding this style. They are:

- Use of stucco as predominant exterior material
- Low pitch hip roofs with enclosed flat eave overhangs and corbels
- Large scale stone accents to highlight prominent massing elements
- Windows and doors have decorative trim

Modern Craftsman
The Modern Craftsman style is a fresh take on the traditional architectural style common to the early 20th century development of California. Striking and iconic in nature, the style artfully merges streamlined forms, bold roof lines, stunning glass and details with subtle textures. Balanced, asymmetrical masses and deep roof overhangs are essential for executing this style properly. Recessed and corner window compositions with wood file accents are strongly encouraged as they add drama to the Modern Craftsman’s inherent simplicity. The material palette is comprised predominantly of stucco, with accents of clean stone textures and rich wood tile. Stucco body colors should be light and tonal, allowing for contrasting fascia and eyebrow roofs. Overall, the Modern Craftsman style is sophisticated and contemporary without being sterile.

Modern Craftsman Design Characteristics
The design characteristics provide essentials for massing, scale and proportion, and building materials for understanding this style. They are:

- Clean, streamlined forms and textures
- Use of transom windows and expansive glass walls
- Recessed windows with wood file veneer accents
- Large scale stone accents to highlight prominent massing elements
- Low pitch hip roofs with deep enclosed flat eave overhangs and modern cornice accents
- Horizontal trim band accents to differentiate changes in wall planes materials

Spanish Colonial
The Spanish Colonial style evolved in California and the southwest as an adaptation of Mission Revival infused with additional elements and details from Latin America. The style received widespread popularity after its use in the Panama-California Exposition of 1915. Key features of this style were adopted to the California lifestyle. Spanish Colonial style follows plan forms ranging from simple rectilinear configurations to larger massing expressions. The roof forms mirror that of the plan, combining low-pitched gable roofs, simplistic in nature, clean stucco facades express the style’s purity of forms, while gable and details, louvered shutters, wood tiles and decorative corbels contribute to its articulation without becoming ornate and obtrusive. Elevations are very simply articulated and detailed. Roofs are typically constructed with concrete “S” roof tiles. Overall, this style is characterized by its unadulterated elegance, clearly illustrated through its masses and authentic detailing.

Spanish Colonial Design Characteristics
The design characteristics provide essentials for massing, scale and proportion, and building materials for understanding this style. They are:

- Use of stucco as predominant exterior material
- Roof configurations should be primarily low-slope gables with hip roofs if necessary
- Use of decorative recessed accents and corbels at gable roofs
- Windows to receive decorative trim
## Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
<th>Rear Yard Square Footage (including Outdoor Living Room):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenstone</td>
<td>4 Bed + Loft + 3.5 Bath - 2,938 SF</td>
<td>Lot Coverage: 43.5% Conditioned + Garage + Porch 4.2% Outdoor Living Room 2,255 SF/ 4,725 SF Lot = 47.7% Coverage</td>
<td>1,100.8 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayduke</td>
<td>5 Bed + Loft + 4.5 Bath - 3,102 SF</td>
<td>Lot Coverage: 43.0% Conditioned + Garage + Porch 4.1% Outdoor Living Room 2,225 SF/ 4,725 SF Lot = 47.1% Coverage</td>
<td>1,096.6 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inca</td>
<td>5 Bed + Loft + 4.5 Bath - 3,359 SF</td>
<td>Lot Coverage: 45.5% Conditioned + Garage + Porch 4.2% Outdoor Living Room 2,349 SF/ 4,725 SF Lot = 49.7% Coverage</td>
<td>965.8 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Type: V-8 2 Story Detached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lot Coverage:
43.5% Conditioned + Garage + Porch
4.2% Outdoor Living Room
2,255 SF / 4,725 SF Lot = 47.7% Coverage
Lot Coverage:
45.5% Conditioned + Garage + Porch
4.2% Outdoor Living Room
2,349 SF / 4,725 SF Lot = 49.7% Coverage
Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lot Coverage:</th>
<th>Rear Yard Square Footage (including Outdoor Living Room):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azul</td>
<td>4 Bed + Flex + 3.5 Bath - 2,555 SF</td>
<td>Lot Coverage: 50.0% Conditioned + Garage + Porch 3.0% Outdoor Living Room 3,336 SF/ 6,300 SF Lot = 53.0% Coverage</td>
<td>1,271.0 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruger</td>
<td>5 Bed + Flex + Loft + 4.5 Bath - 3,500 SF</td>
<td>Lot Coverage: 38.8% Conditioned + Garage + Porch 5.3% Outdoor Living Room 2,798 SF/ 6,300 SF Lot = 44.1% Coverage</td>
<td>2,138.2 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona</td>
<td>5 Bed + Flex + Loft + 4.5 Bath - 3,637 SF</td>
<td>Lot Coverage: 39.8% Conditioned + Garage + Porch 4.0% Outdoor Living Room 2,760 SF/ 6,300 SF Lot = 43.8% Coverage</td>
<td>1,920.0 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcan</td>
<td>5 Bed + Flex + Loft + 5.5 Bath - 3,787 SF</td>
<td>Lot Coverage: 40.1% Conditioned + Garage + Porch (2530.5) 4.0% Outdoor Living Room (249) 2,779 SF/ 6,300 SF Lot = 44.1% Coverage</td>
<td>1,920.0 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction Type: V-8 1 Story Detached / 2 Story Detached
* First Floor - 2,555 SQ FT.
* Total - 2,555 SQ FT.

Lot Coverage:
50.0% Conditioned + Garage + Porch
3.0% Outdoor Living Room
3,336 SF / 6,300 SF Lot = 53.0% Coverage
Lot Coverage:
38.8% Conditioned + Garage + Porch
5.3% Outdoor Living Room
2,798 SF; 6,300 SF Lot = 44.1% Coverage
Lot Coverage:
- 40.1% Conditioned + Garage + Porch
- 4.0% Outdoor Living Room
- 2,749 SF / 6,300 SF Lot = 44.1% Coverage
Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch

Color and Material Schemes
Scheme 1
- Roof Tile: Eagle 4697 Slate Range (Concrete Flat Smooth)
- Stucco: SW 7096 Extra White
- Trim 1: SW 7006 Extra White (Garage Doors, Fascias / Trim @ Windows & Doors)
- Trim 2: SW 7006 Extra White (Garage Doors, Fascias / Trim @ Windows & Doors)
- Trim 3: SW 7076 Cyberspace (Shutters)

Scheme 2
- Roof Tile: Eagle 4602 Concord Blend (Concrete Flat Smooth)
- Stucco: SW 6070 Heron Plume
- Trim 1: SW 6070 Heron Plume (Garage Doors, Fascias / Trim @ Windows & Doors)
- Trim 2: SW 7632 Modern Gray (Shutters or Stucco)
- Trim 3: SW 6174 Andiron (Shutters)

Scheme 3
- Roof Tile: Eagle 4697 Slate Range (Concrete Flat Smooth)
- Stucco: SW 7038 Jogging Mth
- Trim 1: SW 7008 Alabaster (Garage Doors, Fascias / Trim @ Windows & Doors)
- Trim 2: SW 6207 Retreat (Shutters or Stucco)
- Trim 3: SW 7020 Black Fox (Shutters)
Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch

Specification
Front Entry Doors

Spanish Colonial Therma Tru Model No. CCR8222

Italian Villa Therma Tru Model No. CCR8225

Craftsman Therma Tru Model No. CCR8222

Modern Farmhouse Therma Tru Model No. CCR8222

Garage Doors

Spanish Colonial Wayne Dalton - Classic Steel Ranch Style Model No. 9100 Optional Clear II Glass

Italian Villa Wayne Dalton - Classic Steel Sonoma Style Model No. 9100 Optional Stockton I Glass

Craftsman Wayne Dalton - Classic Steel Contemporary Style Model No. 9100 Optional Clear IV Glass

Modern Farmhouse Wayne Dalton - Classic Steel Colonial Style Model No. 9100 Optional Clear I Glass

Light Fixtures

Progress Lighting Cadence Collection Model No. P6626-31

Progress Lighting Gibbs Street Antique Collection Model No. P60021-020

Progress Lighting Maison Collection Model No. P6635.31

Progress Lighting Valera Collection Model No. P5806-20
Attachment 6
Attachment 7

Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch Colors and Materials dated August 30, 2019
Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch

Folsom, California
Color and Material Schemes
Attachment 8

Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch Conceptual Landscape Design dated January 24, 2020
REGENCY AT FOLSOM - 60X105 FRONT YARD TYPICALS LANDSCAPE CONCEPT

TOLL BROTHERS, FOLSOM, CA - MAY 5, 2022

PLANT PALETTE:

STREET TREES
- MAY INCLUDE, BUT NOT LIMITED TO
  - Common Name: Olive
  - Alternatives: Arizona Cypress, Willows, Staghorn Sumac

ACCENT TREES
- MAY INCLUDE, BUT NOT LIMITED TO
  - Common Name: Peach, Maples, Dogwood

VERTICAL SCREEN
- MAY INCLUDE, BUT NOT LIMITED TO
  - Common Name: English Ivy, Creeping Fig, Teenie Weenie

BACKGROUND SHRUBS
- MAY INCLUDE, BUT NOT LIMITED TO
  - Common Name: Pieris, Photinias, Forsythias

MID-GROUND SHRUBS
- MAY INCLUDE, BUT NOT LIMITED TO
  - Common Name: Barberry, Skimmia, Ninebark

FOREGROUND GRASSES & SHRUBS
- MAY INCLUDE, BUT NOT LIMITED TO
  - Common Name: Blanket Fern, Maiden Grass, Japanese Forest Grass

GROUNDCOVERS
- MAY INCLUDE, BUT NOT LIMITED TO
  - Common Name: Vinca, Creeping Thyme, English Ivy

MULCH AT PLANTING BEDIA
ALL BORDERS AND BEDS SHALL BE MULCHED WITH A MINIMUM OF 2 INCH DEPTH OF BLACK STABILIZED MULCH. MULCH DEPTHS SHALL BE ONE INCH AT ALL BEDS AND ONE AND ONE-HALF INCH AT ALL BORDERS.

IRRIGATION NOTES:
A LOW PRESSURE AUTOMATIC IRRIGATION SYSTEM SHALL BE INSTALLED TO LOCAL CODE AND ORGANIZATIONS TO ALL LANDSCAPING AREAS. OWNER TO SUPPLY AND INSTALLATIONS FOR CONCEPTUAL USE ONLY TO BE INSTALLED NATURAL MAPLE LEAF IN MULCH.

SMP
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34187 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446
Planning Commission Staff Report
50 Natoma Street, Council Chambers
Folsom, CA 95630

Project: Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 Subdivision Residential Design Review
File #: DRCL22-00096
Request: Residential Design Review
Location: Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision within Folsom Plan Area (Northwest Corner of E. Bidwell St. and Mangini Pkwy.)
Staff Contact: Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner, 916-461-6209 jkinkade@folsom.ca.us

Property Owner
Name: TCS Improvement Company, LLC
Address: 4370 Town Center Blvd. Ste 100, El Dorado Hills CA 95762

Applicant
Taylor Morrison Homes
81 Blue Ravine Rd., Suite 220 Folsom CA 95630

Recommendation: Conduct a public meeting and upon conclusion recommend approval of a Residential Design Review Application for 218 single-family residential homes as illustrated on Attachment 5 for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 project (DRCL22-00096) based on the findings (Findings A-J) and subject to the conditions of approval (Conditions 1-16) attached to this report.

Project Summary: The proposed project involves a request for Residential Design Review approval for 218 traditional single-family residential homes located within Villages 1-3 of the previously approved Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project. In particular, the applicant is requesting Design Review approval for 10 individual master plans. Five distinct California heritage-themed architectural styles and 15 color and material alternatives are incorporated among the ten master plans.

Table of Contents:
1. Description/Analysis
2. Background
3. Conditions of Approval
4. Vicinity Map
5. Site Plan
6. Architectural and Landscape Plans dated May 18, 2022
7. Exterior Colors and Materials, dated April 20, 2022
8. Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines

Submitted,

PAM JOHNS
Community Development Director
APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL
The applicant, Taylor Morrison Homes, is requesting Residential Design Review approval for 218 single-family residential homes situated within the previously approved Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project. Specifically, the applicant is requesting Design Review approval for ten individual master plans within Villages 1-3. The master plans include five distinct California heritage-themed architectural styles (Italian Villa, Spanish Colonial, Farmhouse, European Cottage and Craftsman) and 15 color and material alternatives.

The proposed master plans feature three single-story and seven two-story plans ranging in size from 1,767 to 3,056 square feet (3BR/2BA to 4BR/3BA with options for a fifth bedroom, a fourth bath and multi-generational suites in some units) and include an attached two-car garage (with one plan including a third tandem parking space in the garage). The five classic design themes are characterized by a variety of unique architectural elements including distinctive roof shapes and forms, covered front entries, varied door and window design, and enhanced decorative elements. Proposed building materials include stucco, board and batten and shingle siding, rock, ledgestone and brick veneer, wood posts and columns, wood shutters, wood windowsills, multi-paned windows, themed garage doors, decorative light fixtures, and concrete roof tiles. In addition, there are 15 distinct color and material alternatives available for each of the master plans. The figures on the following page illustrate the approved site plan and proposed building elevations for the project.

POLICY/RULE
Folsom Municipal Code (FMC), Section 17.06.030 requires that single-family residential master plans submit a Design Review Application for approval by the Planning Commission. Pursuant to FMC section 17.06.080(B), the Planning Commission must make the following findings in approving, conditionally approving, or denying the design review application:

1. Project compliance with the general plan and any applicable specific plans and zoning ordinances;
2. Conformance with any adopted city-wide design guidelines;
3. Conformance with any project-specific design guidelines and standards approved through the planned development permit process or similar review process;
4. Compatibility of building materials, textures and colors with surrounding development and consistency with the general design theme of the neighborhood.
FIGURE 1: APPROVED SITE PLAN

FIGURE 2: PROPOSED STREET SCENES
ANALYSIS

Project Compliance with Applicable Specific Plan - Development Standards

The proposed project is subject to the development standards established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan for SFHD (Single-Family High Density)-designated properties. The following table demonstrates that the proposed project is consistent with the required development standards:

TABLE 1: SFHD DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>4,000 SF</td>
<td>4,500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porch Setback</td>
<td>12.5 Feet</td>
<td>14 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Primary Structure Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Garage Setback</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>5 Feet</td>
<td>5 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conformance with Applicable Design Guidelines

The proposed project is located within the Mangini Ranch portion of the Folsom Plan Area; thus, it is subject to the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines, which were approved by the City Council in 2015. No applicable City-wide design guidelines exist. The Design Guidelines are a complementary document to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Community Guidelines. The Design Guidelines, which are intended to act as an implementation tool for residential development within the Central District of the Folsom Plan Area, provide the design framework for architecture, street scene, and landscaping to convey a master plan identity. The Design Guidelines also establish the pattern and intensity of development for the Central District to ensure a high quality and aesthetically cohesive environment. While these Design Guidelines establish the quality of architectural and landscape development for the master plan, they are not intended to prevent alternative designs and/or concepts that are compatible with the overall project theme.

As a regulatory tool, the Design Guidelines are intended to assist applicants in creating single-family residential neighborhoods that reflect the City’s rich history, reinforce the sense of community, and utilize sustainable best practices. The Design Guidelines also provide the framework for design review approval of Folsom Ranch, Central District residential projects. In addition, the Design Guidelines are intended to be used by builders and developers when designing their Master Plot Plans. Any development project that is submitted to the City must be reviewed for consistency with these Design Guidelines. The following are the general architectural principles intended to guide the design of the Folsom Ranch, Central District to ensure quality development:
• Provide a varied and interesting street scene
• Focus of the home is the front elevation, not the garage
• Provide a variety of garage placements
• Provide detail on rear elevations where visible from the public streets
• Choose appropriate massing and roof forms to define the architectural styles
• Ensure that plans and styles provide a degree of individuality
• Use architectural elements and details to reinforce individual architectural styles

In addition to the general architectural principles referenced previously, the Design Guidelines also provide specific direction regarding a number of architectural situations and features including: edge conditions, corner buildings, building forms, off-set massing forms, front elevations, roof forms, feature windows, architectural projects, balconies, lower height elements, garage door treatments, outdoor living spaces, exterior structures, building materials, and color criteria. The following are examples of architectural situations and features that are relevant to the proposed project:

• Provide a mix of hip and gable roof forms along the street scene
• Provide off-set massing, forms, or wall planes
• Provide recessed second-story elements
• Provide enhanced style-appropriate details on the front building elevation
• Provide decorative window shelves or sill treatments
• Provide architectural projections (recessed windows, eaves, shutters, etc.)
• Provide garage doors that are consistent with the architecture of the building
• Provide variety in the garage door patterns
• Provide outdoor living spaces (porches, balconies, courtyards, etc.)

The architectural design styles selected for the Folsom Ranch Central District have been chosen from the traditional heritage of California home styles, a majority of which have been influenced by the Spanish Mission and Mexican Rancho eras. Over the years, architectural styles in California have become reinterpreted traditional styles that reflect the indoor-outdoor lifestyle choices available in the Mediterranean climate. Suggested architectural styles in the Design Guidelines include American Traditional, Craftsman, Early California Ranch, European Cottage, Italian Villa, Monterey, Spanish Colonial, and Western Farmhouse. Additional architectural styles compatible with the intent of the Design Guidelines may be added if they are regionally appropriate.

As described in the applicant’s proposal, the proposed project features five distinct architectural themes that have been chosen from or are similar to the traditional heritage of California home styles including Italian Villa, Spanish Colonial, Farmhouse, European Cottage and Craftsman. The following is a description of each of the aforementioned architectural styles proposed for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 Subdivision:
Italian Villa
The Italian Villa was one of the most fashionable architectural styles in the United States in the 1860’s. Appearing on architect-designed landmarks in larger cities, the style was based on formal and rigidly symmetrical palaces of the Italian Renaissance. Although residential adaptations generated less formality, traditional classical elements, such as the symmetrical facade, squared tower entry forms, arched windows, and bracketed eaves, persisted as the enduring traits of this style. When cast iron became a popular building material, it became a part of the Italianate vocabulary, embellishing homes with a variety of designs for balconies, porches, railings, and fences.

Spanish Colonial
This style evolved in California and the southwest as an adaptation of Mission Revival infused with additional elements and details from Latin America. The style attained widespread popularity after its use in the Panama-California Exposition of 1915. Key features of this style were adapted to the California lifestyle. Plans were informally organized around a courtyard with the front elevation very simply articulated and detailed. The charm of this style lies in the directness, adaptability, and contrasts of materials and textures.

Farmhouse
The Farmhouse represents a practical and picturesque country house. Its beginnings are traced to both Colonial styles from New England and the Midwest. As the American frontier moved westward, the American Farmhouse style evolved according to the availability of materials and technological advancements, such as balloon framing. Predominant features of the style are large wrapping front porches with a variety of wood columns and railings. Two story massing, dormers, and symmetrical elevations occur most often on the New England Farmhouse variations. The asymmetrical, casual cottage look, with a more decorated appearance, is typical of the Western American Farmhouse. Roof ornamentation is a characteristic detail consisting of cupolas, weathervanes, and dovecotes.

European Cottage
The Cottage is a style that evolved out of medieval Tudor and Normandy architecture. This evolving character that eventually resulted in the English and French “Cottage” became extremely popular when the addition of stone and brick veneer details was developed in the 1920’s. Although the Cottage is looked upon as small and unpretentious, the style was quickly recognized as one of the most popular in America. Designs for the homes typically reflected the rural setting in which they evolved. Roof pitches for these homes are steeper than traditional homes, and are comprised of gables, hips, and half-hip forms. The primary material is stucco with heavy use of stone and brick at bases, chimneys, and entry elements. Some of the most recognizable features for this style are the accent details in gable ends, sculptured swooping walls at the front elevation, and tower or alcove elements at the entry.
Craftsmen
Influenced by the English Arts and Crafts movement of the late 19th century and stylized by California architects, the Craftsman style focused on exterior elements with tasteful and artful attention to detail. Originating in California, Craftsman architecture relied on the simple house tradition, combining hip and gable roof forms with wide, livable porches, and broad overhanging eaves. Extensive built-in elements define this style, treating details such as windows and porches as if they were furniture. The horizontal nature is emphasized by exposed rafter tails and knee braces below broad overhanging eaves constructed in rustic-textured building materials. The overall effect is the creation of a natural, warm, and livable home of artful and expressive character.

In reviewing the architecture and design of the project, staff determined that the design of the ten proposed master plans (which also include five elevation plans, 15 color and material alternatives) generally reflect the level and type of high-quality design features recommended by the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines. Specifically, the master plans are responsive to views on all four building elevations and include a variety of unique architectural elements that create an interesting streetscape scene including: off-set building massing, distinctive roof shapes and forms, covered front entries, architectural projections, varied door and window design, single-story elements in the rear and enhanced decorative elements.

Compatibility With Surrounding Development and Consistency with General Design Theme of the Neighborhood
The proposed building materials (stucco, board and batten and shingle siding, rock, ledgestone and brick veneer, wood posts and columns, wood shutters, wood windowsills, multi-paned windows, themed garage doors, decorative light fixtures, and concrete roof tiles) are consistent with the materials recommended by the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines. In addition, the proposed project includes distinct (earth-tone) color schemes that will enhance the visual interest of each of the master plans.

Staff forwards the following design recommendations to the Commission for consideration:

1. This approval is for ten master plans (five building elevations with 15 color and material options) for Villages 1-3 of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision. The applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached building elevations dated May 18, 2022.

2. The design, materials, and colors of the proposed Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 Subdivision single-family residential homes shall be consistent with the attached building elevations, materials samples, and color scheme to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.
3. The Community Development Department shall approve the individual lot permits to assure no duplication or repetition of the same house, same roofline, same elevation style, side-by-side, or across the street from each other.

4. Driveways shall only be placed in the locations shown in plot plans approved by Community Development Department. No additional driveways shall be constructed on these lots.

5. All mechanical equipment shall be ground-mounted and concealed from view of public streets, neighboring properties, and nearby higher buildings. For lots abutting the open space areas, mechanical equipment shall be located out of view from open space areas.

6. Decorative light fixtures, consistent with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines and unique to each architectural design theme, shall be added to the front and rear building elevation of each Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

7. A minimum of one tree shall be planted in the front yard of each residential lot within the subdivision. A minimum of two trees are required along the street-side of all corner lots. All front yard irrigation and landscaping shall be installed prior to a Building Permit Final.

These recommendations listed above are included in the conditions of approval presented for consideration by the Planning Commission (Condition No. 12).

Taking into consideration the aforementioned architectural details, materials, and colors, staff has determined that the design of the master plans, with the proposed conditions, is consistent with the design principles established by the Design Guidelines and is also compatible with surrounding development and consistent with the general design theme of the neighborhood.

**Landscaping**

The Applicant is proposing to install new landscaping in the front yards and street side yards of the new homes within the project. Homeowners will be responsible for landscaping the rear yards of the individual homes. Front yard landscaping has been designed by the applicant to complement the proposed architecture and to work within the front yard areas available.

Proposed landscaping includes street trees on each lot (at least one per interior lot and two per corner lot) and accent trees (at least one per lot). Groundcover consists of a mix of mulch with drought-tolerant, low-maintenance shrub and groundcover plantings. No turf is proposed in the front yards. The conceptual landscape plans are shown in Attachment 6. The species of the trees and plants will be subject to the review and approval of the City Arborist upon submittal of the final landscape plans.
Landscaping plans are required to include all on-site landscape specifications and details and are required to comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s declarations and restrictions pertaining to water conservation and outdoor landscaping, including city-wide landscape rules and regulations on water usage and landscaping requirements necessitated to mitigate for drought conditions. The landscape plans are also required to comply with and implement water efficient requirements as adopted by the State of California (Assembly Bill 1881) (State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance) until such time the City of Folsom adopts its own Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance at which time the owner/applicant shall comply with any new ordinance.

Wood fencing is proposed on the property lines of each interior lot. Corner lots provide fencing along the property lines of the interior side property line and inside of the property line on the street-side property line to allow room for additional landscaping outside of the fence line but within the property lines, as shown in Attachment 6. The Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines require that rear yard fencing adjacent to park areas or open space edges where the residential pad is elevated above park/open space be view fencing, where applicable, considering grade differentials, etc.

With the proposed conditions, staff has determined that the design of the landscaping and fencing will be consistent with the design principles established by the Design Guidelines and will also be compatible with surrounding development and consistent with the general design theme of the neighborhood.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
The City, as lead agency, previously determined that the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project is entirely consistent with the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) and therefore the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act as provided by Government Code section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines section 15182. Since that determination was made, none of the events described in Public Resources Code section 21166 or CEQA Guidelines section 15162 (e.g. substantial changes to the project) have occurred. Therefore, no environmental review is required in association with this Residential Design Review Application.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends approval of the proposed project, based on the following findings and subject to the conditions of approval included in this report.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
Move to Approve a Residential Design Review Application for 218 single-family residential homes as illustrated on Attachment 6 for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 project (DRCL22-00096) based on the findings (Findings A-J) and subject to the conditions of approval (Conditions 1-16) attached to this report.
GENERAL FINDINGS

A. NOTICE OF HEARING HAS BEEN GIVEN AT THE TIME AND IN THE MANNER REQUIRED BY STATE LAW AND CITY CODE.

B. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN, AND THE FOLSOM RANCH CENTRAL DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES.

CEQA FINDINGS

C. THE CITY, AS LEAD AGENCY, PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

D. THE CITY PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED THAT THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

E. THE CITY PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED THAT THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65457 AND CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15182.

F. NONE OF THE EVENTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 21166 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE OR SECTION 15162 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES HAVE OCCURRED.

G. NO ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW IS REQUIRED FOR THIS APPLICATION.

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

H. THE PROJECT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN, AND THE APPLICABLE ZONING ORDINANCES.

I. THE PROJECT IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE FOLSOM RANCH CENTRAL DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES.

J. THE BUILDING MATERIALS, TEXTURES, AND COLORS OF THE PROJECT WILL BE COMPATIBLE WITH SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT AND CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL DESIGN THEME OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.
BACKGROUND
On May 12, 2021, the City Council approved a Large-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, and Minor Administrative Modifications for Mangini Ranch Phase 3 located within the central portion of the Folsom Plan Area. The Large-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map was approved to subdivide the 173-acre project site into 14 individual parcels for future development. The Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map was approved to subdivide a 52.3-acre portion of the project site into 260 residential lots for single-family detached units, three open space parcels, eight lettered landscape lots, and one paseo lot. Minor administrative modifications were also approved to transfer 25 allocated dwelling units among parcels within the Project to accommodate the residential unit count and densities of the project and to refine land uses edges for the purpose of maximizing development efficiencies, avoiding natural resources, and accommodating a Class I trail.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION
SFHD (Single Family High Density)

SPECIFIC PLAN DESIGNATION
SP-SFHD PD (Specific Plan-Single Family High Density, Planned Development District)

ADJACENT LAND USES/ZONING
North: Westland/Eagle SPA land (MLD) (OS) Beyond

South: Mangini Parkway with Open Space (OS) and Single-Family High-Density land (SFHD) and Open Space (OS) beyond

East: East Bidwell Street with Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD) land beyond

West: Elementary School and Middle School properties (PQP)

SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The project site has been fully graded and site improvements (underground utilities, roadways, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, etc.) are currently in the process of being reviewed.

APPLICABLE CODES
FPASP (Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan)
Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines
FMC 17.06, Design Review
Attachment 3
Conditions of Approval
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGES 1-3 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00096)**

**MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.                 | The applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below and provided in Attachments 6 and 7:  
  • Architectural and Landscape Plans dated May 18, 2022  
  • Exterior Colors and Materials dated April 20, 2022 | B | CD (P)(E) |

This project approval is for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 Subdivision Residential Design Review, which includes design review approval for 218 traditional single-family residential units located within Villages 1-3 of the previously approved Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 Subdivision Residential Design Review project (DRCL22-00096). Implementation of the project shall be consistent with the above-referenced items as modified by these conditions of approval. The species of the trees and plants will be subject to the review and approval of the City Arborist upon submittal of the final landscape plans.

| 2.                 | Building plans shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval to ensure conformance with this approval and with relevant codes, policies, standards and other requirements of the City of Folsom. | B | CD (P)(E)(B) |

| 3.                 | The project approvals granted under this staff report (Residential Design Review) shall remain in effect for two years from final date of approval (July 20, 2024). Failure to obtain the relevant building (or other) permits within this time period, without the subsequent extension of this approval, shall result in the termination of this approval. | B | CD (P) |
# CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGES 1-3 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00096)

MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.                 | The owner/applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul any approval by the City or any of its agencies, departments, commissions, agents, officers, employees, or legislative body concerning the project. The City will promptly notify the owner/applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. The City may, within its unlimited discretion, participate in the defense of any such claim, action or proceeding if both of the following occur:  
  - The City bears its own attorney’s fees and costs; and  
  - The City defends the claim, action or proceeding in good faith  
  The owner/applicant shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement of such claim, action or proceeding unless the settlement is approved by the owner/applicant. | OG            | CD (P)(E)(B)            |
<p>|                    |                                                                                     |               | PW, PR, FD, PD, NS     |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND FEE REQUIREMENTS |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | B             | CD (P)(E)              |
| 5.                 | The owner/applicant shall pay all applicable taxes, fees and charges at the rate and amount in effect at the time such taxes, fees and charges become due and payable.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | B             | CD (P)(E)              |
| 6.                 | If applicable, the owner/applicant shall pay off any existing assessments against the property, or file necessary segregation request and pay applicable fees.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | B             | CD (E)                 |
| 7.                 | The City, at its sole discretion, may utilize the services of outside legal counsel to assist in the implementation of this project, including, but not limited to, drafting, reviewing and/or revising agreements and/or other documentation for the project. If the City utilizes the services of such outside legal counsel, the applicant shall reimburse the City for all outside legal fees and costs incurred by the City for such services. The applicant may be required, at the sole discretion of the City Attorney, to submit a deposit to the City for these services prior to initiation of the services. The applicant shall be responsible for reimbursement to the City for the services regardless of whether a deposit is required. | B             | CD (P)(E)              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If the City utilizes the services of consultants to prepare special studies or provide specialized design review or inspection services for the project, the applicant shall reimburse the City for actual costs it incurs in utilizing these services, including administrative costs for City personnel. A deposit for these services shall be provided prior to initiating review of the Final Map, improvement plans, or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>This project shall be subject to all City-wide development impact fees, unless exempt by previous agreement. This project shall be subject to all City-wide development impact fees in effect at such time that a building permit is issued. These fees may include, but are not limited to, fees for fire protection, park facilities, park equipment, Humbug-Willow Creek Parkway, Light Rail, TSM, capital facilities and traffic impacts. The 90-day protest period for all fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions imposed on this project will begin on the date of final approval (May 2, 2022). The fees shall be calculated at the fee rate in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E), PW, PK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant agrees to pay to the Folsom-Cordova Unified School District the maximum fee authorized by law for the construction and/or reconstruction of school facilities. The applicable fee shall be the fee established by the School District that is in effect at the time of the issuance of a building permit. Specifically, the owner/applicant agrees to pay any and all fees and charges and comply with any and all dedications or other requirements authorized under Section 17620 of the Education Code; Chapter 4.7 (commencing with Section 65970) of the Government Code; and Sections 65995, 65995.5 and 65995.7 of the Government Code.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGES 1-3 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00096)

**MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Final exterior building and site lighting plans shall be submitted for review and approval by Community Development Department for aesthetics, level of illumination, glare and trespass prior to the issuance of any building permits. The exterior building and site lighting will be required to achieve energy efficient standards by installing high-intensity discharge (mercury vapor, high-pressure sodium, or similar) lamps. Lighting shall be equipped with a timer or photo condenser. Lighting shall be designed to be directed downward onto the project site and away from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project shall comply with the following architecture and design requirements:

1. This approval is for ten master plans (five building elevations with 15 color and material options for Villages 1-3 of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision. The applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached building elevations dated May 18, 2022.

2. The design, materials, and colors of the proposed Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 Subdivision single-family residential homes shall be consistent with the attached building elevations, materials samples, and color scheme to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

3. The Community Development Department shall approve the individual lot permits to assure no duplication or repetition of the same house, same roof-line, same elevation style, side-by-side, or across the street from each other.

4. Driveways shall only be placed in the locations shown in plot plans approved by Community Development Department. No additional driveways shall be built on these lots.

5. All mechanical equipment shall be ground-mounted and concealed from view of public streets, neighboring properties and nearby higher buildings. For lots abutting the open space areas, mechanical equipment shall be located out of view from open space areas.

6. Decorative light fixtures, consistent with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines and unique to each architectural design theme, shall be added to the front and rear building elevation of each Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

7. A minimum of one tree shall be planted in the front yard of each residential lot within the subdivision. A minimum of two trees are required along the street-side of all corner lots. All front yard irrigation and landscaping shall be installed prior to a Building Permit Final.
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGES 1-3 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00096)
MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>The building shall have illuminated addresses visible from the street or drive fronting the property. Size and location of address identification shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshal.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICE/SECURITY REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall consult with the Police Department in order to incorporate all reasonable crime prevention measures. The following security/safety measures shall be required:</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A security guard shall be on-duty at all times at the site or another approved security measure shall be in place including but not limited to a six-foot security fence shall be constructed around the perimeter of construction areas. (This requirement shall be included on the approved construction drawings).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security measures for the safety of all construction equipment and unit appliances shall be employed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landscaping shall not cover exterior doors or windows, block line-of-sight at intersections or screen overhead lighting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPING/WALLS/FENCES</td>
<td>The final location, design, height, materials, and colors of the walls and fences shall consistent with the submitted exhibits subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department to ensure consistency with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines. The location of the fencing shall remain in perpetuity as shown and installed originally by the Applicant (i.e., fence may not be moved into the PUE on side/corner lots).</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD(P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGES 1-3 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00096)

**MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Final landscape plans and specifications shall be prepared by a registered landscape architect and approved by the City prior to the approval of the first building permit or Small-Lot Final Map, whichever occurs first. Said plans shall include all on-site landscape specifications and details, and shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s declarations and restrictions pertaining to water conservation and outdoor landscaping. Landscaping shall meet shade requirements as outlined in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan where applicable. The landscape plans shall comply and implement water efficient requirements as adopted by the State of California (Assembly Bill 1881) (State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance) until such time the City of Folsom adopts its own Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance at which time the owner/applicant shall comply with any new ordinance.</td>
<td>B, M</td>
<td>CD(P), PW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>WHEN REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD (P) Community Development Department</td>
<td>I Prior to approval of Improvement Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Planning Division</td>
<td>M Prior to approval of Final Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Engineering Division</td>
<td>B Prior to issuance of first Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Building Division</td>
<td>O Prior to approval of Occupancy Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Fire Division</td>
<td>G Prior to issuance of Grading Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW Public Works Department</td>
<td>DC During construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Park and Recreation Department</td>
<td>OG On-going requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4
Vicinity Map
Attachment 5
Site Plan
Mangini Ranch Phase 3
Enhanced Lot Exhibit
Villages 1, 2 & 3
Attachment 6
Architectural and Landscape Plans dated
May 18, 2022
BUILDING ARTICULATION PLAN
VILLAGE 1 (45’x100’ LOTS)
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 1
1st Floor  1766
Second Floor  116
Garage  426
Covered Porch  50
TOTAL S.F.  2242
2242 S.F. / LOT AREA 4500 S.F. = 49.8%

LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 2
1st Floor  1766
Second Floor  116
Garage  426
Covered Porch  52
TOTAL S.F.  2244
2244 S.F. / LOT AREA 4500 S.F. = 49.8%

LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 3
1st Floor  1086
Garage  445
Covered Porch  16
TOTAL S.F.  1547
1547 S.F. / LOT AREA 4500 S.F. = 34.3%

LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 4
1st Floor  1327
Garage  449
Covered Porch  115
TOTAL S.F.  1891
1891 S.F. / LOT AREA 4500 S.F. = 40%

LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 10
1st Floor  1031
Garage  477
Covered Porch  136
TOTAL S.F.  1644
1644 S.F. / LOT AREA 4500 S.F. = 36.5%

COLOR KEY
- TWO STORY ELEMENT
- SINGLE STORY ELEMENT
- COVERED PORCH (SINGLE STORY ELEMENT)
- PAVED DRIVEWAY

SETBACK VARIATIONS
THIS ARTICULATION PLAN DEPICTS THE
DESIRED LOT SIZE AT EACH LOCATION, VARYING
ACCORDING TO ACTUAL LOT WIDTH AND
DEPTH. SEE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR
SPECIFIC BUILDING LOCATION AT ALL LOTS.
### LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Garages</th>
<th>Covered Porch</th>
<th>Total S.F.</th>
<th>% of Lot Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2446</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **SINGLE STORY ELEMENT**
- **TWO STORY ELEMENT**
- **PAVED DRIVEWAY**

### LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Garages</th>
<th>Covered Porch</th>
<th>Total S.F.</th>
<th>% of Lot Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Garages</th>
<th>Covered Porch</th>
<th>Total S.F.</th>
<th>% of Lot Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2446</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Garages</th>
<th>Covered Porch</th>
<th>Total S.F.</th>
<th>% of Lot Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2498</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOT COVERAGE - PLAN 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Garages</th>
<th>Covered Porch</th>
<th>Total S.F.</th>
<th>% of Lot Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SETBACK VARIATIONS**

This articulation plan depicts the median lot size. Setbacks will vary according to actual lot width and depth. See development plan for specific building location at all lots.
PLANS AND VILLAGE LAYOUTS

**VILLAGE 1**
- Plan 1D: Italian Villa
- Plan 10A: Spanish
- Plan 4E: Farmhouse
- Plan 3B: European Cottage
- Plan 2C: Craftsman

**VILLAGE 2 & 3**
- Plan 5E: Farmhouse
- Plan 8C: Craftsman
- Plan 7D: Italian Villa
- Plan 9A: Spanish
- Plan 6B: European Cottage

MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
FOLSOM, CALIFORNIA
### Concept Tree Legend

- **1.** Evergreen Conifer (Pine, Spruce, Firs, Etc.)
- **2.** Evergreen Deciduous (Cedar, Redwood, Yew, Etc.)
- **3.** Shrub (Evergreen or Deciduous)
- **4.** Vine
- **5.** Heather
- **6.** Groundcover
- **7.** Bulb
- **8.** Herbaceous Perennial
- **9.** Annual
- **10.** Fruit or Nut Tree
- **11.** Flowering Deciduous (Cherry, Apple, etc.)
- **12.** Flowering Evergreen (Holly, Azalea, etc.)
- **13.** Palm
- **14.** Bamboo

### Plant Schedule South & West Exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>General Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Plant Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cercidiphyllum japonicum</td>
<td>Japanese Maple</td>
<td>3.5 gal</td>
<td>JAP-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ulmus rubra</td>
<td>Red Elm</td>
<td>5 gal</td>
<td>RDE-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acer saccharinum</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
<td>7.5 gal</td>
<td>SPA-200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica</td>
<td>Beech</td>
<td>10 gal</td>
<td>BEECH-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plant Schedule North & East Exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>General Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Plant Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
<td>Chinese Juniper</td>
<td>3 gal</td>
<td>CHJ-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Viburnum opulus</td>
<td>European Guelder Rose</td>
<td>5 gal</td>
<td>EGR-200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hydrangea arborescens</td>
<td>Smooth Hydrangea</td>
<td>7.5 gal</td>
<td>SHA-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rosa canina</td>
<td>Japanese Rose</td>
<td>10 gal</td>
<td>JAP-400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Town Center South - Villages 1-3 by Taylor Morrison**

Conceptual Production (Front Yard) Landscape Legends

Folsom, California

March 25, 2022

LC-3
PLAN 1 (1767 SF)
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

FLOOR PLAN (1767 S.F.)

AREA SUMMARY - PLAN 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
<th>Covered Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Floor</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Entry</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>2234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

205-05-18-22

SHEET A.1

PLAN 1 (1767 SF)
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

AREA SUMMARY - PLAN 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lot Coverage</th>
<th>Covered Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Floor</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Entry</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>2234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FRONT ELEVATION "A" (SPANISH COLONIAL)

FRONT ELEVATION "B" (EUROPEAN COTTAGE)

FRONT ELEVATION "C" (CRAFTSMAN)

FRONT ELEVATION "D" (ITALIAN VILLA)

FRONT ELEVATION "E" (FARMHOUSE)

PLAN 1
MANGINI RANCH 3
Folsom, California
PLAN 1
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

EUROPEAN COTTAGE
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE ARCHED VENT
- DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE
- ▼ INDICATES RECESS

TOWN CENTER SOUTH
PLAN 1
Date: 03/10/22
Taylor Morrison Sacramento

FRONT ELEVATION "B"
( EUROPEAN COTTAGE )
CRAFTSMAN

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- BOARD AND BATTEN GABLE ENDS
- DECORATIVE OUTLOOKERS
- DECORATIVE VENTS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SHAKE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS

PLAN 1
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
ITALIAN VILLA

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE SHELF WITH CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"

INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "D"

REAR "D"

LEFT SIDE "D"

FRONT ELEVATION "D"

(ITALIAN VILLA)
SPANISH-Colonial

- Stucco siding
- Stucco over foam trim
- Stucco over foam wainscot
- Decorative tile vents
- Decorative shutters
- Theme specific garage door
- "O'gee" gutter
- Concrete tile roofing - Low profile "S"
- Indicates recess

Plan 2
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
EUROPEAN COTTAGE

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE ARCHED VENTS
- DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE
- INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "B"

REAR "B"

LEFT SIDE "B"

FRONT ELEVATION "B"

(EUROPEAN COTTAGE)
CRAFTSMAN

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- BOARD AND BATEN GABLE ENDS
- DECORATIVE OUTLOOKERS
- DECORATIVE VENTS
- WOOD POSTS W/ STONE BASE
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SHAKE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS

PLAN 2
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
FARMHOUSES
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM AT
- STUCCO SIDING
- BOARD & BATTEN AT ACCENT
- AREAS
- WOOD TRIM AT BOARD AND BATTEN
- SIDING
- WOOD POSTS W/ KICKERS
- LOUVERED PANEL SHUTTERS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOORS
- O'GEE GUTTERS
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "E"

REAR "E"

LEFT SIDE "E"

FENCELINE

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS,
PROVIDE GABLE END
TREATMENT (SHOWN DASHED)

LINE OF SECOND
FLOOR LOFT

FENCELINE

FRONT ELEVATION "E"
(FARMHOUSE)

PLAN 2
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
MANGINI RANCH 3
Folsom, California

 план 3

FRONT ELEVATION "A"
(SPANISH COLONIAL)

FRONT ELEVATION "B"
(EUROPEAN COTTAGE)

FRONT ELEVATION "C"
(CRAFTSMAN)

FRONT ELEVATION "D"
(ITALIAN VILLA)

FRONT ELEVATION "E"
(FARMHOUSE)
RIGHT SIDE "A"

REAR "A"

LEFT SIDE "A"

FRONT ELEVATION "A" (SPANISH COLONIAL)

PLAN 3
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

SPANISH COLONIAL
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- STUCCO OVER FOAM WAINSCOT
- DECORATIVE TILE VENTS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"

INDICATES RECESS

12" O.H. TYP. @ EAVE

12" O.H. TYP. @ RAKE

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE SHUTTERS AND EAVE CORBEL (SHOWN DASHED)
CRAFTSMAN

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- BOARD AND BATTEN GABLE ENDS
- DECORATIVE OUTLOOKERS
- DECORATIVE BRACKETS
- DECORATIVE VENTS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SHAKE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE ENHANCED WINDOW TRIM (SHOWN DASHED)

12" O.H. TYP. @ EAVE

12" O.H. TYP. @ RAKE

5:12 RIDGE

12" O.H.

4:12 VALLEY

REAR "C"

FENCELINE

LEFT SIDE "C"

FENCELINE

RIGHT SIDE "C"

TOWN CENTER SOUTH PLAN 3

Date: 3/10/22

Taylor Morrison Sacramento

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE GABLE END TREATMENT & OUTLOOKER (SHOWN DASHED)

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE ENHANCED WINDOW TRIM (SHOWN DASHED)

PLAN 3
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

230
计划3
MANGINI RANCH - 阶段3，V. 1-3
Folsom, California

ITALIAN VILLA
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE SHELF WITH CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"
  - INDICATES RECESS

- AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE OUTLOOKER (SHOWN DASHED)

- RIGHT SIDE "D"
- REAR "D"
- LEFT SIDE "D"
- FRONT ELEVATION "D" (ITALIAN VILLA)
FRONT ELEVATION “A”
(SPANISH COLONIAL)

FRONT ELEVATION “B”
(EUROPEAN COTTAGE)

FRONT ELEVATION “C”
(CRAFTSMAN)

FRONT ELEVATION “D”
(ITALIAN VILLA)

FRONT ELEVATION “E”
(FARMHOUSE)

PLAN 4
MANGINI RANCH 3
Folsom, California
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

RIGHT SIDE "A"

REAR "A"

LEFT SIDE "A"

ROOF PLAN "A"

FRONT ELEVATION "A" (SPANISH COLONIAL)

SPANISH COLONIAL
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- STUCCO OVER FOAM WAINSCOT
- DECORATIVE TILE VENTS
- DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"
  INDICATES RECESS
**EUROPEAN COTTAGE**

- Stucco siding
- Stucco over foam trim
- Decorative arched vent
- Decorative shutters
- Cultured stone veneer
- Theme specific garage door
- Ogee gutter
- Concrete tile roofing - "SLATE" profile
- Indicates recess

**FenceLine**

- Right side "B"
- Rear "B"
- Left side "B"

**Folsom, California**

Taylor Morrison Sacramento

Plan 4

Mangini Ranch - Phase 3, V. 1-3

59 Tyler Street #1

Benicia, CA 94510

Phone: (707) 746-6586

Sheet A-25

2022-05-18-22
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CRAFTSMAN

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- BOARD AND BATTEN GABLE ENDS
- DECORATIVE OUTLOOKERS
- DECORATIVE VENTS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SHAKE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

RIGHT SIDE "D"

REAR "D"

LEFT SIDE "D"

ROOF PLAN "D"

FRONT ELEVATION "D"

ITALIAN VILLA
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE SHELF WITH CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"

INDICATES RECESS
RIGHT SIDE "E"

REAR "E"

LEFT SIDE "E"

FARMHOUSE
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM AT
- STUCCO SIDING
- BOARD & BATTEN AT ACCENT
- AREAS
- WOOD TRIM AT BOARD AND BATTEN
- SIDING
- WOOD POSTS W/ KICKERS
- LOUVERED PANEL SHUTTERS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOORS
- O'GEE GUTTERS
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS

ROOF PLAN "E"

FRONT ELEVATION "E"
(FARMHOUSE)
PLAN 5
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

SPANISH COLONIAL
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- STUCCO OVER FOAM WAINSCOT
- DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
- DECORATIVE TILE VENTS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"
  □ INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "A"

REAR "A"

LEFT SIDE "A"

FRONT ELEVATION "A"
(Spanish Colonial)
EUROPEAN COTTAGE

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE ARCHED VENT
- DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE
- _ INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "B"

REAR "B"

LEFT SIDE "B"

FRONT ELEVATION "B" (EUROPEAN COTTAGE)

ROOF PLAN "B"
CRAFTSMAN

- Stucco siding
- Stucco over foam trim
- Board and batten gable end
- Decorative outlookers
- Decorative vent
- Wood posts w/ stone base
- Cultured stone veneer
- Theme specific garage door
- O'gee gutter
- Concrete tile roofing - "shake" profile
- "C" indicates recess

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE GABLE END TREATMENT & OUTLOOKER (SHOWN DASHED)

CRAFTSMAN STUCCO SIDING
STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
BOARD AND BATTEN GABLE END
DECORATIVE OUTLOOKERS
DECORATIVE VENT
WOOD POSTS W/ STONE BASE
CULTURED STONE VENEER
THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
O'GEE GUTTER
CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SHAKE" PROFILE
"C" INDICATES RECESS

MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

PLAN 5
Taylor Morrison Sacramento

RIGHT SIDE "C"

REAR "C"

LEFT SIDE "C"

CULTURED STONE VENEER
THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
O'GEE GUTTER
CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SHAKE" PROFILE
"C" INDICATES RECESS

PLAN 5
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

FRONT ELEVATION "C"
(CRAFTSMAN)

ROOF PLAN "C"
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

PLAN 5
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

ITALIAN VILLA
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE SHELF WITH CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"

INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "D"

REAR "D"

LEFT SIDE "D"

ROOF PLAN "D"

FRONT ELEVATION "D"
(ITALIAN VILLA)
PLAN 5
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
PLAN 6
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

SPANISH COLONIAL
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- STUCCO OVER FOAM WAINSCOT
- DECORATIVE TILE VENTS
- DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"
- INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "A"

REAR "A"

LEFT SIDE "A"

ROOF PLAN "A"

FRONT ELEVATION "A"
(SPANISH COLONIAL)
EUROPEAN COTTAGE

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE ARCHED VENTS
- DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE
  "_" INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "B"

REAR "B"

LEFT SIDE "B"

FRONT ELEVATION "B"
(EUROPEAN COTTAGE)
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

938 Tyler Street
Benicia, CA 94510
Phone: (707) 746-6586

SHEET A-41

计划6
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

ITALIAN VILLA
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE SHELF WITH CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- D'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"

INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "D"

REAR "D"

LEFT SIDE "D"

ROOF PLAN "D"

FRONT ELEVATION "D"

(ITALIAN VILLA)
RIGHT SIDE "E"

REAR "E"

LEFT SIDE "E"

FRONT ELEVATION "E" (FARMHOUSE)

FARMHOUSES

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM AT
- STUCCO SIDING
- BOARD & BATTEN AT ACCENT AREAS
- WOOD TRIM AT BOARD AND BATTEN SIDING
- WOOD POSTS W/ KICKERS
- LOUVERED PANEL SHUTTERS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOORS
- "O'GEE" GUTTERS
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS

Taylor Morrison Sacramento

FENCE LINE

PLAN 6
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

253
PLAN 7
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

RIGHT SIDE "A"

REAR "A"

LEFT SIDE "A"

ROOF PLAN "A"

FRONT ELEVATION "A"
(SPANISH COLONIAL)

SPANISH COLONIAL
• STUCCO SIDING
• STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
• STUCCO OVER FOAM WAINSCOT
• DECORATIVE TILE VENTS
• DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
• THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
• O'GEE GUTTER
• CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"
_ INDICATES RECESS

Taylor Morrison Sacramento

Taylor Morrison
Homes Inspired by You

OAG Architects

256
EUROPEAN COTTAGE

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE ARCHED VENTS
- DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE
- ~ INDICATES RECESS

PLAN 7
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
ITALIAN VILLA

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE SHELF WITH CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"
- INDICATES RECESS

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE OUTLOOKER (SHOWN DASHED)

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE OUTLOOKER (SHOWN DASHED)

LINE OF SECOND FLOOR LOFT

LINE OF SECOND FLOOR LOFT

FRONT ELEVATION "D"
(ITALIAN VILLA)
FRONT ELEVATION "A"
(SPANISH COLONIAL)

FRONT ELEVATION "D"
(ITALIAN VILLA)

FRONT ELEVATION "B"
(EUROPEAN COTTAGE)

FRONT ELEVATION "C"
(CRAFTSMAN)

FRONT ELEVATION "E"
(FARMHOUSE)

PLAN 8
MANGINI RANCH 3
Folsom, California
**EUROPEAN COTTAGE**

- Stucco siding
- Stucco over foam trim
- Decorative arched vents
- Decorative shutters
- Cultured stone veneer
- Theme specific garage door
- Ogee gutter
- Concrete tile roofing - "slate" profile

---

**Plan 8**

MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3

Folsom, California

**Sheet A-53**

Taylor Morrison Sacramento

---

**Fence Line**

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE SHUTTERS & CORBELED WINDOW LEDGE (SHOWN DASHED)

---

**Right Side "B"**

---

**Rear "B"**

---

**Left Side "B"**

---

**Front Elevation "B"**

(EUROPEAN COTTAGE)
CRAFTSMAN

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- BOARD AND BATTEN GABLE ENDS
- DECORATIVE OUTLOOKERS
- DECORATIVE BRACKETS
- WOOD POSTS W/ STONE BASE
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SHAKE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE GABLE END TREATMENT & OUTLOOKER (SHOWN DASHED)

AT COMMUNITY EDGE LOTS, PROVIDE ENHANCED WINDOW TRIM (SHOWN DASHED)
PLAN 8
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

ITALIAN VILLA
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE SHELF WITH CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"

INDICATES RECESS

SHEET A-55

TOWN CENTER SOUTH
DATE: 3/10/22

Taylor Morrison Sacramento

RIGHT SIDE "D"

TOP

P

L

T.O. SLAB

T.O. PLY

TOP

P

L

RIDGE

TOP

P

L

4"

5:12

12" O.H.

TYP. @ EAVE

12" O.H.

TYP. @ RAKE

FENCE LINE

ROOF PLAN "D"

REAR "D"

FENCE LINE

LEFT SIDE "D"

FENCE LINE

FRONT ELEVATION "D"
(ITALIAN VILLA)
FARMHOUSES

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM AT
- STUCCO SIDING
- BOARD & BATTEN AT ACCENT AREAS
- WOOD TRIM AT BOARD AND BATTEN SIDING
- WOOD POSTS W/ KICKERS
- LOUVERED PANEL SHUTTERS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOORS
- O'GEE GUTTERS
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE
- INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "E"

REAR "E"

LEFT SIDE "E"

FRONT ELEVATION "E" (FARMHOUSE)
FIRST FLOOR PLAN (1211 SF, 2678 TOTAL SF)

- **Kitchen**
- **Foyer**
- **Garage, Tandem 3-Car** 20'-3" x 20'-4"
- **Pantry/Storage**
- **Dining** 13'-1" x 11'-5"
- **Great Room** 13'-1" x 13'-3"
- **Coat/Storage Entry**
- **Porch**
- **Flex (Bedroom 5 OPT.)**
- **Powder (Bath 4 OPT.)**
- **Bedroom 5/Bath 4 Option**
- **Optional Roll-Up Door**

SECOND FLOOR PLAN (1467 SF)

- **Bath 2**
- **Laundry**
- **Primary Bath**
- **Primary Suite** 13'-0" x 17'-0"
- **Loft (Bedroom 4 OPT.)**
- **Bedroom 4/Bath 3 Option**
- **Bedroom 4** 14'-10" x 14'-4"
- **Bedroom 2**
- **Wet Bar Option**
- **Hall 2**
- **Hall 3**

AREA SUMMARY - PLAN 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1st Floor</th>
<th>2nd Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livable Area</td>
<td>1211 SF</td>
<td>1467 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>693 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Entry</td>
<td>28 SF</td>
<td>37 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1932 SF</td>
<td>2038 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLAN 9 (2678 SF)
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
FRONT ELEVATION "A"
(SPANISH COLONIAL)

FRONT ELEVATION "D"
(ITALIAN VILLA)

FRONT ELEVATION "B"
(EUROPEAN COTTAGE)

FRONT ELEVATION "C"
(CRAFTSMAN)

FRONT ELEVATION "E"
(FARMHOUSE)

PLAN 9
MANGININ RANCH 3
Folsom, California
Plan 9
Mangini Ranch - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
EUROPEAN COTTAGE
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE ARCHED VENTS
- DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE
- INDICATES RECESS

PLAN 9
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
CRAFTSMAN

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- BOARD AND BATTEN GABLE ENDS
- DECORATIVE OUTLOOKERS
- DECORATIVE BRACKETS
- WOOD POSTS W/ STONE BASE
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SHAKE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS

PLAN 9
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
ITALIAN VILLA

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE SHELF WITH CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- D'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"
- INDICATES RECESS

PLAN 9
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
FARMHOUSES
- Stucco siding
- Stucco over foam trim at
- Stucco siding
- Board & batten at accent areas
- Wood trim at board and batten siding
- Wood posts w/ kickers
- Louvered panel shutters
- Theme specific garage doors
- O'gee gutters
- Concrete tile roofing - "slate" profile

INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "E"

REAR "E"

LEFT SIDE "E"

FRONT ELEVATION "E"
(FARMHOUSE)
PLAN 10 (2392 SF)
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

FIRST FLOOR PLAN (1031 S.F.; 2392 TOTAL S.F.)

SECOND FLOOR PLAN (1361 S.F.)

BEDROOM #5/
BATH #4 OPTION

AREA SUMMARY - PLAN 10
LOT COVERAGE
1ST FLOOR   1031   1031
2ND FLOOR   1361   1361
REST     -       -
TOTAL     2392   2392

1031 S.F.; 2392 TOTAL S.F.
**European Cottage**

- Stucco Siding
- Stucco over foam trim
- Decorative arched vents
- Decorative shutters
- Cultured stone veneer
- Theme specific garage door
- O'gee gutter
- Concrete tile roofing - "Slate" profile
  - Indicates recess

---

**Plan 10**

Mangini Ranch - Phase 3, V. 1-3

Folsom, California

---

**Right Side "B"**

**Rear "B"**

**Left Side "B"**

---

**Roof Plan "B"**

**Front Elevation "B"**

(European Cottage)
CRAFTSMAN

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- BOARD AND BATTEN GABLE ENDS
- DECORATIVE OUTLOOKERS
- DECORATIVE BRACKETS
- WOOD POSTS W/ STONE BASE
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SHAKE" PROFILE

INDICATES RECESS

RIGHT SIDE "C"

REAR "C"

LEFT SIDE "C"

ROOF PLAN "C"

FRONT ELEVATION "C" (CRAFTSMAN)
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

ITALIAN VILLA
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE SHELF WITH CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"
  (INDICATES RECESS)

PLAN 10
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California
FARMHOUSES
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM AT
- STUCCO SIDING
- BOARD & BATTEN AT ACCENT AREAS
- WOOD TRIM AT BOARD AND BATTEN SIDING
- WOOD POSTS W/ KICKERS
- LOUVERED PANEL SHUTTERS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOORS
- O'GEE GUTTERS
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE
- INDICATES RECESS

PLAN 10
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, V. 1-3
Folsom, California

RIGHT SIDE "E"
REAR "E"
LEFT SIDE "E"

FRONT ELEVATION "E"
Attachment 7
Exterior Colors and Materials dated
April 20, 2022
TOWN CENTER SOUTH

COLOR APPLICATIONS

SPANISH SCHEMES 1, 2, & 3 (ELEVATIONS "A")
COLOR 1 – BODY
COLOR 2 – TRIM, VENTS, FASCIA & GUTTERS
COLOR 3 – GARAGE DOOR, FRONT DOOR & SHUTTER

EUROPEAN COTTAGE SCHEMES 4, 5, & 6 (ELEVATIONS "B")
COLOR 1 – BODY
COLOR 2 – TRIM, FASCIA, VENTS, GARAGE DOOR & GUTTERS
COLOR 3 – SHUTTERS, FRONT DOOR

CRAFTSMAN SCHEMES 7, 8, & 9 (ELEVATIONS "C")
COLOR 1 – BODY
COLOR 2 – TRIM, SIDING AT GABLES & POSTS
COLOR 3 – FASCIA, CORBLES, GARAGE DOOR, FRONT DOOR, VENTS & GUTTERS

ITALIAN VILLA SCHEMES 10, 11, & 12 (ELEVATIONS "D")
COLOR 1 – BODY
COLOR 2 – TRIM, FASCIA, CORBLES & GUTTERS
COLOR 3 – FRONT DOOR AND GARAGE DOOR

FARMHOUSE SCHEMES 13, 14, & 15 (ELEVATIONS "E")
COLOR 1 – BODY & GARAGE DOOR
COLOR 2 – TRIM, FASCIA, POSTS & GUTTERS
COLOR 3 – SIDING AT GABLE ENDS & VENTS
COLOR 4 – FRONT DOOR & SHUTTERS

COLOR SCHEMES
STONE AND BRICK VENEER
ROOF MATERIALS

FEBRUARY 08, 2022
SCHEME 1 (Spanish – Elevation “A”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLOR 1</th>
<th>SW 7035</th>
<th>Aesthetic White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLOR 2</td>
<td>SW 2840</td>
<td>Hammered Silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOR 3</td>
<td>SW 7027</td>
<td>Well-Bred Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAGLE ROOFING</td>
<td>2522</td>
<td>Terracotta Flashed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHEME 2 (Spanish – Elevation “A”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLOR 1</th>
<th>SW 7010</th>
<th>White Duck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLOR 2</td>
<td>SW 7509</td>
<td>Tiki Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOR 3</td>
<td>SW 7624</td>
<td>Slate Tile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAGLE ROOFING</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>Vallejo Range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHEME 3 (Spanish – Elevation “A”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLOR 1</th>
<th>SW 6119</th>
<th>Antique White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLOR 2</td>
<td>SW 6067</td>
<td>Mocha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOR 3</td>
<td>SW 6083</td>
<td>Sable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAGLE ROOFING</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>San Benito Blend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHEME 4 (European Cottage – Elevation “B”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLOR 1</th>
<th>SW 7548</th>
<th>Portico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLOR 2</td>
<td>SW 7025</td>
<td>Backdrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOR 3</td>
<td>SW 6207</td>
<td>Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAGLE ROOFING</td>
<td>4671</td>
<td>Village Blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL DORADO STONE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country Rubble Bells</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OAG Architects, Inc. 940 Tyler Street, #19 • Benicia, CA 94510 • (707) 746-6586 • fax (707) 746-5448
SCHEME 5 (European Cottage – Elevation “B”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1: SW 9165 - Gossamer Veil
COLOR 2: SW 6199 - Rare Gray
COLOR 3: SW 7594 - Carriage Door
EAGLE ROOFING: 4687 - Brown Gray Range
EL DORADO STONE: 6697 - Country Rubble Polerino

SCHEME 7 (Craftsman – Elevation “C”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1: SW 6150 - Universal Khaki
COLOR 2: SW 2807 - Rockwood Medium Brown
COLOR 3: SW 6167 - Garden Gate
EAGLE ROOFING: 8803 - Arlington Blend
EL DORADO STONE: 8803 - Mountain Ledge Panel Silvertone

SCHEME 6 (European Cottage – Elevation “B”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1: SW 7045 - Intellectual Gray
COLOR 2: SW 7046 - Anonymous
COLOR 3: SW 7046 - Anonymous
EAGLE ROOFING: 4697 - Slate Range
EL DORADO STONE: 6697 - Country Rubble Cognac

SCHEME 8 (Craftsman – Elevation “C”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1: SW 6121 - Whole Wheat
COLOR 2: SW 2806 - Rockwood Brown
COLOR 3: SW 2851 - Sage Green Light
EAGLE ROOFING: 5504 - New Cedar
EL DORADO STONE: 5504 - Mountain Ledge Panel Pioneer
TOWN CENTER SOUTH

SCHEME 9 (Craftsman – Elevation “C”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1 ............... SW 2840 ............... Hammered Silver
COLOR 2 ............... SW 7674 ............... Peppercorn
COLOR 3 ............... SW 6076 ............... Turkish Coffee
EAGLE ROOFING: ............... 5557 ............... Live Oak Range
EL DORADO STONE: ............... Mountain Ledge Panel Whiskey Creek

SCHEME 10 (Italian Villa – Elevation “D”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1 ............... SW 9093 ............... Nearly Brown
COLOR 2 ............... SW 7526 ............... Maison Blanche
COLOR 3 ............... SW 7141 ............... Van Dyke Brown
EAGLE ROOFING: ............... 2689 ............... Brown Range
EL DORADO STONE: ............... Marques24 Sanderling

SCHEME 11 (Italian Villa – Elevation “D”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1 ............... SW 7024 ............... Functional Gray
COLOR 2 ............... SW 7627 ............... White Heron
COLOR 3 ............... SW 9132 ............... Acacia Haze
EAGLE ROOFING: ............... 2520 ............... Weathered Terracotta Flashed
EL DORADO STONE: ............... Marques24 Dove Tail

SCHEME 12 (Italian Villa – Elevation “D”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1 ............... SW 7032 ............... Warm Stone
COLOR 2 ............... SW 7542 ............... Naturel
COLOR 3 ............... SW 6034 ............... Arresting Auburn
EAGLE ROOFING: ............... 2646 ............... Sunset Blend
EL DORADO STONE: ............... Marques24 Sanderling
SCHEME 13 (Farmhouse – Elevation “E”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1 : SW 7503 - Sticks & Stones
COLOR 2 : SW 7008 - Alabaster
COLOR 3 : SW 6061 - Tanbark
COLOR 4 : SW 7674 - Peppercorn
EAGLE ROOFING: SCB 8805 - Seattle Blend
EL DORADO STONE: Tundra Brick Ashland

SCHEME 14 (Farmhouse – Elevation “E”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1 : SW 7005 - Pure White
COLOR 2 : SW 6074 - Spalding Gray
COLOR 3 : SW 7023 - Requisite Gray
COLOR 4 : SW 6589 - Domino
EAGLE ROOFING: 4684 - Alameda Range
EL DORADO STONE: Tundra Brick Hartford
Attachment 8
Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines
ARCHITECTURAL GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following residential guiding principles will guide the architecture to ensure quality development:

- Provide a varied and interesting streetscene.
- Focus of the home is the front elevation, not the garage.
- Provide a variety of garage placements.
- Provide detail on rear elevations where visible from the public streets.
- Choose appropriate massing and roof forms to define the architectural styles.
- Ensure that plans and styles provide a degree of individuality.
- Use architectural elements and details to reinforce individual architectural styles.

GENERAL ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES

Edge Conditions

Rear elevations visible from open spaces and major roadways shall incorporate enhanced details used on the front elevation of the home. Rear elevations observable from open spaces and major roadways shall be visually aesthetically pleasing from surrounding viewpoints and adjacencies. Silhouettes and massing of homes along edges require design sensitivity. A row of homes with a single front or rear facing gable are prohibited. The following should be considered, and at least one element incorporated, in the design of the side and rear elevations along edge conditions:

- A balance of hip and gable roof forms;
- Single-story plan;
- Single-story elements on two-story homes;
- Offset massing or wall planes (on individual plans or between plans);
- Roof plane breaks (on individual plans or between plans);
- Detail elements on the front elevation shall be applied to the side and rear elevations along edge conditions.
Roof Forms

Rows of homes seen along major community roadways are perceived by their contrast against the skyline or background. The dominant impact is the shape of the building and roofline. To minimize the visual impact of repetitious flat planes, similar building silhouettes and similar ridge heights, discernibly different roof plans for each home plan shall be designed. Individual roof plans may be simple but, between different plans, should exhibit variety by using front to rear, side-to-side, gables, hipped roofs, and/or the introduction of single story elements.

The following roof design guidelines should also be considered:

- Provide a mix of gable and hip roofs along the streetscene.
- Design roofs for maximum solar exposure for the potential installation of solar features.
- Consider deep overhangs where appropriate to the style to provide additional shade and interior cooling.
- Offset roof planes, eave heights, and ridge lines.

Corner Buildings

Buildings located on corners often times function as neighborhood entries and highlight the architecture for the overall Folsom Ranch, Central District community. Buildings located on corners shall include one of the following:

- Front and side facade articulation using materials that wrap around the corner-side of the building;
- Awning on corner side;
- Home entry on corner side;
- Corner facing garage;
- A pop-out side hip, gable, or shed form roof;
- An added single-story element, such as a wrap-around porch or balcony;
- Recessed second- or third-story (up to 35’ max.); or
- Balcony on corner side.
Front Elevations

Front elevations shall be detailed to achieve a variety along the street scene. Each front elevation shall incorporate a Feature Window treatment (see Feature Window requirements on page 2-6). In addition, each front elevation shall incorporate one or more of the following techniques:

- Provide enhanced style-appropriate details on the front elevation.
- Offset the second story from the first level for a portion of the second story.
- Vary the wall plane by providing projections of elements such as bay windows, porches, and similar architectural features.
- Create recessed alcoves and/or bump-out portions of the building.
- Incorporate second-story balconies.
- Create interesting entries that integrate features such as porches, courtyards, large recessed entry alcoves, or projecting covered entries with columns.
- Use a minimum of two building materials or colors on the front elevation.

Multi-family Entries

Entries for multi-family homes should create an initial impression, locate and frame the doorway, act as a link between public and private spaces, and further identify individual unit entries.

- Wherever possible, orient the front door and principal access towards the roadway, paseo, or common open space.
- Incorporate appropriate roof elements, columns, Feature Windows and/or architectural forms in the entry statement to emphasize the building character and the location of individual doorways.

- If due to building configuration the front entry location is not immediately apparent, direct and draw the observer to it with added elements such as signs, lighting, and landscape.
Feature Windows

All front and visible edge elevations shall incorporate one Feature Window treatment that articulates the elevation. Feature Window options include:

- A window of unique size or shape;
- Picture window;
- A bay window projecting a minimum of 24 inches, or a 12 inch pop-out surround;
- A window with a substantial surround matching or contrasting the primary color of the home;
- A window recess a minimum of 2 inches;
- Decorative iron window grilles;
- Decorative window shelves or sill treatments;
- Grouped or ganged windows with complete trim surrounds or unifying head and/or sill trim;
- A Juliet balcony with architectural style appropriate materials;
- Window shutters; or
- Trellis protruding a minimum of 12 inches from the wall plane of the window.

Windows

Windows on south-facing exposures should be designed, to the greatest extent possible, to maximize light and heat entering the home in the winter, and to minimize light and heat entering in the summer.

West-facing windows should be shaded where feasible to avoid prolonged sun exposure/overheating of the homes.

For additional window requirements addressing Sound Attenuation requirements refer to the Mangini Ranch Residential Development Environmental Noise Assessment document prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. on January 29, 2015.
Garage Door Treatments

Appropriate treatment of garage doors will further enhance the building elevation and decrease the utilitarian appearance of the garage door. Various garage door patterns, windows, and/or color schemes should be applied as appropriate to individual architectural styles, where feasible.

- Garage doors shall be consistent with the architecture of the building to reduce the overall visual mass of the garage.
- Garage doors shall be recessed 8 inches from the wall plane.
- All garage doors shall be automatic section roll-up doors.
- When appropriate, single garage doors are encouraged.
- Carriage-style garage doors of upgraded design are encouraged.

Street Facing Garages

All street facing garages should vary the garage door appearance along the streetscape. Below are options for the door variety:

- Vary the garage door pattern, windows, and/or color as appropriate to individual architectural styles.
- Use an attached overhead trellis installed beneath the garage roof fascia and/or above garage door header trim.
- Span the driveway with a gated element or overhead trellis.
- Provide a porte cochere.
- Street facing garages on corner lots at neighborhood entries shall be located on the side of the house furthest away from the corner.
Alley Treatments

The use of alleys should be elevated from purely functional, simple garage access to an enjoyable space that residents experience and utilize daily. Design of alleys shall address the functional and aesthetic features of the space to create a positive experience for the residents. At least one of the following shall be implemented along the alley:

- Building size and shape shall have stepped massing (recessed or cantilevered, i.e., stepping back upper floors or protruding forward upper floors) of at least one foot.
- Window trim, color, and appropriate details from the front elevation.
- Rear privacy walls and pedestrian gates designed and located for ease of unit access.
- Enhanced garage door patterns or finishes; garage door shall complement the design intent of the home and neighborhood.
- Provide sufficient planting areas between garages to soften the vertical architectural planes at alleys.

Building Forms

Building form, detail, and placement greatly influences how a structure is perceived based on how light strikes and frames the building. The effect of sunlight is a strong design consideration, as shadow and shade can lend a sense of substance and depth to a building. The following elements and considerations can be used to facilitate the dynamic of light and depth perception of the building.

Architectural Projections

Projections can create shadow and provide strong visual focal points. This can be used to emphasize design features such as entries, major windows, or outdoor spaces. Projections are encouraged on residential building forms. Projections may include, but are not limited to:

- Awnings (wood, metal, cloth)
- Balconies
- Shutters
- Eave overhangs
- Projecting second- or third-story elements
- Window/door surrounds
- Tower elements
- Trellis elements
- Recessed windows
- Porch elements
- Bay windows or dormers
- Shed roof elements

Offset Massing Forms

Front and street-facing elevations may have offset masses or wall planes (vertically or horizontally) to help break up the overall mass of a building.

- Offset forms are effective in creating a transition:
  - Vertically between stories, or
  - Horizontally between spaces, such as recessed entries.
- Offset massing features are appropriate for changes in materials and colors.
- Offsets should be incorporated as a functional element or detail enhancement.
- Over-complicated streetscenes and elevations should be avoided.
• Streetscenes should provide a mix of simple massing elevation with offset massing elements to compose an aesthetic and understandable streetscape.

**Floor Plan Plotting**

In each single-family detached neighborhood with a **minimum** of up to 80 homes, provide:

• Three floor plans.
• Four elevations for each floor plan using a minimum of two architectural styles. If only two styles are selected, elevations shall be significantly different in appearance.
• Four different color schemes for each floor plan.

In each single-family detached neighborhood with **more** than 80 homes, provide:

• Three floor plans.
• Four elevations for each floor plan using a minimum of three architectural styles. If only three styles per floor plan are selected, elevations shall be significantly different in appearance.
• Four different color schemes for each floor plan.

In each single-family detached neighborhood, street facing garages on corner lots at neighborhood entries shall be located on the side of the house furthest away from entry corner.
**Style Plotting**

To ensure that architectural variety occurs, similar elevations cannot be plotted adjacent to or immediately across the street from one another. No more than two of the same floor plan/elevations shall be plotted next to each other or directly across the street from one another. (Refer to Section Four for Design Review process.) The following describes the minimum criteria for style plotting:

- For a home on a selected lot, the same floor plan and elevation is not permitted on the lot most directly across from it and the one lot on either side of it.
- Identical floor plans may be plotted on adjacent lots, provided a different elevation style is selected for each floor plan.
- Identical floor plans may be plotted on lots across the street from each other provided a different elevation style is selected for each floor plan.

**Color Criteria**

To ensure variety of color schemes, like color schemes cannot be plotted adjacent to or immediately across the street from one another. Color and material sample boards shall be submitted for review along with the Master Plot Plan. (Refer to Section Four.)

A color scheme for a home on a selected lot may not be repeated (even if on a different floor plan) on the three lots most directly across from it and on the single lot to each side of it.

**Lower Height Elements**

Lower height elements are important to streetscape variety, especially for larger buildings or masses, as they articulate massing to avoid monotonous single planes. These elements also provide a transition from the higher story vertical planes to the horizontal planes of sidewalk and street, and help to transition between public and private spaces. Lower height elements are encouraged to establish pedestrian scale and add variety to the streetscene. Lower height elements may include, but are not limited to:

- Porches
- Entry features
- Interior living spaces
- Courtyards
- Bay windows
- Trellises
Balconies

Balconies break up large wall planes, offset floors, create visual interest to the facade, provide outdoor living opportunities, and adds human scale to a building. Scaled second- or third-story balconies can have as much impact on stepped massing and building articulation as a front porch or lower height elements. Balcony elements:

- May be covered or open, recessed into or projecting from the building mass.
- Shall be an integral element of, and in scale with, the building mass, where appropriate.
- Are discouraged from being plotted side-by-side at the same massing level (i.e. mirrored second-story balconies).

Roof Considerations

Composition and balance of roof forms are as definitive of a streetscape as the street trees, active architecture, or architectural character.

- Rooflines and pitches, ridgelines and ridge heights should create a balanced form to the architecture and elevation.
- Direction of ridgelines and/or ridge heights should vary along a streetscene.
- Roof overhangs (eaves and rakes) may be used as projections to define design vocabulary and create light and shade patterns.
- Hip, gable, shed, and conical roof forms may be used separately or together on the same roof or streetscene composition.
- Roof form and pitch shall be appropriate to the massing and design vocabulary of the home.
Outdoor Living Spaces

Outdoor living spaces, including porches, balconies, and courtyards, activate the streetscape and promote interaction among neighbors. Outdoor living spaces can also create indoor/outdoor environments opening up the home to enhance indoor environmental quality. Wherever possible, outdoor living space is encouraged.

Materials

The selection and use of materials has an important impact on the character of each neighborhood and the community as a whole. Wood is a natural material reflective of many architectural styles; however, maintenance concerns, a design for long-term architectural quality and new high-quality manufactured alternative wood materials make the use of real wood elements less desirable. Where “wood” is referred to in these guidelines, it can also be interpreted as simulated wood trim with style-appropriate wood texture. Additionally, some styles can be appropriately expressed without the wood elements, in which case stucco-wrapped, high-density foam trim (with style-appropriate stucco finish) is acceptable. Precast elements can also be satisfied by high-density foam or other similar materials in a style-appropriate finish.

- Brick, wood, and stone cladding shall appear as structural materials, not as applied veneers.
- Material changes should occur at logical break points.
- Columns, tower elements, and pilasters should be wrapped in its entirety.
- Materials and colors should be varied to add texture and depth to the overall character of the neighborhood.
- The use of flashy or non-traditional materials or colors that will not integrate with the overall character of the community is prohibited.
- Material breaks at garage corners shall have a return dimension equal to or greater than the width of the materials on the garage plane elevation.
- Use durable roofing and siding materials to reduce the need for replacement.
- Use local, recycled and/or rapidly renewable materials to conserve resources and reduce energy consumption associated with the manufacturing and transport of the materials. (Refer to Section Four for Design Review process.)
Section 2 - Architectural Design Guidelines

Exterior Structures

Exterior structures, including but not limited to, porches, patio covers, and trellises shall reflect the character, color, and materials of the building to which they are related.

- Columns and posts should project a substantial and durable image.
- Stairs should be compatible in type and material to the deck and landing.
- Railings shall be appropriately scaled, consistent with the design vernacular of the building, and constructed of durable materials.
- Exposed gutters and downspouts shall be colored to complement or match the fascia material or surface to which they are attached.

Accessory Structures

Accessory structures should conform to the design standards, setbacks, and height requirements of the primary structure. If visible from the front or side lot line, the visible elevation should be considered a front elevation and should meet the design criteria of the applicable architectural style.

Lighting

Appropriate lighting is essential in creating a welcoming evening atmosphere for the Folsom Ranch, Central District community. As a forward-thinking community, The Folsom Ranch, Central District will institute dark sky recommendations to mitigate light pollution, cut energy waste, and protect wildlife. All lighting shall be aesthetically pleasing and non-obtrusive, and meet the dark sky recommendations.

- All exterior lighting shall be limited to the minimum necessary for public safety.
- All exterior lighting shall be shielded to conceal the light source, lamp, or bulb. Fixtures with frosted or heavy seeded glass are permitted.
- Each residence shall have an exterior porch light at its entry that complements the architectural style of the building.
- Where feasible, lighting should be on a photocell or timer.
- Low voltage lighting shall be used whenever possible.

Address Numbers

To ensure public safety and ease of identifying residences by the Fire and Police Departments, address numbers shall be lighted or reflective and easily visible from the street.
RESIDENTIAL
ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

Folsom Ranch, Central District is envisioned as a sustainable, contemporary community where architectural massing, roof forms, detailing, walls, and landscape collaborate to reflect historic, regional, and climate-appropriate styles.

The design criteria established in this section encourages a minimum quality design and a level of style through the use of appropriate elements. Although the details are important elements that convey the style, the massing and roof forms are essential to establishing a recognizable style. The appropriate scale and proportion of architectural elements and the proper choice of details are all factors in achieving the architectural style.

ARCHITECTURAL THEME: CALIFORNIA HERITAGE

The styles selected for Folsom Ranch, Central District have been chosen from the traditional heritage of the California home styles, a majority of which have been influenced by the Spanish Mission and Mexican Rancho eras. Over the years, architectural styles in California became reinterpreted traditional styles that reflect the indoor-outdoor lifestyle choices available in the Mediterranean climate. These styles included the addition of western materials while retaining the decorative detailing of exposed wood work, wrought iron hardware, and shaped stucco of the original Spanish styles. Mixing of style attributes occurs in both directions, such as adapting Spanish detailing to colonial style form, or introducing colonial materials and details to the Hacienda form and function. The landscape and climate of California has also generated styles that acknowledge and blend with its unique setting. The Italian Villa is a prime example of a transplanted style developed in a climate zone similar to the climate found in California.

The following styles can be used within Folsom Ranch, Central District:
- Italian Villa
- Spanish Colonial
- Monterey
- Western Farmhouse
- European Cottage
- Craftsman
- Early California Ranch
- American Traditional

Additional architectural styles compatible with the intent of these guidelines may be added when it can be demonstrated to the Architectural Review Committee that they are regionally appropriate.

The following pages provide images and individual “style elements” that best illustrate and describe the key elements of each style. They are not all mandatory elements, nor are they a comprehensive list of possibilities. Photographs of historic and current interpretations of each style are provided to inspire and assist the designer in achieving strong, recognizable architectural style elevations. The degree of detailing and/or finish expressed in these guidelines should be relative to the size and type of building upon which they are applied.

These images are for concept and inspiration only and should not be exactly replicated.
ITALIAN VILLA

The Italian Villa was one of the most fashionable architectural styles in the United States in the 1860’s. Appearing on architect-designed landmarks in larger cities, the style was based on formal and rigidly symmetrical palaces of the Italian Renaissance.

Although residential adaptations generated less formality, traditional classical elements, such as the symmetrical facade, squared tower entry forms, arched windows, and bracketed eaves, persisted as the enduring traits of this style. When cast iron became a popular building material, it became a part of the Italianate vocabulary, embellishing homes with a variety of designs for balconies, porches, railings, and fences.

Italian Villa Style Elements:

- Eave and exaggerated overhangs.
- Wall materials typically consist of stucco with stone and precast accents.
- Decorative brackets below eaves may be added accents.
- Barrel tile or “S” tile roof
- The entry may be detailed with a precast surround feature.
- Stucco or precast columns with ornate cap and base trim are typical.
- Wrought iron elements, arched windows or elements, and quoins are frequently used as details.
SPANISH COLONIAL

This style evolved in California and the southwest as an adaptation of Mission Revival infused with additional elements and details from Latin America. The style attained widespread popularity after its use in the Panama-California Exposition of 1915.

Key features of this style were adapted to the California lifestyle. Plans were informally organized around a courtyard with the front elevation very simply articulated and detailed. The charm of this style lies in the directness, adaptability, and contrasts of materials and textures.

Spanish Colonial Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically rectangular or “L”-shaped.
- Roofs are typically of shallower pitch with “S” or barrel tiles and typical overhangs.
- Roof forms are typically comprised of a main front-to-back gable with front-facing gables.
- Wall materials are typically stucco.
- Decorative “wood” beams or trim are typical.
- Segmented or full-arch elements are typical in conjunction with windows, entry, or the porch.
- Round or half-round tile profiles are typical at front-facing gable ends.
- Arcades are sometimes utilized.
- Windows may be recessed, have projecting head or sill trim, or be flanked by plank-style shutters.
- Decorative wrought-iron accents, grille work, post or balcony railing may be used.
MONTEREY

The Monterey style is a combination of the original Spanish Colonial adobe construction methods with the basic two-story New England colonial house. Prior to this innovation in Monterey, all Spanish colonial houses were of single story construction.

First built in Monterey by Thomas Larkin in 1835, this style introduced two story residential construction and shingle roofs to California. This Monterey style and its single story counterpart eventually had a major influence on the development of modern architecture in the 1930’s.

The style was popularized by the use of simple building forms. Roofs featured gables or hips with broad overhangs, often with exposed rafter tails. Shutters, balconies, verandas, and porches are integral to the Monterey character. Traditionally, the first and second stories had distinctly different cladding material; respectively siding above with stucco and brick veneer base below.

The introduction of siding and manufactured materials to the home building scene allowed for the evolution of the Monterey home from strictly Spanish Adobe construction to a hybrid of local form and contemporary materials. Siding, steeper pitched flat tile roofing, and the cantilevered balcony elements on the Monterey house define this native California style.

Monterey Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically a simple two-story box.
- Roofs are typically shallow to moderately pitched with flat concrete tile or equal; “S” tile or barrel tile are also appropriate.
- Roof forms are typically a front-to-back gable with typical overhangs.
- Wall materials are typically comprised of stucco, brick, or siding.
- Materials may contrast between first and second floors.
- A prominent second-story cantilevered balcony is typically the main feature of the elevation; two-story balconies with simple posts are also appropriate.
- Simple Colonial corbels and beams typically detail roof overhangs and cantilevers.
- Balcony or porch is typically detailed by simple columns without cap or base trim.
- Front entry is typically traditionally pedimented by a surround, porch, or portico.
- Windows are typically accented with window head or sill trim of colonial-style and louvered shutters.
- Corbel and post sometimes lean toward more “rustic” details and sometimes toward more “Colonial” details.
WESTERN FARMHOUSE

The Farmhouse represents a practical and picturesque country house. Its beginnings are traced to both Colonial styles from New England and the Midwest. As the American frontier moved westward, the American Farmhouse style evolved according to the availability of materials and technological advancements, such as balloon framing.

Predominant features of the style are large wrapping front porches with a variety of wood columns and railings. Two story massing, dormers, and symmetrical elevations occur most often on the New England Farmhouse variations. The asymmetrical, casual cottage look, with a more decorated appearance, is typical of the Western American Farmhouse. Roof ornamentation is a characteristic detail consisting of cupolas, weather vanes, and dovecotes.

Western Farmhouse Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically simple.
- Roofs are typically of steeper pitch with flat concrete tiles or equal.
- Roof forms are typically a gable roof with front-facing gables and typical overhangs.
- Roof accents sometimes include standing-seam metal or shed forms at porches.
- Wall materials may include stucco, horizontal siding, and brick.
- A front porch typically shelters the main entry with simple posts.
- Windows are typically trimmed in simple colonial-style; built-up head and sill trim is typical.
- Shaped porch columns typically have knee braces.
European Cottage

The European Cottage is a style that evolved out of medieval Tudor and Normandy architecture. This evolving character that eventually resulted in the English and French “Cottage” became extremely popular when the addition of stone and brick veneer details was developed in the 1920’s.

Although the cottage is looked upon as small and unpretentious, the style was quickly recognized as one of the most popular in America. Designs for the homes typically reflected the rural setting in which they evolved. Many established older neighborhoods across the United States contain homes with the charm and character of this unpretentious style.

Roof pitches for these homes are steeper than traditional homes, and are comprised of gables, hips, and half-hip forms. The primary material is stucco with heavy use of stone and brick at bases, chimneys, and entry elements. Some of the most recognizable features for this style are the accent details in gable ends, sculptured swooping walls at the front elevation, and tower or alcove elements at the entry.

European Cottage Style Elements:

- Rectangular plan form massing with some recessed second floor area is desirable.
- Main roof hip or gable with intersecting gable roofs is typical of this style.
- Steep roof pitches with swooping roof forms are encouraged.
- Roof appearance of flat concrete tile or equal is typical of the European Cottage style.
- Recessed entry alcoves are encouraged.
- Wall materials are typically comprised of stucco with brick and/or stone veneer.
- Bay windows, curved or round top accent windows, and vertical windows with mullions and simple 2x trim are utilized at front elevations and high visibility areas.
- Stone or brick accent details at the building base, entry, and chimney elements are typical.
- Horizontal siding accents and wrought iron or wood balconies and pot shelves are encouraged.
CRAFTSMAN

Influenced by the English Arts and Crafts movement of the late 19th century and stylized by California architects like Bernard Maybeck in Berkeley and the Greene brothers in Pasadena, the style focused on exterior elements with tasteful and artful attention. Originating in California, Craftsman architecture relied on the simple house tradition, combining hip and gable roof forms with wide, livable porches, and broad overhanging eaves. The style was quickly spread across the state and across the country by pattern books, mail-order catalogs, and popular magazines.

Extensive built-in elements define this style, treating details such as windows and porches as if they were furniture. The horizontal nature is emphasized by exposed rafter tails and knee braces below broad overhanging eaves constructed in rustic-textured building materials. The overall effect was the creation of a natural, warm, and livable home of artful and expressive character. Substantial, tapered porch columns with stone piers lend a Greene character, while simpler double posts on square brick piers and larger knee braces indicate a direct Craftsman reference to the style of California architect Bernard Maybeck, who was greatly influenced by the English Arts and Crafts Movement of the late 19th Century.

Craftsman Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically a simple box.
- Roofs are typically of shallower pitch with flat concrete tiles (or equal) and exaggerated eaves.
- Roof forms are typically a side-to-side gable with cross gables.
- Roof pitch ranges from 3:12 to 5:12 typically with flat concrete tiles or equal.
- Wall materials may include stucco, horizontal siding, and stone.
- Siding accents at gable ends are typical.
- A front porch typically shelters the main entry.
- Exposed rafter tails are common under eaves.
- Porch column options are typical of the Craftsman style:
  - Battered tapered columns of stone, brick, or stucco
  - Battered columns resting on brick or stone piers (either or both elements are tapered)
  - Simpler porch supports of double square post resting on piers (brick, stone, or stucco); piers may be square or tapered.
- Windows are typically fully trimmed.
- Window accents commonly include dormers or ganged windows with continuous head or sill trim.
EARLY CALIFORNIA RANCH

A building form rather than an architectural style, the Ranch is primarily a one-story rambling home with strong horizontal lines and connections between indoor and outdoor spaces. The “U”- or “L”-shaped open floor plan focused on windows, doors, and living activities on the porch or courtyard. The horizontal plan form is what defines the Ranch.

The applied materials, style, and character applied to the Ranch have been mixed, interpreted, adapted, and modernized based on function, location, era, and popularity.

This single-story family oriented home became the American dream with the development of tract homes in the post-World War II era. Simple and affordable to build, the elevation of the Ranch was done in a variety of styles. Spanish styling with rusticated exposed wood beams, rafter tails under broad front porches, and elegantly simple recessed windows were just as appropriate on the Ranch as the clean lines of siding and floor to ceiling divided-light windows under broad overhanging laminate roofs.

Details and elements of the elevation of a Ranch should be chosen as a set identifying a cohesive style. Brick and stucco combinations with overly simple sill trim under wide windows with no other detailing suggests a Prairie feel, while all stucco, recessed windows, and exposed rusticated wood calls to mind a Hacienda ranch.

California Ranch Style Elements:
- Plan form is typically one-story with strong horizontal design.
- Roofs are typically shallow pitched with “S” tile, barrel tile, or flat concrete tile.
- Roof forms are typically gable or hip with exaggerated overhangs.
- Wall materials are commonly comprised of stucco, siding, or brick.
- A porch, terrace, or courtyard is typically the prominent feature of the elevation.
- Exposed rafter tails are typical.
- Porch is commonly detailed by simple posts or beams with simple cap or base trim.
- Front entry is typically traditionally pedimented by a surround, porch, or portico.
- Windows are typically broad and accented with window head and sill trim, shutters, or are recessed.
- A strong indoor/outdoor relationship joined by sliding or French doors, or bay windows is common.
AMERICAN TRADITIONAL

The American Traditional style is a combination of the early English and Dutch house found on the Atlantic coast. Their origins were sampled from the Adam style and other classical styles. Details from these original styles are loosely combined in many examples.

Current interpretations have maintained the simple elegance of the early prototypes, but added many refinements and new design details. This style relies on its asymmetrical form and colonial details to differentiate it from the strict colonial styles.

Highly detailed entries having decorative pediments extended and supported by semi-engaged columns typically. Detailed doors with sidelights and symmetrically designed front facades. Cornices with dentils are an important feature and help identify this style.

American Traditional Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically asymmetric “L”-shaped.
- Roofs are typically of moderate to steeper pitch with flat concrete tile (or equal) roof and exaggerated boxed eaves.
- Roof forms are typically hip or gable with dominant forward facing gables.
- Front facade is typically one solid material which may include stucco, brick, or horizontal siding.
- The front entry is typically sheltered within a front porch with traditionally detailed columns and railings.
- A curved or round-top accent window is commonly used on the front elevation.
- Windows are typically fully trimmed with flanking louvered shutters.
- Gable ends are typically detailed by full or partial cornice, sometimes emphasized with dentils or decorative molding.
- Decorative or pedimented head and sill trim on windows is typical.
GUIDING LANDSCAPE DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Sustainable Landscape Design

Through thoughtful, sensitive design, Folsom Ranch, Central District can be designated to conserve valuable resources and create a noteworthy community within the City of Folsom. Sustainable landscape design links natural and built systems to achieve balanced environmental, social, and economic outcomes and improves quality of life, and the long-term health of communities and the environment. Sustainable landscape balances the needs of people and the environment to benefit both. Landscape Architects are encouraged to research alternative possibilities and incorporate them into the Model Home and community common area landscape design. The following is a list of various 'sustainable' features and practices to be used and/or considered for the Folsom Ranch, Central District Development at the improvement plan phase/level.

- To comply with AB 1881, Model Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance and conserve water, incorporate a water management system utilizing up-to-date best management practices that allows groundwater to recharge.

- Encourage the use of low toxic wood preservatives (no CCA), or naturally rot-resistant wood for landscaping (no pressure-treated wood in or on the ground.)

- Choose low water, drought tolerant, and/or native plants that match the micro climate, and soil conditions. (Refer to Plant Matrix herein)

- Select plants that are “non-invasive” according to the current California Invasive Plant Inventory, published by the California Invasive Plant Council.
• Design landscape and plant spacing to allow for plants to reach mature size. Using appropriate sizes and the thoughtful placing of plants prevents overgrowth and future thinning, reducing the amount of material sent to the landfill.

• Locate plants to ensure proper drainage and to reduce potential damage to buildings.

• Reuse soils from the site, if appropriate, as horticultural soils.

• Maintain and/or improve soil health through responsible management including nurturing soil with organic matter, reducing synthetic fertilizer use, and restoration to sustain protected and future ecosystems.

• Use integrated pest management to control or eliminate pesticide and toxic chemical use.

• Create and/or maintain wildlife habitat.

• Increase tree cover to provide shade in developed areas to reduce energy demand, mitigate solar heat gain into buildings, and to reduce the amount of heat absorbed by paved areas.

• Plant deciduous trees on the south side of buildings to allow for increased solar heat gain in winter months (thereby reducing energy needed for heating interiors) and shading in summer months (thereby reducing energy needed for cooling interiors).

• Minimize the use of large turf areas (except within parks, parkways (as permitted by AB1881 Water Use Analysis), or single family residential front yards) or inefficient small turf areas (those under 8’-0” in width) in landscaping by incorporating water-conserving groundcovers or perennial grasses, shrubs, and trees.

• Utilize weather and climate-smart irrigation controllers.

• Design irrigation zones to suit plant requirements and incorporate high-efficiency nozzles.

• Use sustainable materials in landscape construction and site furnishing selections including, but not limited to, recycled materials, environmentally preferable/responsible products, materials that can be recycled, certified “green” products, and locally available or locally manufactured products.

• Use nitrogen-fixing plants to reduce fertilizer use.

• Create natural looking design to reduce maintenance required.

• Water conservation (xeriscape, rain gardens, grouping plants with similar requirements).

• Control water runoff (bioswales, rain gardens, green roofs).

• Preserving Oak Woodlands and isolated Oak Trees. Refer to the Landscape Master Community Plant Matrix section.
COMMUNITY DESIGN
THEME/ LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

Landscaping plays an important role in establishing the visual identity and character of the Folsom Ranch, Central District Community. Consistency in theme and the application of major community-level design elements, such as enhanced entry with dynamic monumentation, upgraded hardscape and master landscape, arterial street parkways, thoughtful specifications of walls, fences and pilasters, adjacent community interface with improved edge conditions, and site-specific plant materials, is designed to be maintained throughout the Folsom Ranch, Central District development to communicate and enhance the community’s identity.

Folsom Ranch, Central District embraces the California Heritage theme. Careful thought has been given to integrate the structural and aesthetic elements of a balanced, cohesive community. To ensure that these design guidelines are implemented in a manner that will provide a sense of the City of Folsom’s character and ambiance, a central theme of California Heritage has been developed. This theme is appropriate to the community’s locale, and will tie the community together while enabling neighborhoods and mixed-use areas to further develop their individual character through their own unique elements.

Several identifying design and landscape elements will be incorporated throughout the community and will generally include:

- Timeless stone, steel, boulders, stucco, and heavy wood beams incorporated into monumentation, way-finding, and accessory structures.
- Natural landscaped areas blended with manicured landscaping.
• Low water, drought-tolerant and native tree and shrub materials, such as California Sycamores, Oaks, and Pine trees. In addition, plants rated low and very low water use per the WUCOLS rating system shall be used.

• Natural materials such as stone, wood, and boulders, complemented by an earth-tone color palette.

• Varied paving materials, including stone, concrete, wood, decomposed granite, and concrete pavers.

Folsom Ranch, Central District is a planned community that is inspired by the unique character of the City of Folsom and enhances its distinct identity. Like California itself, the design intent and architecture is an eclectic and colorful mix of various influences from across the United States. This community offers its residents an environment in which pedestrian connectivity, recreational activity, and social interaction are fostered. The residential neighborhoods within Folsom Ranch, Central District focus on these aspects by providing generous landscape setbacks, residences oriented to the street, widened pathways/trails, public gathering areas, and several community parks with recreational amenities.

Thematic elements are major project improvements that occur at the community or neighborhood level, and assist in establishing the overall design theme for the Folsom Ranch, Central District community. These major thematic elements will be reinforced within the following:

• Monumentation/ Signage
• Streetscape Landscape
• Enhanced Masonry Vertical Elements
• Enhanced Hardscape
• Enhanced Community Edge Conditions
• Open Space, Parks and Recreation Facilities
• Lighting/ Street Furniture Family

• Walls and Fences
• Landscaping/ Plant Palette

These thematic elements will commonly occur throughout the community and will unite Folsom Ranch, Central District under a common design vocabulary. General design guidelines and design criteria for the community theme elements are contained in the sections that follow.
WALL AND FENCE GUIDELINES

Maintaining quality and character of all aspects of the public realm is a key placemaking principle. The wall and fence design criteria is intended to provide variety and privacy for each lot while providing continuity and unity within the community.

Walls and fencing will be used throughout the community to complement the overall design theme, establish community identity, provide protection from roadway and other noise, and allow privacy and security in residential areas. The use of walls and fences can also serve to accentuate neighborhood features in addition to screening streets and adjacent uses.

The following types of walls (solid and opaque) and fences (open and largely transparent) have been selected for possible use within different areas of the project site. All wall and fence heights are measured from the highest grade elevation on either side of the wall or fence. An overall community wall program is provided to help unify and reinforce community character.

For wall heights exceeding those outlined herein based on Sound Attenuation requirements refer to the Mangini Ranch Residential Development Environmental Noise Assessment document prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. on January 29, 2015.

- Decorative walls and/or screen walls shall be integrated with the architecture of community building, as well as the overall landscape design.
- All community theme walls and fences shall be consistent in design.
- For most products, the community wall will be colored split face block with an enhanced brick cap.
- Pilasters will be stacked stone veneered with an enhanced brick cap. Pilasters will occur at changes in wall direction or change in materials visible to the public realm and as outlined on page 3-26.
- Higher-end estate product wall adjoining a public street or any wall publicly visible or adjacent to the public realm shall be slump face block, slurry coat and painted, with a decorative brick cap.
- Interior/side yard or any wall not visible to the public realm shall be precision block with precision cap, or wood fencing based on builder's preference and product price point. Block color to match slump slurry wall paint color.
- View fencing of full height tubular steel and/or a low wall or concrete mowcurb with tubular steel combination may be used. Pilasters may be incorporated into steel fencing.
- Vines and/or shrubs should be planted along community walls to soften the visual character. An extensive use of vines is encouraged.
- The maximum wall or fence height shall be six (6) feet within any required rear, or side setback area, and along the project perimeter unless a need for an 8'-0" high wall or higher is determined necessary to act as a sound wall and approved by the City. Wall/fence heights are measured from the base of the wall/fence to the top of the interior or exterior side, always providing a minimum six (6) feet barrier from either side. The maximum height of any wall should not exceed ten (10) feet (when in combination with a retaining wall) without a variance.
- Combination retaining wall and privacy walls at block ends may be used.
- Rear yard fencing adjacent to park areas or open space edges where residential pad is
elevated above park/open space shall be view fencing, where applicable, considering grade differentials, etc.

- Where appropriate, view fencing may be less than 6’ high to provide an enhanced view shed. In cases where pools or spas are located in rear yards, a minimum 5’-6” high perimeter fence is required. Continuous view fencing or block walls shall have pilasters located at corners, at change in wall/fencing materials, and significant redirections in the fence line.

- Wall sections greater than 50 feet in length should incorporate at least two of the following design features which are proportionate to the wall length:
  - A minimum 2 feet change in plane for at least 2 feet.
  - A minimum 18-inch change in height for at least 10 feet.
  - Use of pilasters at 50 feet maximum intervals and at changes in wall planes.
  - A minimum 4 feet high view fencing section for at least 10 feet.

- Solid walls or wood fencing shall be used for property line fencing and gate returns between housing lots and those areas in public view. Fence return located on the garage side of each home shall include a three foot (3’) wide minimum gate.

- All retaining walls, courtyard walls, gates and fences shall be compatible with the architecture of each neighborhood/village.

- Visible precision block walls or wood fencing is prohibited from the public realm.

- Walls shall be setback a minimum of 5 feet from all public sidewalks. Where feasible a 10 feet setback is preferred.

- For residential side yard gates, vinyl gates are encouraged, color to match or complement adjacent wall/architecture.

- Gates should be provided in walls or fences to allow emergency access and to facilitate convenient pedestrian access to activity areas and adjacent uses.

- Walls should be eliminated or sited to provide additional setbacks areas at project entries to accommodate distinctive landscaping, ornamental gateways, signage and street furniture.

- Walls should be curved or angled at corner locations along street frontages to preserve sight lines.

- Be mindful of sight lines when laying out lots and perimeter walls.
The following photos should not be construed as the exact wall and fence height, color and material, but should be used as preferred examples. The sketches and graphic representations contained within these Design Guidelines are for conceptual purposes and are provided as visual aids in understanding the basic intent of the Guidelines and to present examples of their potential implementation. The block/color specification can be substituted with a different manufacturer as long as colors and textures match.

Community Wall and Pilaster

Pilaster: Precision column block with stone veneer and enhanced brick cap
Wall: Split face block with brick cap
Block Color: Sandstone available through Angelus Block - 6x6x16
Brick: Jumbo Alamo Blend ‘A’ - available through Belden Brick
Grout: Light Khaki - available through Orco Blended Products
Stone: TNS Coso Junction Thin Veneer - available through Thompson Bldg.
Grout-CBP Light Smoke #145

High End Product - Community Wall and Pilaster

Pilaster: Precision column block with stone veneer and brick cap
Wall: Slump column block with slurry coat, paint, and brick cap
Block Color: Auburn available through Angelus Block - Slump 6x6x16 - Super Slump
Slurry Coat/Sack: Sherwin Williams SW7513w Sanderling (La Habra Color Coat Match x81072)
Brick: Jumbo Alamo Blend ‘A’ - available through Belden Brick
Grout: Light Khaki - available through Orco Blended Products
Stone: TNS Coso Junction Thin Veneer - available through Thompson Bldg.
Grout-CBP Light Smoke #145
Community Prefabricated Tubular Steel Fence

Color: Sherwin Williams SW7020 Black Fox, Powdercoated
Precision Block Wall Option at Side Yard Conditions
(No Precision Block Wall shall be visible/exposed to the public realm.)

Color: Harvest, available through Angelus Block

Wood Fence Option at Side Yard Conditions
(No Wood Fence shall be visible/ exposed to the public realm)

Color: Mission Brown Cabot Semi-solid Stain or equivalent
Planning Commission Staff Report
50 Natoma Street, Council Chambers
Folsom, CA 95630

Project: Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Village 4 Subdivision Residential Design Review
File #: DRCL22-00126
Request: Residential Design Review
Location: Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision within Folsom Plan Area (Northwest Corner of E. Bidwell St. and Mangini Pkwy.)
Staff Contact: Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner, 916-461-6209
jkinkade@folsom.ca.us

Property Owner
Name: TCS Improvement Company, LLC
Address: 4370 Town Center Blvd. Ste 100, El Dorado Hills CA 95762

Applicant
Taylor Morrison Homes
81 Blue Ravine Rd., Suite 220 Folsom CA 95630

Recommendation: Conduct a public meeting and upon conclusion recommend approval of a Residential Design Review Application for 42 single-family residential homes as illustrated on Attachment 5 for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Village 4 project (DRCL22-00126) based on the findings (Findings A-J) and subject to the conditions of approval (Conditions 1-16) attached to this report.

Project Summary: The proposed project involves a request for Residential Design Review approval for 42 traditional single-family residential homes located within Village 4 of the previously approved Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project. In particular, the applicant is requesting Design Review approval for three individual master plans. Four distinct California heritage-themed architectural styles and 12 color and material alternatives are incorporated among the three master plans.

Table of Contents:
1. Description/Analysis
2. Background
3. Conditions of Approval
4. Vicinity Map
5. Site Plan
6. Architectural and Landscape Plans dated June 13, 2022
7. Exterior Colors and Materials, dated June 8, 2022
8. Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines

Submitted,

PAM JOHNS
Community Development Director
APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL
The applicant, Taylor Morrison Homes, is requesting Residential Design Review approval for 42 single-family residential homes situated within the previously approved Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project. Specifically, the applicant is requesting Design Review approval for three individual master plans within Village 4. The master plans include four distinct California heritage-themed architectural styles (Italian Villa, Spanish Colonial, Cottage and Craftsman) and 12 color and material alternatives.

The proposed master plans feature three two-story plans ranging in size from 1,649 to 2,097 square feet (3BR/2BA to 4BR/3BA) and include an attached two-car garage. The four classic design themes are characterized by a variety of unique architectural elements including distinctive roof shapes and forms, covered front entries, varied door and window design, and enhanced decorative elements. Proposed building materials include stucco and shingle siding, rock and ledgestone veneer, wood posts and columns, wood shutters, wood windowsills, multi-paned windows, themed garage doors, decorative light fixtures, and concrete roof tiles. In addition, there are 12 distinct color and material alternatives available for each of the master plans. The figures on the following page illustrate the approved site plan and proposed building elevations for the project.

POLICY/RULE
Folsom Municipal Code (FMC), Section 17.06.030 requires that single-family residential master plans submit a Design Review Application for approval by the Planning Commission. Pursuant to FMC section 17.06.080(B), the Planning Commission must make the following findings in approving, conditionally approving, or denying the design review application:

1. Project compliance with the general plan and any applicable specific plans and zoning ordinances;
2. Conformance with any adopted city-wide design guidelines;
3. Conformance with any project-specific design guidelines and standards approved through the planned development permit process or similar review process;
4. Compatibility of building materials, textures and colors with surrounding development and consistency with the general design theme of the neighborhood.
ANALYSIS

Project Compliance with Applicable Specific Plan - Development Standards

The proposed project is subject to the development standards established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan for MLD (Multi-Family Low Density)-designated properties. The following table demonstrates that the proposed project is consistent with the required development standards:
TABLE 1: MLD DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>3,000 SF</td>
<td>3,015 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porch Setback</td>
<td>12.5 Feet</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Primary Structure Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Garage Setback</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>5 Feet</td>
<td>5 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conformance with Applicable Design Guidelines

The proposed project is located within the Mangini Ranch portion of the Folsom Plan Area; thus, it is subject to the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines, which were approved by the City Council in 2015. No applicable City-wide design guidelines exist. The Design Guidelines are a complementary document to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Community Guidelines. The Design Guidelines, which are intended to act as an implementation tool for residential development within the Central District of the Folsom Plan Area, provide the design framework for architecture, street scene, and landscaping to convey a master plan identity. The Design Guidelines also establish the pattern and intensity of development for the Central District to ensure a high quality and aesthetically cohesive environment. While these Design Guidelines establish the quality of architectural and landscape development for the master plan, they are not intended to prevent alternative designs and/or concepts that are compatible with the overall project theme.

As a regulatory tool, the Design Guidelines are intended to assist applicants in creating single-family residential neighborhoods that reflect the City’s rich history, reinforce the sense of community, and utilize sustainable best practices. The Design Guidelines also provide the framework for design review approval of Folsom Ranch, Central District residential projects. In addition, the Design Guidelines are intended to be used by builders and developers when designing their Master Plot Plans. Any development project that is submitted to the City must be reviewed for consistency with these Design Guidelines. The following are the general architectural principles intended to guide the design of the Folsom Ranch, Central District to ensure quality development:

- Provide a varied and interesting street scene
- Focus of the home is the front elevation, not the garage
- Provide a variety of garage placements
- Provide detail on rear elevations where visible from the public streets
- Choose appropriate massing and roof forms to define the architectural styles
- Ensure that plans and styles provide a degree of individuality
Use architectural elements and details to reinforce individual architectural styles

In addition to the general architectural principles referenced previously, the Design Guidelines also provide specific direction regarding a number of architectural situations and features including: edge conditions, corner buildings, building forms, off-set massing forms, front elevations, roof forms, feature windows, architectural projects, balconies, lower height elements, garage door treatments, outdoor living spaces, exterior structures, building materials, and color criteria. The following are examples of architectural situations and features that are relevant to the proposed project:

- Provide a mix of hip and gable roof forms along the street scene
- Provide off-set massing, forms, or wall planes
- Provide recessed second-story elements
- Provide enhanced style-appropriate details on the front building elevation
- Provide decorative window shelves or sill treatments
- Provide architectural projections (recessed windows, eaves, shutters, etc.)
- Provide garage doors that are consistent with the architecture of the building
- Provide variety in the garage door patterns
- Provide outdoor living spaces (porches, balconies, courtyards, etc.)

The architectural design styles selected for the Folsom Ranch Central District have been chosen from the traditional heritage of California home styles, a majority of which have been influenced by the Spanish Mission and Mexican Rancho eras. Over the years, architectural styles in California have become reinterpreted traditional styles that reflect the indoor-outdoor lifestyle choices available in the Mediterranean climate. Suggested architectural styles in the Design Guidelines include American Traditional, Craftsman, Early California Ranch, European Cottage, Italian Villa, Monterey, Spanish Colonial, and Western Farmhouse. Additional architectural styles compatible with the intent of the Design Guidelines may be added if they are regionally appropriate.

As described in the applicant’s proposal, the proposed project features four distinct architectural themes that have been chosen from or are similar to the traditional heritage of California home styles including Italian Villa, Spanish Colonial, Cottage and Craftsman. The following is a description of each of the aforementioned architectural styles proposed for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Village 4 Subdivision:

**Italian Villa**

The Italian Villa was one of the most fashionable architectural styles in the United States in the 1860’s. Appearing on architect-designed landmarks in larger cities, the style was based on formal and rigidly symmetrical palaces of the Italian Renaissance. Although residential adaptations generated less formality, traditional classical elements, such as the symmetrical facade, squared tower entry forms, arched windows, and bracketed eaves, persisted as the enduring traits of this style. When cast iron became a popular building material, it became a part of the Italianate vocabulary, embellishing homes with
a variety of designs for balconies, porches, railings, and fences.

**Spanish Colonial**

This style evolved in California and the southwest as an adaptation of Mission Revival infused with additional elements and details from Latin America. The style attained widespread popularity after its use in the Panama-California Exposition of 1915. Key features of this style were adapted to the California lifestyle. Plans were informally organized around a courtyard with the front elevation very simply articulated and detailed. The charm of this style lies in the directness, adaptability, and contrasts of materials and textures.

**Cottage**

The Cottage is a style that evolved out of medieval Tudor and Normandy architecture. This evolving character that eventually resulted in the English and French “Cottage” became extremely popular when the addition of stone and brick veneer details was developed in the 1920’s. Although the Cottage is looked upon as small and unpretentious, the style was quickly recognized as one of the most popular in America. Designs for the homes typically reflected the rural setting in which they evolved. Roof pitches for these homes are steeper than traditional homes, and are comprised of gables, hips, and half-hip forms. The primary material is stucco with heavy use of stone and brick at bases, chimneys, and entry elements. Some of the most recognizable features for this style are the accent details in gable ends, sculptured swooping walls at the front elevation, and tower or alcove elements at the entry.

**Craftsman**

Influenced by the English Arts and Crafts movement of the late 19th century and stylized by California architects, the Craftsman style focused on exterior elements with tasteful and artful attention to detail. Originating in California, Craftsman architecture relied on the simple house tradition, combining hip and gable roof forms with wide, livable porches, and broad overhanging eaves. Extensive built-in elements define this style, treating details such as windows and porches as if they were furniture. The horizontal nature is emphasized by exposed rafter tails and knee braces below broad overhanging eaves constructed in rustic-textured building materials. The overall effect is the creation of a natural, warm, and livable home of artful and expressive character.

In reviewing the architecture and design of the project, staff determined that the design of the three proposed master plans (which also include four elevation plans and 12 color and material alternatives) generally reflect the level and type of high-quality design features recommended by the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines. Specifically, the master plans are responsive to views on all four building elevations and include a variety of unique architectural elements that create an interesting streetscape scene including: off-set building massing, distinctive roof shapes and forms, covered front entries, architectural projections, varied door and window design, single-story elements in the rear and enhanced decorative elements.
Typically, single-family master plans in the MLD-designated villages within Mangini Ranch include at least one single-story master plan. In discussing this with the applicant, the applicant indicated their preference for two-story products given market demands and limited lot size. Staff worked with the applicant to modify the plans so that various rooflines were offered and that single-story elements were provided on the proposed rear elevations to ensure that the massing of an entirely two-story master plan village was adequately addressed. Furthermore, the master plans for the 218 single-family residential lots of Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 are being proposed concurrently by the same applicant and include several single-story and two-story master plans. Therefore, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 as a whole will include several options for single- and two-story residences with Phase 4 providing an option for two-story residences on smaller lots.

**Compatibility With Surrounding Development and Consistency with General Design Theme of the Neighborhood**

The proposed building materials (stucco, and shingle siding, rock, ledgestone and brick veneer, wood posts and columns, wood shutters, wood windowsills, multi-paned windows, themed garage doors, decorative light fixtures, and concrete roof tiles) are consistent with the materials recommended by the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines. In addition, the proposed project includes distinct (earth-tone) color schemes that will enhance the visual interest of each of the master plans.

Staff forwards the following design recommendations to the Commission for consideration:

1. This approval is for three master plans (four building elevations with 12 color and material options for Village 1-4 of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision. The applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached building elevations dated June 13, 2022.

2. The design, materials, and colors of the proposed Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Village 4 Subdivision single-family residential homes shall be consistent with the attached building elevations, materials samples, and color scheme to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

3. The Community Development Department shall approve the individual lot permits to assure no duplication or repetition of the same house, same rooftopline, same elevation style, side-by-side, or across the street from each other.

4. Driveways shall only be placed in the locations shown in plot plans approved by Community Development Department. No additional driveways shall be constructed on these lots.

5. All mechanical equipment shall be ground-mounted and concealed from view of public streets, neighboring properties, and nearby higher buildings. For lots
abutting the open space areas, mechanical equipment shall be located out of view from open space areas.

6. Decorative light fixtures, consistent with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines and unique to each architectural design theme, shall be added to the front and rear building elevation of each Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

7. A minimum of one tree shall be planted in the front yard of each residential lot within the subdivision. A minimum of two trees are required along the street-side of all corner lots. All front yard irrigation and landscaping shall be installed prior to a Building Permit Final.

These recommendations listed above are included in the conditions of approval presented for consideration by the Planning Commission (Condition No. 12).

Taking into consideration the aforementioned architectural details, materials, and colors, staff has determined that the design of the master plans, with the proposed conditions, is consistent with the design principles established by the Design Guidelines and is also compatible with surrounding development and consistent with the general design theme of the neighborhood.

Landscaping
The Applicant is proposing to install new landscaping in the front yards and street side yards of the new homes within the project. Homeowners will be responsible for landscaping the rear yards of the individual homes. Front yard landscaping has been designed by the applicant to complement the proposed architecture and to work within the front yard areas available.

Proposed landscaping includes street trees on each lot (at least one per interior lot and two per corner lot) and accent trees (at least one per lot). Groundcover consists of a mix of mulch with drought-tolerant, low-maintenance shrub and groundcover plantings. No turf is proposed in the front yards. The conceptual landscape plans are shown in Attachment 6. The species of the trees and plants will be subject to the review and approval of the City Arborist upon submittal of the final landscape plans.

Landscaping plans are required to include all on-site landscape specifications and details and are required to comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s declarations and restrictions pertaining to water conservation and outdoor landscaping, including city-wide landscape rules and regulations on water usage and landscaping requirements necessitated to mitigate for drought conditions. The landscape plans are also required to comply with and implement water efficient requirements as adopted by the State of California (Assembly Bill 1881) (State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance) until such time the City of Folsom adopts its own Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance at which time the owner/applicant shall comply with any new ordinance.
Wood fencing is proposed on the property lines of each interior lot. Corner lots provide fencing along the property lines of the interior side property line and inside of the property line on the street-side property line to allow room for additional landscaping outside of the fence line but within the property lines, as shown in Attachment 6. The Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines require that rear yard fencing adjacent to park areas or open space edges where the residential pad is elevated above park/open space be view fencing, where applicable, considering grade differentials, etc.

With the proposed conditions, staff has determined that the design of the landscaping and fencing will be consistent with the design principles established by the Design Guidelines and will also be compatible with surrounding development and consistent with the general design theme of the neighborhood.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
The City, as lead agency, previously determined that the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project is entirely consistent with the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) and therefore the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act as provided by Government Code section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines section 15182. Since that determination was made, none of the events described in Public Resources Code section 21166 or CEQA Guidelines section 15162 (e.g. substantial changes to the project) have occurred. Therefore, no environmental review is required in association with this Residential Design Review Application.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends approval of the proposed project, based on the following findings and subject to the conditions of approval included in this report.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
Move to Approve a Residential Design Review Application for 42 single-family residential homes as illustrated on Attachment 6 for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Village 4 project (DRCL22-00126) based on the findings (Findings A-J) and subject to the conditions of approval (Conditions 1-16) attached to this report.

GENERAL FINDINGS

A. NOTICE OF HEARING HAS BEEN GIVEN AT THE TIME AND IN THE MANNER REQUIRED BY STATE LAW AND CITY CODE.

B. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN, AND THE FOLSOM RANCH CENTRAL DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES.
CEQA FINDINGS

C. THE CITY, AS LEAD AGENCY, PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

D. THE CITY PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED THAT THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

E. THE CITY PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED THAT THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65457 AND CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15182.

F. NONE OF THE EVENTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 21166 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE OR SECTION 15162 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES HAVE OCCURRED.

G. NO ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW IS REQUIRED FOR THIS APPLICATION.

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

H. THE PROJECT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN, AND THE APPLICABLE ZONING ORDINANCES.

I. THE PROJECT IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE FOLSOM RANCH CENTRAL DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES.

J. THE BUILDING MATERIALS, TEXTURES, AND COLORS OF THE PROJECT WILL BE COMPATIBLE WITH SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT AND CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL DESIGN THEME OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.
BACKGROUND
On May 12, 2021, the City Council approved a Large-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, and Minor Administrative Modifications for Mangini Ranch Phase 3 located within the central portion of the Folsom Plan Area. The Large-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map was approved to subdivide the 173-acre project site into 14 individual parcels for future development. The Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map was approved to subdivide a 52.3-acre portion of the project site into 260 residential lots for single-family detached units, three open space parcels, eight lettered landscape lots, and one paseo lot. Minor administrative modifications were also approved to transfer 25 allocated dwelling units among parcels within the Project to accommodate the residential unit count and densities of the project and to refine land uses edges for the purpose of maximizing development efficiencies, avoiding natural resources, and accommodating a Class I trail.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION
MLD (Multi-Family Low Density)

SPECIFIC PLAN DESIGNATION
SP-MLD PD (Specific Plan-Multi-Family Low Density, Planned Development District)

ADJACENT LAND USES/ZONING
North: Open Space (OS) with Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Village 1 (SFHD) beyond

South: Mangini Parkway with Open Space (OS) and Single-Family High-Density land (SFHD) beyond

East: East Bidwell Street with Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD) land beyond

West: Open Space (OS) with Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Village 3 (SFHD) beyond

SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The project site has been fully graded and site improvements (underground utilities, roadways, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, etc.) are currently in the process of being reviewed.

APPLICABLE CODES
FPASP (Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan)
Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines
FMC 17.06, Design Review
Attachment 3
Conditions of Approval
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGE 4 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00126)**

**MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below and provided in Attachments 6 and 7:</td>
<td></td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Architectural and Landscape Plans dated June 13, 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exterior Colors and Materials dated June 8, 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This project approval is for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Village 4 Subdivision Residential Design Review, which includes design review approval for 42 traditional single-family residential units located within Village 4 of the previously approved Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 Subdivision Residential Design Review project (DRCL22-00126). Implementation of the project shall be consistent with the above-referenced items as modified by these conditions of approval. The species of the trees and plants will be subject to the review and approval of the City Arborist upon submittal of the final landscape plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Building plans shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval to ensure conformance with this approval and with relevant codes, policies, standards and other requirements of the City of Folsom.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CD (P)(E)(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The project approvals granted under this staff report (Residential Design Review) shall remain in effect for two years from final date of approval (July 20, 2024). Failure to obtain the relevant building (or other) permits within this time period, without the subsequent extension of this approval, shall result in the termination of this approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGE 4 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00126)
MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.                | The owner/applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul any approval by the City or any of its agencies, departments, commissions, agents, officers, employees, or legislative body concerning the project. The City will promptly notify the owner/applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. The City may, within its unlimited discretion, participate in the defense of any such claim, action or proceeding if both of the following occur:  
  • The City bears its own attorney’s fees and costs; and  
  • The City defends the claim, action or proceeding in good faith  
  The owner/applicant shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement of such claim, action or proceeding unless the settlement is approved by the owner/applicant. | OG           | CD (P)(E)(B) PW, PR, FD, PD, NS |

### DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND FEE REQUIREMENTS

| 5.                | The owner/applicant shall pay all applicable taxes, fees and charges at the rate and amount in effect at the time such taxes, fees and charges become due and payable.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | B            | CD (P)(E)                  |
| 6.                | If applicable, the owner/applicant shall pay off any existing assessments against the property, or file necessary segregation request and pay applicable fees.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | B            | CD (E)                     |
### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGE 4 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00126)

**MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The City, at its sole discretion, may utilize the services of outside legal counsel to assist in the implementation of this project, including, but not limited to, drafting, reviewing and/or revising agreements and/or other documentation for the project. If the City utilizes the services of such outside legal counsel, the applicant shall reimburse the City for all outside legal fees and costs incurred by the City for such services. The applicant may be required, at the sole discretion of the City Attorney, to submit a deposit to the City for these services prior to initiation of the services. The applicant shall be responsible for reimbursement to the City for the services regardless of whether a deposit is required.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If the City utilizes the services of consultants to prepare special studies or provide specialized design review or inspection services for the project, the applicant shall reimburse the City for actual costs it incurs in utilizing these services, including administrative costs for City personnel. A deposit for these services shall be provided prior to initiating review of the Final Map, improvement plans, or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>This project shall be subject to all City-wide development impact fees, unless exempt by previous agreement. This project shall be subject to all City-wide development impact fees in effect at such time that a building permit is issued. These fees may include, but are not limited to, fees for fire protection, park facilities, park equipment, Humbug-Willow Creek Parkway, Light Rail, TSM, capital facilities and traffic impacts. The 90-day protest period for all fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions imposed on this project will begin on the date of final approval (May 2, 2022). The fees shall be calculated at the fee rate in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E), PW, PK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGE 4 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00126)**

**MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant agrees to pay to the Folsom-Cordova Unified School District the maximum fee authorized by law for the construction and/or reconstruction of school facilities. The applicable fee shall be the fee established by the School District that is in effect at the time of the issuance of a building permit. Specifically, the owner/applicant agrees to pay any and all fees and charges and comply with any and all dedications or other requirements authorized under Section 17620 of the Education Code; Chapter 4.7 (commencing with Section 65970) of the Government Code; and Sections 65995, 65995.5 and 65995.7 of the Government Code.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARCHITECTURE/SITE DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Final exterior building and site lighting plans shall be submitted for review and approval by Community Development Department for aesthetics, level of illumination, glare and trespass prior to the issuance of any building permits. The exterior building and site lighting will be required to achieve energy efficient standards by installing high-intensity discharge (mercury vapor, high-pressure sodium, or similar) lamps. Lighting shall be equipped with a timer or photo condenser. Lighting shall be designed to be directed downward onto the project site and away from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project shall comply with the following architecture and design requirements:

1. This approval is for three master plans (four building elevations with 12 color and material options for Village 4 of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision. The applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached building elevations dated June 13, 2022.

2. The design, materials, and colors of the proposed Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Villages 1-3 Subdivision single-family residential homes shall be consistent with the attached building elevations, materials samples, and color scheme to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

3. The Community Development Department shall approve the individual lot permits to assure no duplication or repetition of the same house, same roof-line, same elevation style, side-by-side, or across the street from each other.

4. Driveways shall only be placed in the locations shown in plot plans approved by Community Development Department. No additional driveways shall be built on these lots.

5. All mechanical equipment shall be ground-mounted and concealed from view of public streets, neighboring properties and nearby higher buildings. For lots abutting the open space areas, mechanical equipment shall be located out of view from open space areas.

6. Decorative light fixtures, consistent with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines and unique to each architectural design theme, shall be added to the front and rear building elevation of each Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

7. A minimum of one tree shall be planted in the front yard of each residential lot within the subdivision. A minimum of two trees are required along the street-side of all corner lots. All front yard irrigation and landscaping shall be installed prior to a Building Permit Final.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The building shall have illuminated addresses visible from the street or drive fronting the property. Size and location of address identification shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshal.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICE/SECURITY REQUIREMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14. | The owner/applicant shall consult with the Police Department in order to incorporate all reasonable crime prevention measures. The following security/safety measures shall be required:  
• A security guard shall be on-duty at all times at the site or another approved security measure shall be in place including but not limited to a six-foot security fence shall be constructed around the perimeter of construction areas. (This requirement shall be included on the approved construction drawings).  
• Security measures for the safety of all construction equipment and unit appliances shall be employed.  
• Landscaping shall not cover exterior doors or windows, block line-of-sight at intersections or screen overhead lighting. | B | PD |
| **LANDSCAPING/WALLS/FENCES** | | | |
| 15. | The final location, design, height, materials, and colors of the walls and fences shall consistent with the submitted exhibits subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department to ensure consistency with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines. The location of the fencing shall remain in perpetuity as shown and installed originally by the Applicant (i.e., fence may not be moved into the PUE on side/corner lots). | B | CD(P) |
### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3, VILLAGE 4 SUBDIVISION RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT (DRCL22-00126)

MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION WITHIN FOLSOM PLAN AREA RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Final landscape plans and specifications shall be prepared by a registered landscape architect and approved by the City prior to the approval of the first building permit or Small-Lot Final Map, whichever occurs first. Said plans shall include all on-site landscape specifications and details, and shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s declarations and restrictions pertaining to water conservation and outdoor landscaping. Landscaping shall meet shade requirements as outlined in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan where applicable. The landscape plans shall comply and implement water efficient requirements as adopted by the State of California (Assembly Bill 1881) (State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance) until such time the City of Folsom adopts its own Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance at which time the owner/applicant shall comply with any new ordinance.</td>
<td>B, M</td>
<td>CD(P), PW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>WHEN REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD (P) Community Development Department</td>
<td>I Prior to approval of Improvement Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Planning Division</td>
<td>M Prior to approval of Final Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Engineering Division</td>
<td>B Prior to issuance of first Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Building Division</td>
<td>O Prior to approval of Occupancy Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Fire Division</td>
<td>G Prior to issuance of Grading Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW Public Works Department</td>
<td>DC During construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Park and Recreation Department</td>
<td>OG On-going requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4
Vicinity Map
Attachment 5
Site Plan
Shaded lots will have side elevation enhancements. All rear elevations will receive enhanced detailing.
Attachment 6
Architectural and Landscape Plans dated
June 13, 2022
MANGINI RANCH
PHASE 3, VILLAGE 4
FOLSOM, CALIFORNIA

PLAN 3B - COTTAGE
PLAN 1A - SPANISH
PLAN 3C - CRAFTSMAN
PLAN 2D - ITALIAN VILLA

SHEET INDEX

T-1: STREETSCENE
L-1: LANDSCAPE PLAN
A-1: LOTS ARTICULATION PLANS
A-2: PLAN 1 - FLOOR PLAN
A-3: PLAN 1 - ELEVATION A (SPANISH)
A-4: PLAN 1 - ELEVATION B (COTTAGE)
A-6: PLAN 1 - ELEVATION C (CRAFTSMAN)
A-8: PLAN 1 - ELEVATION D (ITALIAN VILLA)
A-7: PLAN 2 - FLOOR PLAN
A-8: PLAN 2 - ALL FRONTS
A-9: PLAN 2 - ELEVATION H (SPANISH)
A-10: PLAN 2 - ELEVATION H (COTTAGE)
A-11: PLAN 2 - ELEVATION E (CRAFTSMAN)
A-12: PLAN 2 - ELEVATION D (ITALIAN VILLA)
A-13: PLAN 3 - FLOOR PLAN
A-14: PLAN 3 - ELEVATION A (SPANISH)
A-15: PLAN 3 - ELEVATION B (COTTAGE)
A-16: PLAN 3 - ELEVATION C (CRAFTSMAN)
A-17: PLAN 3 - ELEVATION D (ITALIAN VILLA)
Note: All proposed planting and irrigation shall comply with the current city and state model efficient landscape ordinance. Each irrigation system shall utilize a smart controller with strain/freeze sensor and low-volume point source drip irrigation.
PLAN 1

MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, Village 4
Folsom, California
ITALIAN VILLA
- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE FOAM CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"

RIGHT SIDE "D"

REAR "D"

LEFT SIDE "D"

FRONT ELEVATION "D" (ITALIAN VILLA)

PLAN 1
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, Village 4
Folsom, California
COTTAGE
• STUCCO SIDING
• STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
• DECORATIVE VENT
• DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
• CULTURED STONE VENEER
• THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
• O'GEE GUTTER
• CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - "SLATE" PROFILE

PLAN 2
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, Village 4
Folsom, California
CRAFTSMAN

- Stucco siding
- Stucco over foam trim
- Shingle gable ends
- Decorative outlookers
- Cultured stone veneer
- Theme specific garage door
- Ogee gutter
- Concrete tile roofing - "Shake" profile

PLAN 2
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, Village 4
Folsom, California
PLAN 3
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, Village 4
Folsom, California
SECOND FLOOR PLAN (1204 S.F.)

FIRST FLOOR PLAN (885 S.F.; 2089 TOTAL S.F.)

PLAN 3 (235-2089)
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, Village 4
Folsom, California
CRAFTSMAN

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- SHINGLE GABLE ENDS
- DECORATIVE OUTLOOKERS
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING
- "SHAKE" PROFILE

PLAN 3
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, Village 4
Folsom, California
ITALIAN VILLA

- STUCCO SIDING
- STUCCO OVER FOAM TRIM
- DECORATIVE FOAM CORBELS
- THEME SPECIFIC GARAGE DOOR
- O'GEE GUTTER
- CULTURED STONE VENEER
- CONCRETE TILE ROOFING - LOW PROFILE "S"

PLAN 3
MANGINI RANCH - Phase 3, Village 4
Folsom, California
Attachment 7
Exterior Colors and Materials dated
June 8, 2022
COLOR APPLICATIONS

SPANISH SCHEMES 1, 2, & 3 (ELEVATIONS "A")
COLOR 1 – BODY
COLOR 2 – TRIM, VENTS, FASCIA, GUTTERS & GARAGE DOOR
COLOR 3 – FRONT DOOR & SHUTTER

EUROPEAN COTTAGE SCHEMES 4, 5, & 6 (ELEVATIONS "B")
COLOR 1 – BODY
COLOR 2 – TRIM, FASCIA, VENTS, GARAGE DOOR & GUTTERS
COLOR 3 – SHUTTERS, FRONT DOOR

CRAFTSMAN SCHEMES 7, 8, & 9 (ELEVATIONS "C")
COLOR 1 – BODY
COLOR 2 – TRIM, SIDING AT GABLES & POSTS
COLOR 3 – FASCIA, CORBLES, GARAGE DOOR, FRONT DOOR, VENTS/VENT TRIM & GUTTERS

ITALIAN VILLA SCHEMES 10, 11, & 12 (ELEVATIONS "D")
COLOR 1 – BODY
COLOR 2 – TRIM, FASCIA, CORBLES & GUTTERS
COLOR 3 – FRONT DOOR AND GARAGE DOOR
SCHEME 1 (Spanish – Elevation “A”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1  SW 7035  Aesthetic White
COLOR 2  SW 2840  Hammered Silver
COLOR 3  SW 7027  Well-Bred Brown
EAGLE ROOFING: Malibu 2522  Terracotta Flashd (A.R.: .21)

SCHEME 2 (Spanish – Elevation “A”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1  SW 7010  White Duck
COLOR 2  SW 7509  Tiki Hut
COLOR 3  SW 7615  Sea Serpent
EAGLE ROOFING: Malibu 2606  Vallejo Range (A.R.: .18)

SCHEME 3 (Spanish – Elevation “A”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1  SW 6119  Antique White
COLOR 2  SW 6067  Mocha
COLOR 3  SW 6083  Sable
EAGLE ROOFING: Malibu 2605  San Benito Blend (A.R.: .21)

SCHEME 4 (European Cottage – Elevation “B”)

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:
COLOR 1  SW 7548  Portico
COLOR 2  SW 7025  Backdrop
COLOR 3  SW 6207  Retreat
EAGLE ROOFING: Bel Air 4671  Village Blend (A.R.: .17)
EL DORADO STONE: Country Rubble Bella
SCHEME 5 (European Cottage – Elevation “B”)

- **SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:**
  - COLOR 1: SW 9165 - Gossamer Veil
  - COLOR 2: SW 6199 - Rare Gray
  - COLOR 3: SW 7594 - Carriage Door

- **EAGLE ROOFING:** Bel Air 4687 - Brown Gray Range (A.R. .16)
- **EL DORADO STONE:** Country Rubble Poleromo

---

SCHEME 6 (European Cottage – Elevation “B”)

- **SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:**
  - COLOR 1: SW 7045 - Intellectual Gray
  - COLOR 2: SW 7046 - Anonymous
  - COLOR 3: SW 2383 - Birdseye Maple

- **EAGLE ROOFING:** Bel Air 4979 - Slate Range (A.R. .17)
- **EL DORADO STONE:** Country Rubble Cognac

---

SCHEME 7 (Craftsman – Elevation “C”)

- **SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:**
  - COLOR 1: SW 7009 - Pearly White
  - COLOR 2: SW 7591 - Red Barn
  - COLOR 3: SW 7503 - Sticks & Stones

- **EAGLE ROOFING:** Ponderosa SCP 8803 Arlington Blend (A.R. .16)
- **EL DORADO STONE:** Mountain Ledge Panel Silvertown

---

SCHEME 8 (Craftsman – Elevation “C”)

- **SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT:**
  - COLOR 1: SW 6121 - Whole Wheat
  - COLOR 2: SW 2806 - Rockwood Brown
  - COLOR 3: SW 2851 - Sage Green Light

- **EAGLE ROOFING:** Ponderosa SCP 5504 - New Cedar (A.R. .17)
- **EL DORADO STONE:** Mountain Ledge Panel Pioneer
### MANGINI RANCH - PHASE 3, VILLAGE 4

#### BY

**SCHEME 9 (Craftsman – Elevation “C”)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color 1</th>
<th>SW 2840</th>
<th>Hammered Silver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color 2</td>
<td>SW 7674</td>
<td>Peppercorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color 3</td>
<td>SW 6076</td>
<td>Turkish Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Roofing</td>
<td>Ponderosa 5557</td>
<td>Live Oak Range (A.R.: .18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Stone</td>
<td>Mountain Ledge Panel Whiskey Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SCHEME 11 (Italian Villa – Elevation “D”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color 1</th>
<th>SW 7024</th>
<th>Functional Gray</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color 2</td>
<td>SW 7627</td>
<td>White Heron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color 3</td>
<td>SW 9132</td>
<td>Acacia Haze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Roofing</td>
<td>Malibu 2520</td>
<td>Weathered Terracotta Flashed (A.R.: .20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SCHEME 10 (Italian Villa – Elevation “D”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color 1</th>
<th>SW 9093</th>
<th>Nearly Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color 2</td>
<td>SW 7526</td>
<td>Maison Blanche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color 3</td>
<td>SW 7041</td>
<td>Van Dyke Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Roofing</td>
<td>Malibu 2689</td>
<td>Brown Range (A.R.: .17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SCHEME 12 (Italian Villa – Elevation “D”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color 1</th>
<th>SW 7032</th>
<th>Warm Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color 2</td>
<td>SW 7542</td>
<td>Naturel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color 3</td>
<td>SW 6634</td>
<td>Arresting Auburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Roofing</td>
<td>Malibu 2646</td>
<td>Sunset Blend (A.R.: .18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment 8
Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES
ARCHITECTURAL GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following residential guiding principles will guide the architecture to ensure quality development:

• Provide a varied and interesting streetscene.
• Focus of the home is the front elevation, not the garage.
• Provide a variety of garage placements.
• Provide detail on rear elevations where visible from the public streets.
• Choose appropriate massing and roof forms to define the architectural styles.
• Ensure that plans and styles provide a degree of individuality.
• Use architectural elements and details to reinforce individual architectural styles.

GENERAL ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES

Edge Conditions

Rear elevations visible from open spaces and major roadways shall incorporate enhanced details used on the front elevation of the home. Rear elevations observable from open spaces and major roadways shall be visually aesthetically pleasing from surrounding viewpoints and adjacencies. Silhouettes and massing of homes along edges require design sensitivity. A row of homes with a single front or rear facing gable are prohibited. The following should be considered, and at least one element incorporated, in the design of the side and rear elevations along edge conditions:

• A balance of hip and gable roof forms;
• Single-story plan;
• Single-story elements on two-story homes;
• Offset massing or wall planes (on individual plans or between plans);
• Roof plane breaks (on individual plans or between plans);
• Detail elements on the front elevation shall be applied to the side and rear elevations along edge conditions.
Roof Forms

Rows of homes seen along major community roadways are perceived by their contrast against the skyline or background. The dominant impact is the shape of the building and roofline. To minimize the visual impact of repetitious flat planes, similar building silhouettes and similar ridge heights, discernibly different roof plans for each home plan shall be designed. Individual roof plans may be simple but, between different plans, should exhibit variety by using front to rear, side-to-side, gables, hipped roofs, and/or the introduction of single story elements.

The following roof design guidelines should also be considered:

- Provide a mix of gable and hip roofs along the streetscape.
- Design roofs for maximum solar exposure for the potential installation of solar features.
- Consider deep overhangs where appropriate to the style to provide additional shade and interior cooling.
- Offset roof planes, eave heights, and ridge lines.

Corner Buildings

Buildings located on corners often times function as neighborhood entries and highlight the architecture for the overall Folsom Ranch, Central District community. Buildings located on corners shall include one of the following:

- Front and side facade articulation using materials that wrap around the corner-side of the building;
- Awning on corner side;
- Home entry on corner side;
- Corner facing garage;
- A pop-out side hip, gable, or shed form roof;
- An added single-story element, such as a wrap-around porch or balcony;
- Recessed second- or third-story (up to 35’ max.); or
- Balcony on corner side.
Front Elevations

Front elevations shall be detailed to achieve a variety along the street scene. Each front elevation shall incorporate a Feature Window treatment (see Feature Window requirements on page 2-6). In addition, each front elevation shall incorporate one or more of the following techniques:

- Provide enhanced style-appropriate details on the front elevation.
- Offset the second story from the first level for a portion of the second story.
- Vary the wall plane by providing projections of elements such as bay windows, porches, and similar architectural features.
- Create recessed alcoves and/or bump-out portions of the building.
- Incorporate second-story balconies.
- Create interesting entries that integrate features such as porches, courtyards, large recessed entry alcoves, or projecting covered entries with columns.
- Use a minimum of two building materials or colors on the front elevation.

Multi-family Entries

Entries for multi-family homes should create an initial impression, locate and frame the doorway, act as a link between public and private spaces, and further identify individual unit entries.

- Wherever possible, orient the front door and principal access towards the roadway, paseo, or common open space.
- Incorporate appropriate roof elements, columns, Feature Windows and/or architectural forms in the entry statement to emphasize the building character and the location of individual doorways.
- If due to building configuration the front entry location is not immediately apparent, direct and draw the observer to it with added elements such as signs, lighting, and landscape.
Feature Windows

All front and visible edge elevations shall incorporate one Feature Window treatment that articulates the elevation. Feature Window options include:

- A window of unique size or shape;
- Picture window;
- A bay window projecting a minimum of 24 inches, or a 12 inch pop-out surround;
- A window with a substantial surround matching or contrasting the primary color of the home;
- A window recess a minimum of 2 inches;
- Decorative iron window grilles;
- Decorative window shelves or sill treatments;
- Grouped or ganged windows with complete trim surrounds or unifying head and/or sill trim:
  - A Juliet balcony with architectural style appropriate materials;
  - Window shutters; or
  - Trellis protruding a minimum of 12 inches from the wall plane of the window.

Windows

Windows on south-facing exposures should be designed, to the greatest extent possible, to maximize light and heat entering the home in the winter, and to minimize light and heat entering in the summer.

West-facing windows should be shaded where feasible to avoid prolonged sun exposure/overheating of the homes.

For additional window requirements addressing Sound Attenuation requirements refer to the Mangini Ranch Residential Development Environmental Noise Assessment document prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. on January 29, 2015.
Garage Door Treatments

Appropriate treatment of garage doors will further enhance the building elevation and decrease the utilitarian appearance of the garage door. Various garage door patterns, windows, and/or color schemes should be applied as appropriate to individual architectural styles, where feasible.

- Garage doors shall be consistent with the architecture of the building to reduce the overall visual mass of the garage.
- Garage doors shall be recessed 8 inches from the wall plane.
- All garage doors shall be automatic section roll-up doors.
- When appropriate, single garage doors are encouraged.
- Carriage-style garage doors of upgraded design are encouraged.

Street Facing Garages

All street facing garages should vary the garage door appearance along the streetscene. Below are options for the door variety:

- Vary the garage door pattern, windows, and/or color as appropriate to individual architectural styles.
- Use an attached overhead trellis installed beneath the garage roof fascia and/or above garage door header trim.
- Span the driveway with a gated element or overhead trellis.
- Provide a porte cochere.
- Street facing garages on corner lots at neighborhood entries shall be located on the side of the house furthest away from the corner.
Alley Treatments

The use of alleys should be elevated from purely functional, simple garage access to an enjoyable space that residents experience and utilize daily. Design of alleys shall address the functional and aesthetic features of the space to create a positive experience for the residents. At least one of the following shall be implemented along the alley:

- Building size and shape shall have stepped massing (recessed or cantilevered, i.e., stepping back upper floors or protruding forward upper floors) of at least one foot.
- Window trim, color, and appropriate details from the front elevation.
- Rear privacy walls and pedestrian gates designed and located for ease of unit access.
- Enhanced garage door patterns or finishes; garage door shall complement the design intent of the home and neighborhood.
- Provide sufficient planting areas between garages to soften the vertical architectural planes at alleys.

Building Forms

Building form, detail, and placement greatly influences how a structure is perceived based on how light strikes and frames the building. The effect of sunlight is a strong design consideration, as shadow and shade can lend a sense of substance and depth to a building. The following elements and considerations can be used to facilitate the dynamic of light and depth perception of the building.

Architectural Projections

Projections can create shadow and provide strong visual focal points. This can be used to emphasize design features such as entries, major windows, or outdoor spaces. Projections are encouraged on residential building forms. Projections may include, but are not limited to:

- Awnings (wood, metal, cloth)
- Balconies
- Shutters
- Eave overhangs
- Projecting second- or third-story elements
- Window/door surrounds
- Tower elements
- Trellis elements
- Recessed windows
- Porch elements
- Bay windows or dormers
- Shed roof elements

Offset Massing Forms

Front and street-facing elevations may have offset masses or wall planes (vertically or horizontally) to help break up the overall mass of a building.

- Offset forms are effective in creating a transition:
  - Vertically between stories, or
  - Horizontally between spaces, such as recessed entries.
- Offset massing features are appropriate for changes in materials and colors.
- Offsets should be incorporated as a functional element or detail enhancement.
- Over-complicated streetscenes and elevations should be avoided.
Streetscenes should provide a mix of simple massing elevation with offset massing elements to compose an aesthetic and understandable streetscape.

**Floor Plan Plotting**

In each single-family detached neighborhood with a **minimum** of up to 80 homes, provide:

- Three floor plans.
- Four elevations for each floor plan using a minimum of **two** architectural styles. If only two styles are selected, elevations shall be significantly different in appearance.
- Four different color schemes for each floor plan.

In each single-family detached neighborhood with **more** than 80 homes, provide:

- Three floor plans.
- Four elevations for each floor plan using a minimum of **three** architectural styles. If only three styles per floor plan are selected, elevations shall be significantly different in appearance.
- Four different color schemes for each floor plan.

In each single-family detached neighborhood, street facing garages on corner lots at neighborhood entries shall be located on the side of the house furthest away from entry corner.
Style Plotting
To ensure that architectural variety occurs, similar elevations cannot be plotted adjacent to or immediately across the street from one another. No more than two of the same floor plan/elevations shall be plotted next to each other or directly across the street from one another. (Refer to Section Four for Design Review process.) The following describes the minimum criteria for style plotting:

- For a home on a selected lot, the same floor plan and elevation is not permitted on the lot most directly across from it and the one lot on either side of it.
- Identical floor plans may be plotted on adjacent lots, provided a different elevation style is selected for each floor plan.
- Identical floor plans may be plotted on lots across the street from each other provided a different elevation style is selected for each floor plan.

Color Criteria
To ensure variety of color schemes, like color schemes cannot be plotted adjacent to or immediately across the street from one another. Color and material sample boards shall be submitted for review along with the Master Plot Plan. (Refer to Section Four.)

A color scheme for a home on a selected lot may not be repeated (even if on a different floor plan) on the three lots most directly across from it and on the single lot to each side of it.

Lower Height Elements
Lower height elements are important to streetscene variety, especially for larger buildings or masses, as they articulate massing to avoid monotonous single planes. These elements also provide a transition from the higher story vertical planes to the horizontal planes of sidewalk and street, and help to transition between public and private spaces. Lower height elements are encouraged to establish pedestrian scale and add variety to the streetscene. Lower height elements may include, but are not limited to:

- Porches
- Entry features
- Interior living spaces
- Courtyards
- Bay windows
- Trellises
Balconies

Balconies break up large wall planes, offset floors, create visual interest to the facade, provide outdoor living opportunities, and adds human scale to a building. Scaled second- or third-story balconies can have as much impact on stepped massing and building articulation as a front porch or lower height elements. Balcony elements:

- May be covered or open, recessed into or projecting from the building mass.
- Shall be an integral element of, and in scale with, the building mass, where appropriate.
- Are discouraged from being plotted side-by-side at the same massing level (i.e. mirrored second-story balconies).

Roof Considerations

Composition and balance of roof forms are as definitive of a streetscape as the street trees, active architecture, or architectural character.

- Rooflines and pitches, ridgelines and ridge heights should create a balanced form to the architecture and elevation.
- Direction of ridgelines and/or ridge heights should vary along a streetscene.
- Roof overhangs (eaves and rakes) may be used as projections to define design vocabulary and create light and shade patterns.
- Hip, gable, shed, and conical roof forms may be used separately or together on the same roof or streetscene composition.
- Roof form and pitch shall be appropriate to the massing and design vocabulary of the home.
Outdoor Living Spaces

Outdoor living spaces, including porches, balconies, and courtyards, activate the streetscene and promote interaction among neighbors. Outdoor living spaces can also create indoor/outdoor environments opening up the home to enhance indoor environmental quality. Wherever possible, outdoor living space is encouraged.

Materials

The selection and use of materials has an important impact on the character of each neighborhood and the community as a whole. Wood is a natural material reflective of many architectural styles; however, maintenance concerns, a design for long-term architectural quality and new high-quality manufactured alternative wood materials make the use of real wood elements less desirable. Where “wood” is referred to in these guidelines, it can also be interpreted as simulated wood trim with style-appropriate wood texture. Additionally, some styles can be appropriately expressed without the wood elements, in which case stucco-wrapped, high-density foam trim (with style-appropriate stucco finish) is acceptable. Precast elements can also be satisfied by high-density foam or other similar materials in a style-appropriate finish.

- Brick, wood, and stone cladding shall appear as structural materials, not as applied veneers.
- Material changes should occur at logical break points.
- Columns, tower elements, and pilasters should be wrapped in its entirety.
- Materials and colors should be varied to add texture and depth to the overall character of the neighborhood.
- The use of flashy or non-traditional materials or colors that will not integrate with the overall character of the community is prohibited.
- Material breaks at garage corners shall have a return dimension equal to or greater than the width of the materials on the garage plane elevation.
- Use durable roofing and siding materials to reduce the need for replacement.
- Use local, recycled and/or rapidly renewable materials to conserve resources and reduce energy consumption associated with the manufacturing and transport of the materials. (Refer to Section Four for Design Review process.)
Exterior Structures

Exterior structures, including but not limited to, porches, patio covers, and trellises shall reflect the character, color, and materials of the building to which they are related.

- Columns and posts should project a substantial and durable image.
- Stairs should be compatible in type and material to the deck and landing.
- Railings shall be appropriately scaled, consistent with the design vernacular of the building, and constructed of durable materials.
- Exposed gutters and downspouts shall be colored to complement or match the fascia material or surface to which they are attached.

Accessory Structures

Accessory structures should conform to the design standards, setbacks, and height requirements of the primary structure. If visible from the front or side lot line, the visible elevation should be considered a front elevation and should meet the design criteria of the applicable architectural style.

Lighting

Appropriate lighting is essential in creating a welcoming evening atmosphere for the Folsom Ranch, Central District community. As a forward-thinking community, The Folsom Ranch, Central District will institute dark sky recommendations to mitigate light pollution, cut energy waste, and protect wildlife. All lighting shall be aesthetically pleasing and non-obtrusive, and meet the dark sky recommendations.

- All exterior lighting shall be limited to the minimum necessary for public safety.
- All exterior lighting shall be shielded to conceal the light source, lamp, or bulb. Fixtures with frosted or heavy seeded glass are permitted.
- Each residence shall have an exterior porch light at its entry that complements the architectural style of the building.
- Where feasible, lighting should be on a photocell or timer.
- Low voltage lighting shall be used whenever possible.

Address Numbers

To ensure public safety and ease of identifying residences by the Fire and Police Departments, address numbers shall be lighted or reflective and easily visible from the street.
RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

Folsom Ranch, Central District is envisioned as a sustainable, contemporary community where architectural massing, roof forms, detailing, walls, and landscape collaborate to reflect historic, regional, and climate-appropriate styles.

The design criteria established in this section encourages a minimum quality design and a level of style through the use of appropriate elements. Although the details are important elements that convey the style, the massing and roof forms are essential to establishing a recognizable style. The appropriate scale and proportion of architectural elements and the proper choice of details are all factors in achieving the architectural style.

ARCHITECTURAL THEME: CALIFORNIA HERITAGE

The styles selected for Folsom Ranch, Central District have been chosen from the traditional heritage of the California home styles, a majority of which have been influenced by the Spanish Mission and Mexican Rancho eras. Over the years, architectural styles in California became reinterpreted traditional styles that reflect the indoor-outdoor lifestyle choices available in the Mediterranean climate. These styles included the addition of western materials while retaining the decorative detailing of exposed wood work, wrought iron hardware, and shaped stucco of the original Spanish styles. Mixing of style attributes occurs in both directions, such as adapting Spanish detailing to colonial style form, or introducing colonial materials and details to the Hacienda form and function. The landscape and climate of California has also generated styles that acknowledge and blend with its unique setting. The Italian Villa is a prime example of a transplanted style developed in a climate zone similar to the climate found in California.

The following styles can be used within Folsom Ranch, Central District:

- Italian Villa
- Spanish Colonial
- Monterey
- Western Farmhouse
- European Cottage
- Craftsman
- Early California Ranch
- American Traditional

Additional architectural styles compatible with the intent of these guidelines may be added when it can be demonstrated to the Architectural Review Committee that they are regionally appropriate.

The following pages provide images and individual “style elements” that best illustrate and describe the key elements of each style. They are not all mandatory elements, nor are they a comprehensive list of possibilities. Photographs of historic and current interpretations of each style are provided to inspire and assist the designer in achieving strong, recognizable architectural style elevations. The degree of detailing and/or finish expressed in these guidelines should be relative to the size and type of building upon which they are applied.

These images are for concept and inspiration only and should not be exactly replicated.
ITALIAN VILLA

The Italian Villa was one of the most fashionable architectural styles in the United States in the 1860’s. Appearing on architect-designed landmarks in larger cities, the style was based on formal and rigidly symmetrical palaces of the Italian Renaissance.

Although residential adaptations generated less formality, traditional classical elements, such as the symmetrical facade, squared tower entry forms, arched windows, and bracketed eaves, persisted as the enduring traits of this style. When cast iron became a popular building material, it became a part of the Italianate vocabulary, embellishing homes with a variety of designs for balconies, porches, railings, and fences.

Italian Villa Style Elements:

- Eave and exaggerated overhangs.
- Wall materials typically consist of stucco with stone and precast accents.
- Decorative brackets below eaves may be added accents.
- Barrel tile or “S” tile roof
- The entry may be detailed with a precast surround feature.
- Stucco or precast columns with ornate cap and base trim are typical.
- Wrought iron elements, arched windows or elements, and quoins are frequently used as details.
SPANISH COLONIAL

This style evolved in California and the southwest as an adaptation of Mission Revival infused with additional elements and details from Latin America. The style attained widespread popularity after its use in the Panama-California Exposition of 1915.

Key features of this style were adapted to the California lifestyle. Plans were informally organized around a courtyard with the front elevation very simply articulated and detailed. The charm of this style lies in the directness, adaptability, and contrasts of materials and textures.

Spanish Colonial Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically rectangular or “L”-shaped.
- Roofs are typically of shallower pitch with “S” or barrel tiles and typical overhangs.
- Roof forms are typically comprised of a main front-to-back gable with front-facing gables.
- Wall materials are typically stucco.
- Decorative “wood” beams or trim are typical.
- Segmented or full-arch elements are typical in conjunction with windows, entry, or the porch.
- Round or half-round tile profiles are typical at front-facing gable ends.
- Arcades are sometimes utilized.
- Windows may be recessed, have projecting head or sill trim, or be flanked by plank-style shutters.
- Decorative wrought-iron accents, grille work, post or balcony railing may be used.
**Monterey**

The Monterey style is a combination of the original Spanish Colonial adobe construction methods with the basic two-story New England colonial house. Prior to this innovation in Monterey, all Spanish colonial houses were of single story construction.

First built in Monterey by Thomas Larkin in 1835, this style introduced two story residential construction and shingle roofs to California. This Monterey style and its single story counterpart eventually had a major influence on the development of modern architecture in the 1930's.

The style was popularized by the use of simple building forms. Roofs featured gables or hips with broad overhangs, often with exposed rafter tails. Shutters, balconies, verandas, and porches are integral to the Monterey character. Traditionally, the first and second stories had distinctly different cladding material; respectively siding above with stucco and brick veneer base below.

The introduction of siding and manufactured materials to the home building scene allowed for the evolution of the Monterey home from strictly Spanish Adobe construction to a hybrid of local form and contemporary materials. Siding, steeper pitched flat tile roofing, and the cantilevered balcony elements on the Monterey house define this native California style.

**Monterey Style Elements:**

- Plan form is typically a simple two-story box.
- Roofs are typically shallow to moderately pitched with flat concrete tile or equal; “S” tile or barrel tile are also appropriate.
- Roof forms are typically a front-to-back gable with typical overhangs.
- Wall materials are typically comprised of stucco, brick, or siding.
- Materials may contrast between first and second floors.
- A prominent second-story cantilevered balcony is typically the main feature of the elevation; two-story balconies with simple posts are also appropriate.
- Simple Colonial corbels and beams typically detail roof overhangs and cantilevers.
- Balcony or porch is typically detailed by simple columns without cap or base trim.
- Front entry is typically traditionally pedimented by a surround, porch, or portico.
- Windows are typically accented with window head or sill trim of colonial-style and louvered shutters.
- Corbel and post sometimes lean toward more “rustic” details and sometimes toward more “Colonial” details.

![Example of Monterey Architecture](image1)

![Example of Monterey Architecture](image2)
**Western Farmhouse**

The Farmhouse represents a practical and picturesque country house. Its beginnings are traced to both Colonial styles from New England and the Midwest. As the American frontier moved westward, the American Farmhouse style evolved according to the availability of materials and technological advancements, such as balloon framing.

Predominant features of the style are large wrapping front porches with a variety of wood columns and railings. Two story massing, dormers, and symmetrical elevations occur most often on the New England Farmhouse variations. The asymmetrical, casual cottage look, with a more decorated appearance, is typical of the Western American Farmhouse. Roof ornamentation is a characteristic detail consisting of cupolas, weather vanes, and dovecotes.

**Western Farmhouse Style Elements:**

- Plan form is typically simple.
- Roofs are typically of steeper pitch with flat concrete tiles or equal.
- Roof forms are typically a gable roof with front-facing gables and typical overhangs.
- Roof accents sometimes include standing-seam metal or shed forms at porches.
- Wall materials may include stucco, horizontal siding, and brick.
- A front porch typically shelters the main entry with simple posts.
- Windows are typically trimmed in simple colonial-style; built-up head and sill trim is typical.
- Shaped porch columns typically have knee braces.
**European Cottage**

The European Cottage is a style that evolved out of medieval Tudor and Normandy architecture. This evolving character that eventually resulted in the English and French “Cottage” became extremely popular when the addition of stone and brick veneer details was developed in the 1920’s.

Although the cottage is looked upon as small and unpretentious, the style was quickly recognized as one of the most popular in America. Designs for the homes typically reflected the rural setting in which they evolved. Many established older neighborhoods across the United States contain homes with the charm and character of this unpretentious style.

Roof pitches for these homes are steeper than traditional homes, and are comprised of gables, hips, and half-hip forms. The primary material is stucco with heavy use of stone and brick at bases, chimneys, and entry elements. Some of the most recognizable features for this style are the accent details in gable ends, sculptured swooping walls at the front elevation, and tower or alcove elements at the entry.

**European Cottage Style Elements:**

- Rectangular plan form massing with some recessed second floor area is desirable.
- Main roof hip or gable with intersecting gable roofs is typical of this style.
- Steep roof pitches with swooping roof forms are encouraged.
- Roof appearance of flat concrete tile or equal is typical of the European Cottage style.
- Recessed entry alcoves are encouraged.
- Wall materials are typically comprised of stucco with brick and/or stone veneer.
- Bay windows, curved or round top accent windows, and vertical windows with mullions and simple 2x trim are utilized at front elevations and high visibility areas.
- Stone or brick accent details at the building base, entry, and chimney elements are typical.
- Horizontal siding accents and wrought iron or wood balconies and pot shelves are encouraged.
Craftsman

Influenced by the English Arts and Crafts movement of the late 19th century and stylized by California architects like Bernard Maybeck in Berkeley and the Greene brothers in Pasadena, the style focused on exterior elements with tasteful and artful attention. Originating in California, Craftsman architecture relied on the simple house tradition, combining hip and gable roof forms with wide, livable porches, and broad overhanging eaves. The style was quickly spread across the state and across the country by pattern books, mail-order catalogs, and popular magazines.

Extensive built-in elements define this style, treating details such as windows and porches as if they were furniture. The horizontal nature is emphasized by exposed rafter tails and knee braces below broad overhanging eaves constructed in rustic-textured building materials. The overall effect was the creation of a natural, warm, and livable home of artful and expressive character. Substantial, tapered porch columns with stone piers lend a Greene character, while simpler double posts on square brick piers and larger knee braces indicate a direct Craftsman reference to the style of California architect Bernard Maybeck, who was greatly influenced by the English Arts and Crafts Movement of the late 19th Century.

Craftsman Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically a simple box.
- Roofs are typically of shallower pitch with flat concrete tiles (or equal) and exaggerated eaves.
- Roof forms are typically a side-to-side gable with cross gables.
- Roof pitch ranges from 3:12 to 5:12 typically with flat concrete tiles or equal.
- Wall materials may include stucco, horizontal siding, and stone.
- Siding accents at gable ends are typical.
- A front porch typically shelters the main entry.
- Exposed rafter tails are common under eaves.
- Porch column options are typical of the Craftsman style:
  - Battered tapered columns of stone, brick, or stucco
  - Battered columns resting on brick or stone piers (either or both elements are tapered)
  - Simpler porch supports of double square post resting on piers (brick, stone, or stucco); piers may be square or tapered.
- Windows are typically fully trimmed.
- Window accents commonly include dormers or ganged windows with continuous head or sill trim.
EARLY CALIFORNIA RANCH

A building form rather than an architectural style, the Ranch is primarily a one-story rambling home with strong horizontal lines and connections between indoor and outdoor spaces. The “U”- or “L”-shaped open floor plan focused on windows, doors, and living activities on the porch or courtyard. The horizontal plan form is what defines the Ranch.

The applied materials, style, and character applied to the Ranch have been mixed, interpreted, adapted, and modernized based on function, location, era, and popularity.

This single-story family oriented home became the American dream with the development of tract homes in the post-World War II era. Simple and affordable to build, the elevation of the Ranch was done in a variety of styles. Spanish styling with rusticated exposed wood beams, rafter tails under broad front porches, and elegantly simple recessed windows were just as appropriate on the Ranch as the clean lines of siding and floor to ceiling divided-light windows under broad overhanging laminate roofs.

Details and elements of the elevation of a Ranch should be chosen as a set identifying a cohesive style. Brick and stucco combinations with overly simple sill trim under wide windows with no other detailing suggests a Prairie feel, while all stucco, recessed windows, and exposed rusticated wood calls to mind a Hacienda ranch.

California Ranch Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically one-story with strong horizontal design.
- Roofs are typically shallow pitched with “S” tile, barrel tile, or flat concrete tile.
- Roof forms are typically gable or hip with exaggerated overhangs.
- Wall materials are commonly comprised of stucco, siding, or brick.
- A porch, terrace, or courtyard is typically the prominent feature of the elevation.
- Exposed rafter tails are typical.
- Porch is commonly detailed by simple posts or beams with simple cap or base trim.
- Front entry is typically traditionally pedimented by a surround, porch, or portico.
- Windows are typically broad and accented with window head and sill trim, shutters, or are recessed.
- A strong indoor/outdoor relationship joined by sliding or French doors, or bay windows is common.
**American Traditional**

The American Traditional style is a combination of the early English and Dutch house found on the Atlantic coast. Their origins were sampled from the Adam style and other classical styles. Details from these original styles are loosely combined in many examples.

Current interpretations have maintained the simple elegance of the early prototypes, but added many refinements and new design details. This style relies on its asymmetrical form and colonial details to differentiate it from the strict colonial styles.

Highly detailed entries having decorative pediments extended and supported by semi-engaged columns typically. Detailed doors with sidelights and symmetrically designed front facades. Cornices with dentils are an important feature and help identify this style.

**American Traditional Style Elements:**

- Plan form is typically asymmetric “L”-shaped.
- Roofs are typically of moderate to steeper pitch with flat concrete tile (or equal) roof and exaggerated boxed eaves.
- Roof forms are typically hip or gable with dominant forward facing gables.
- Front facade is typically one solid material which may include stucco, brick, or horizontal siding.
- The front entry is typically sheltered within a front porch with traditionally detailed columns and railings.
- A curved or round-top accent window is commonly used on the front elevation.
- Windows are typically fully trimmed with flanking louvered shutters.
- Gable ends are typically detailed by full or partial cornice, sometimes emphasized with dentils or decorative molding.
- Decorative or pedimented head and sill trim on windows is typical.
LANDSCAPE DESIGN GUIDELINES
GUIDING LANDSCAPE DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Sustainable Landscape Design

Through thoughtful, sensitive design, Folsom Ranch, Central District can be designated to conserve valuable resources and create a noteworthy community within the City of Folsom. Sustainable landscape design links natural and built systems to achieve balanced environmental, social, and economic outcomes and improves quality of life, and the long-term health of communities and the environment. Sustainable landscape balances the needs of people and the environment to benefit both. Landscape Architects are encouraged to research alternative possibilities and incorporate them into the Model Home and community common area landscape design. The following is a list of various 'sustainable' features and practices to be used and/or considered for the Folsom Ranch, Central District Development at the improvement plan phase/level.

- To comply with AB 1881, Model Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance and conserve water, incorporate a water management system utilizing up-to-date best management practices that allows groundwater to recharge.
- Encourage the use of low toxic wood preservatives (no CCA), or naturally rot-resistant wood for landscaping (no pressure-treated wood in or on the ground.)
- Choose low water, drought tolerant, and/or native plants that match the micro climate, and soil conditions. (Refer to Plant Matrix herein)
- Select plants that are “non-invasive” according to the current California Invasive Plant Inventory, published by the California Invasive Plant Council.
• Design landscape and plant spacing to allow for plants to reach mature size. Using appropriate sizes and the thoughtful placing of plants prevents overgrowth and future thinning, reducing the amount of material sent to the landfill.

• Locate plants to ensure proper drainage and to reduce potential damage to buildings.

• Reuse soils from the site, if appropriate, as horticultural soils.

• Maintain and/or improve soil health through responsible management including nurturing soil with organic matter, reducing synthetic fertilizer use, and restoration to sustain protected and future ecosystems.

• Use integrated pest management to control or eliminate pesticide and toxic chemical use.

• Create and/or maintain wildlife habitat.

• Increase tree cover to provide shade in developed areas to reduce energy demand, mitigate solar heat gain into buildings, and to reduce the amount of heat absorbed by paved areas.

• Plant deciduous trees on the south side of buildings to allow for increased solar heat gain in winter months (thereby reducing energy needed for heating interiors) and shading in summer months (thereby reducing energy needed for cooling interiors).

• Minimize the use of large turf areas (except within parks, parkways (as permitted by AB1881 Water Use Analysis), or single family residential front yards) or inefficient small turf areas (those under 8'-0” in width) in landscaping by incorporating water-conserving groundcovers or perennial grasses, shrubs, and trees.

• Utilize weather and climate-smart irrigation controllers.

• Design irrigation zones to suit plant requirements and incorporate high-efficiency nozzles.

• Use sustainable materials in landscape construction and site furnishing selections including, but not limited to, recycled materials, environmentally preferable/responsible products, materials that can be recycled, certified “green” products, and locally available or locally manufactured products.

• Use nitrogen-fixing plants to reduce fertilizer use.

• Create natural looking design to reduce maintenance required.

• Water conservation (xeriscape, rain gardens, grouping plants with similar requirements).

• Control water runoff (bioswales, rain gardens, green roofs).

• Preserving Oak Woodlands and isolated Oak Trees. Refer to the Landscape Master Community Plant Matrix section.
COMMUNITY DESIGN THEME/ LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

Landscaping plays an important role in establishing the visual identity and character of the Folsom Ranch, Central District Community. Consistency in theme and the application of major community-level design elements, such as enhanced entry with dynamic monumentation, upgraded hardscape and master landscape, arterial street parkways, thoughtful specifications of walls, fences and pilasters, adjacent community interface with improved edge conditions, and site-specific plant materials, is designed to be maintained throughout the Folsom Ranch, Central District development to communicate and enhance the community’s identity.

Folsom Ranch, Central District embraces the California Heritage theme. Careful thought has been given to integrate the structural and aesthetic elements of a balanced, cohesive community. To ensure that these design guidelines are implemented in a manner that will provide a sense of the City of Folsom’s character and ambiance, a central theme of California Heritage has been developed. This theme is appropriate to the community’s locale, and will tie the community together while enabling neighborhoods and mixed-use areas to further develop their individual character through their own unique elements.

Several identifying design and landscape elements will be incorporated throughout the community and will generally include:

- Timeless stone, steel, boulders, stucco, and heavy wood beams incorporated into monumentation, way-finding, and accessory structures.
- Natural landscaped areas blended with manicured landscaping.
• Low water, drought-tolerant and native tree and shrub materials, such as California Sycamores, Oaks, and Pine trees. In addition, plants rated low and very low water use per the WUCOLS rating system shall be used.

• Natural materials such as stone, wood, and boulders, complemented by an earth-tone color palette.

• Varied paving materials, including stone, concrete, wood, decomposed granite, and concrete pavers.

Folsom Ranch, Central District is a planned community that is inspired by the unique character of the City of Folsom and enhances its distinct identity. Like California itself, the design intent and architecture is an eclectic and colorful mix of various influences from across the United States. This community offers its residents an environment in which pedestrian connectivity, recreational activity, and social interaction are fostered. The residential neighborhoods within Folsom Ranch, Central District focus on these aspects by providing generous landscape setbacks, residences oriented to the street, widened pathways/trails, public gathering areas, and several community parks with recreational amenities.

Thematic elements are major project improvements that occur at the community or neighborhood level, and assist in establishing the overall design theme for the Folsom Ranch, Central District community. These major thematic elements will be reinforced within the following:

• Monotation/ Signage
• Streetscape Landscape
• Enhanced Masonry Vertical Elements
• Enhanced Hardscape
• Enhanced Community Edge Conditions
• Open Space, Parks and Recreation Facilities
• Lighting/ Street Furniture Family

• Walls and Fences
• Landscaping/ Plant Palette

These thematic elements will commonly occur throughout the community and will unite Folsom Ranch, Central District under a common design vocabulary. General design guidelines and design criteria for the community theme elements are contained in the sections that follow.
WALL AND FENCE GUIDELINES

Maintaining quality and character of all aspects of the public realm is a key placemaking principle. The wall and fence design criteria is intended to provide variety and privacy for each lot while providing continuity and unity within the community.

Walls and fencing will be used throughout the community to complement the overall design theme, establish community identity, provide protection from roadway and other noise, and allow privacy and security in residential areas. The use of walls and fences can also serve to accentuate neighborhood features in addition to screening streets and adjacent uses.

The following types of walls (solid and opaque) and fences (open and largely transparent) have been selected for possible use within different areas of the project site. All wall and fence heights are measured from the highest grade elevation on either side of the wall or fence. An overall community wall program is provided to help unify and reinforce community character.

For wall heights exceeding those outlined herein based on Sound Attenuation requirements refer to the Mangini Ranch Residential Development Environmental Noise Assessment document prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. on January 29, 2015.

- Decorative walls and/or screen walls shall be integrated with the architecture of community building, as well as the overall landscape design.
- All community theme walls and fences shall be consistent in design.
- For most products, the community wall will be colored split face block with an enhanced brick cap.
- Pilasters will be stacked stone veneered with an enhanced brick cap. Pilasters will occur at changes in wall direction or change in materials visible to the public realm and as outlined on page 3-26.
- Higher-end estate product wall adjoining a public street or any wall publicly visible or adjacent to the public realm shall be slump face block, slurry coat and painted, with a decorative brick cap.
- Interior/ side yard or any wall not visible to the public realm shall be precision block with precision cap, or wood fencing based on builder’s preference and product price point. Block color to match slump slurry wall paint color.
- View fencing of full height tubular steel and/or a low wall or concrete mowcurb with tubular steel combination may be used. Pilasters may be incorporated into steel fencing.
- Vines and/or shrubs should be planted along community walls to soften the visual character. An extensive use of vines is encouraged.
- The maximum wall or fence height shall be six (6) feet within any required rear, or side setback area, and along the project perimeter unless a need for an 8’-0” high wall or higher is determined necessary to act as a sound wall and approved by the City. Wall/fence heights are measured from the base of the wall/fence to the top of the interior or exterior side, always providing a minimum six (6) feet barrier from either side. The maximum height of any wall should not exceed ten (10) feet (when in combination with a retaining wall) without a variance.
- Combination retaining wall and privacy walls at block ends may be used.
- Rear yard fencing adjacent to park areas or open space edges where residential pad is
• For residential side yard gates, vinyl gates are encouraged, color to match or complement adjacent wall/architecture.

• Gates should be provided in walls or fences to allow emergency access and to facilitate convenient pedestrian access to activity areas and adjacent uses.

• Walls should be eliminated or sited to provide additional setbacks areas at project entries to accommodate distinctive landscaping, ornamental gateways, signage and street furniture.

• Walls should be curved or angled at corner locations along street frontages to preserve sight lines.

• Be mindful of sight lines when laying out lots and perimeter walls.

elevated above park/open space shall be view fencing, where applicable, considering grade differentials, etc.

• Where appropriate, view fencing may be less than 6’ high to provide an enhanced view shed. In cases where pools or spas are located in rear yards, a minimum 5’-6” high perimeter fence is required. Continuous view fencing or block walls shall have pilasters located at corners, at change in wall/fencing materials, and significant redirections in the fence line.

• Wall sections greater than 50 feet in length should incorporate at least two of the following design features which are proportionate to the wall length:
  – A minimum 2 feet change in plane for at least 2 feet.
  – A minimum 18-inch change in height for at least 10 feet.
  – Use of pilasters at 50 feet maximum intervals and at changes in wall planes.
  – A minimum 4 feet high view fencing section for at least 10 feet.

• Solid walls or wood fencing shall be used for property line fencing and gate returns between housing lots and those areas in public view. Fence return located on the garage side of each home shall include a three foot (3’) wide minimum gate.

• All retaining walls, courtyard walls, gates and fences shall be compatible with the architecture of each neighborhood/village.

• Visible precision block walls or wood fencing is prohibited from the public realm.

• Walls shall be setback a minimum of 5 feet from all public sidewalks. Where feasible a 10 feet setback is preferred.
The following photos should not be construed as the exact wall and fence height, color and material, but should be used as preferred examples. The sketches and graphic representations contained within these Design Guidelines are for conceptual purposes and are provided as visual aids in understanding the basic intent of the Guidelines and to present examples of their potential implementation. The block/color specification can be substituted with a different manufacturer as long as colors and textures match.

**Community Wall and Pilaster**

**Pilaster:** Precision column block with stone veneer and brick cap

**Wall:** Split face block with brick cap

**Block Color:** Sandstone available through Angelus Block - 6x6x16

**Brick:** Jumbo Alamo Blend ‘A’ - available through Belden Brick

**Grout:** Light Khaki - available through Orco Blended Products

**Stone:** TNS Coso Junction Thin Veneer-available through Thompson Bldg.

**Grout-CBP Light Smoke #145**

**High End Product - Community Wall and Pilaster**

**Pilaster:** Precision column block with stone veneer and brick cap

**Wall:** Slump column block with slurry coat, paint, and brick cap

**Block Color:** Auburn available through Angelus Block - Slump 6x6x16 - Super Slump

**Slurry Coat/Sack:** Sherwin Williams SW7513w Sanderling (La Habra Color Coat Match x-B1072)

**Brick:** Jumbo Alamo Blend ‘A’ - available through Belden Brick

**Grout:** Light Khaki - available through Orco Blended Products

**Stone:** TNS Coso Junction Thin Veneer-available through Thompson Bldg.

**Grout-CBP Light Smoke #145**
Community Prefabricated Tubular Steel Fence
Color: Sherwin Williams SW7020 Black Fox, Powdercoated
**Precision Block Wall Option at Side Yard Conditions**

(No Precision Block Wall shall be visible/exposed to the public realm.)

**Color:** Harvest, available through Angelus Block

---

**Wood Fence Option at Side Yard Conditions**

(No Wood Fence shall be visible/exposed to the public realm)

**Color:** Mission Brown Cabot Semi-solid Stain or equivalent
Planning Commission Staff Report
50 Natoma Street, Council Chambers
Folsom, CA 95630

Project: Targeted Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Housing Study – Results and Recommendations

File #: SPEC22-00178

Request: Review and Comment

Location: East Bidwell Corridor, Glenn and Iron Point light rail stations and Folsom Plan Area

Parcel(s): N/A

Staff Contact: Desmond Parrington, AICP, Principal Planner, 916-461-6233 dparrington@folsom.ca.us

Recommendation: Staff is seeking input on recommendations described in this staff report resulting from the analysis in the Targeted Mixed-Use and Multi-Family Housing Study. Please review the recommendations presented in the summary below and accompanying memo from Opticos and provide input to staff to be shared with the City Council later this month.

Project Summary: The 2035 General Plan and the recently adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element focus Folsom’s future growth along the East Bidwell Corridor, areas around two of the three light rail stations, and the Folsom Plan Area, south of Highway 50. Furthermore, the housing element identified Folsom’s share of the region’s housing need allocation (RHNA) over the next 8.5-year planning period. The City must provide for the development of 6,383 housing units, of which 3,567 units must be developed as affordable to very low-income and low-income households. A core assumption of the state’s RHNA requirements is that the higher the allowed density in zoning for the land, the more likely it is to accommodate affordable housing. Thus, per state law, the lower income categories (very low- and low-income) can only be accommodated on sites zoned for higher densities (allowing at least 30 dwelling units per acre). While the 2021-2029 Housing Element identified sufficient sites in the sites inventory to accommodate the current RHNA and provided a buffer of 400 units, once several of these sites develop with housing that is not affordable to low-income households or at lower densities below 30 du/ac, the City will likely be required to identify and rezone additional sites outside of the targeted areas. Based on current development trends, the City will likely need to rezone additional sites or identify new strategies within a year in order to maintain sufficient RHNA capacity.
To identify opportunities of increasing development (RHNA) capacity, while at the same time creating housing that is attractive, well-designed and benefits these areas, the City used grant funds to hire Opticos Design, an architecture and urban planning firm with experience advising cities on housing design and development standards. Opticos evaluated the City’s current standards including density, height, setbacks, parking standards, and design guidelines and they also evaluated the economic feasibility of projects using these standards. What they found, as described in Attachment 2, is that the City’s current development standards in these areas either prevent development altogether or promote poorly designed development and do not encourage the development of more affordably priced housing.

Based on Opticos’ analysis, as well as staff’s evaluation of how other communities, including Roseville and El Dorado Hills, have addressed similar challenges, staff developed recommendations that focus on form, size, scale, height, and design rather than on density and setbacks as follows:

1. A modest increase in density to 35 or 40 du/ac in these target areas.
2. An alternative approach using floor area ratio (FAR) that focuses on form, design, and activation of ground floors for projects that wish to exceed the allocated density.
3. Moderate increases in heights in these areas consistent with community input from the prior workshops and survey.
4. Parking reductions down to around 1 space per unit if viable alternative transportation or parking options are provided.
5. Using build-to lines instead of setbacks to ensure that development goes in the right location, activates the street, and supports pedestrian activity.
6. Development of objective design standards that promote quality design and building form.
7. Increase the number of allowed housing units in the Folsom Plan Area and rezone additional sites for multi-family housing development subject to the availability of adequate infrastructure and water supplies.

Attachment 1 provides additional details on the factors behind the analysis, while Attachment 2 provides Opticos’ recommendations. After receiving input from the Planning Commission, Planning staff will present the recommendations along with the Commission’s input to the City Council on July 26 to get specific direction on the final recommendation. Council direction will enable staff and its consultants to start the detailed technical and environmental analyses necessary for any future amendments to the General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the information will also be incorporated into the current Zoning Code Update. Please note that this report was not presented to the Historic District Commission since none of the target areas are located within the boundaries of the Historic District.
Planning Commission
Targeted Multi-family and Mixed-use Housing Study- Results and Recommendations
July 20, 2022

Submitted,

[Signature]

PAM JOHNS
Community Development Director
Folsom has continued to grow and is growing faster than the rest of Sacramento County. In addition, housing rents and sales prices are rising faster here than in other communities. The City must plan for that growth and make sure that growth occurs in key areas of Folsom where it will have the most benefit, but also have the least impact in existing areas, especially established residential areas. In the City’s 2035 General Plan, new growth is focused in the Folsom Plan Area, the East Bidwell Corridor, and the areas around the City’s light rail stations particularly the Glenn/Bob Holderness Station and the Iron Point Station.

In August 2021, the City Council adopted the 2021-2029 Housing Element. This state-mandated part of the General Plan serves as the plan to accommodate current housing needs and future growth. It also includes a plan to encourage a variety of different housing types and ensure that there is sufficient land with the correct zoning for the development of housing units affordable to those with lower incomes (e.g., sites zoned to allow up to 30 dwelling units per acre or more).

As a result of the housing crisis in California, the state has passed numerous new laws changing the rules for housing development over the past few years. One of the biggest changes has been how cities and counties plan for sites to accommodate future housing growth, particularly sites for affordable housing. Under state law, if a city or county includes a site in its housing element sites inventory that is zoned for a density of 30 du/ac or more and that site is developed with market-rate housing, then the jurisdiction must identify another site with zoning that allows 30 du/ac or more. As part of the housing element requirements, the jurisdiction must maintain a housing sites inventory sufficient to accommodate the projected housing growth at all times including sites for housing affordable to lower-income households. If any of those sites identified for affordable housing are developed with market-rate housing, then the jurisdiction must identify additional sites and rezone those sites for housing at 30 du/ac or more within 6 months so that it can accommodate its future affordable housing obligations. This is called the “no net loss” provision.

On July 28, 2020, City Planning staff, in conjunction with its housing element consultant, Ascent Environmental, explained to the Council that the City’s share of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is 6,383 housing units, which must be planned for over the 2021 to 2029 period. Of the 6,383 housing units, approximately 56 percent of those units must be affordable to households with lower incomes (e.g., $81,050 or less for a 4-person household). The type of housing that is affordable at those income level is typically apartments.

Though Folsom has a larger proportion of households with children compared to the rest of Sacramento County, it has a growing population of persons aged 65 or older – similar to that of the County. As people age, they often need smaller housing units that are easier
to maintain and closer to services. Folsom currently has fewer housing options for those looking to transition out of a larger single-family home. Similarly, as children age and become young adults, there are few affordable housing options here available to them. In addition, while Folsom has almost six million square feet of retail shopping space and has a healthy retail environment compared with other areas in the region, the City does not have as many housing options to address the needs of these workers as other cities in this region. As a result, many workers commute into Folsom, which worsens traffic congestion and parking.

While the City has identified sufficient sites for future housing growth, including sites for affordable development, given current development trends here it is anticipated that within a year the City may need to rezone additional sites, particularly to meet the lower income housing needs. This is because of the state’s “no net loss” requirements discussed earlier in this report.

As a result of the ongoing growth, state law changes, and the increasing cost of housing in Folsom, the community faces a challenge. That challenge is not just where to direct this growth, but more importantly ensuring that new housing growth enhances the areas where it is located and minimizes the negative effects of growth (e.g., traffic, noise, greenhouse gas emissions). Future growth should also provide a variety housing types and prices or rents that meet the needs of all income levels. As part of the City Council presentation on July 28, 2020, the Council was asked the following three questions as staff worked to ensure that the City would continue to have enough capacity for future housing growth:

1. Would Council support increasing densities in several key locations?
2. Would Council support increasing the Folsom Plan Area maximum unit count to accommodate an increase in multi-family housing?
3. Would the Council support adding an inclusionary requirement for rental housing?

Overall, the Council supported the concept of increasing density in key locations and increasing the maximum housing unit count in the Folsom Plan Area if analysis supports it but did not support expanding the inclusionary requirement. Based on this information, City staff and the Opticos team reviewed the existing density limit and development standards for those areas. The conclusion was that the density and existing standards prevent development of smaller sites (e.g., sites less than 3 acres), favored fewer and larger unit that were less affordable, and if development did occur it would result in poorly designed development that would detract from the area. The existing regulations also limit the capacity for growth in these areas, which means the housing element sites inventory could fall below what is required. In that situation, the City could have to identify additional sites closer to established neighborhoods and rezone those to higher density.
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As part of the review, Opticos evaluated how the City’s existing development standards impacted design and building form and how these standards affected the economics of projects. Based on their review and analysis, Opticos made the following recommendations:

- Encourage attractive design and appropriate building form using FAR instead of density along with objective design standards and appropriate height limits.
- Foster pedestrian activity and reduce reliance on automobiles for trips.
- Improve development economics for these type of projects by considering changes to development standards including density and parking.
- Promote development that provides a greater number of units and smaller units to encourage affordability.

In addition, City staff evaluated the distribution of existing and planned affordable housing sites throughout Folsom and looked at opportunities for additional affordable housing locations in the Folsom Plan Area south of Highway 50. City staff also looked at recent successful local projects in Roseville and El Dorado Hills as well as approaches used in these communities and in other wealthy communities such as San Rafael and Santa Barbara. Those communities have made changes to focus more on building form, design, and height in innovative ways to encourage attractive and affordable housing options. The result of staff and Opticos’ work is the following:

1) Focus on building form not just density.
2) While higher densities are needed for economic feasibility, just increasing density alone will not result in either attractive development or affordable development (refer to the discussion on p. 26 of Attachment 2).
3) A combination of using FAR standards along with objective design standards, build-to lines, and parking reductions are more likely to result in attractive and appropriate development in these areas as shown in the renderings in Attachment 2.
   a. FAR levels considered ranged from the current 1.5 FAR in the East Bidwell Corridor to between 2.0 and 4.0 FAR in the Glenn and Iron Point Station areas and at the Folsom Town Center along the Alder Creek Parkway transit corridor.
4) The specific target area recommendations can be found in Attachment 2 beginning on p. 23.

For the Folsom Plan Area, Opticos provided specific recommendations on design and form for the Town Center and staff also looked additional opportunities for higher-density affordable housing development including sites within the Town Center and other sites including potential sites in the northwest corner of the area along Prairie City Road and in the northeast area near the planned Empire Ranch Interchange at Highway 50. These sites have the potential to accommodate several hundred higher-density and potentially affordable housing units. All of this is conditioned upon the outcome of technical and environmental studies to determine whether there is sufficient
infrastructure and water resources to support this additional development.

With recent attractive higher-density projects ranging from 50 to 75 du/ac in the communities of Roseville and El Dorado Hills, Folsom has the potential to accommodate additional development in its target areas to expand its housing sites inventory without having to rezone land outside of these areas. While new development brings with it more people and more traffic, putting development in these target areas where residents will be closer to jobs, services, shopping, and transit will reduce the likelihood that cars will be needed for all trips. Furthermore, it will improve the pedestrian environment in these areas compared to the traffic that would be generated if this development happened elsewhere in Folsom.

Community Outreach: Planning staff conducted two virtual community workshops on April 21 and June 9, 2022 to solicit input from residents, businesses, developers, homeowner’s associations, renters, architects, and housing advocates on these issues. In addition, an online survey on the City’s housing study website (www.folsom.ca.us/housingstudy) was conducted between Monday, April 25 and Friday, May 13, 2022. The City received 343 responses to the survey. While many longtime Folsom homeowners completed the survey, the City also received responses from renters, younger people, and newer Folsom residents. Overall, younger respondents and those that were renters tended to favor slightly taller and larger development projects (4 to 6-story heights and medium to larger scale), while older residents and longtime homeowners favored shorter and smaller development projects (3-story heights and small to medium scale).

With all the workshops, including this workshop, as well as with the survey, staff sent emails with information about these events to over 500 persons consisting of residents, businesses, homeowners’ associations, community and religious groups, developers, preservationists, etc. In addition to email, staff also put out information about the workshops in the City’s weekly electronic newsletter and used social media to alert the public about these workshops and the survey.

Next Steps and Schedule: Based on input from the Commission, staff recommendations, along with the Commission’s input will be presented to the City Council for direction. To complete this process, staff needs direction from the City Council on design, form, density, scale, height, parking, and development standards. Once we have that direction, staff and its consultant team can begin the technical and environmental studies necessary for any future amendments to the General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. This information will also be incorporated into the Zoning Code update that is currently underway. It is anticipated that these detailed studies will take between 6 to 12 months to complete at which time staff will return to
the Commission and Council for action.

POLICY/RULE
The City’s 2021-2029 Housing Element was approved by the City Council in August 2021. That document includes several policies that relate directly to the issues discussed in this staff report. These include:

- **Policy H-1.1 Sufficient Land for Housing**: The City shall ensure that sufficient land is designated and zoned in a range of residential densities to accommodate the City’s regional share of housing.

- **Policy H-1.2 Location of Higher-Density Housing Sites**: The City shall endeavor to designate future sites for higher-density housing near transit stops, commercial services, employment centers, and schools, where appropriate and feasible.

- **Policy H-1.3 Multi-family Housing Densities**: The City shall encourage home builders to develop their projects on multi-family-designated land at the high end of the applicable density range.

- **Policy H-1.4 Lower-Income Housing Replacement Sites**: The City shall mitigate the loss of lower-income housing sites within the Folsom Plan Area by securing voluntary agreements with the landowners to find replacement sites as market-rate housing is developed on sites identified in the lower-income sites inventory.

- **Policy H-2.5 Objective Standards**: The City shall endeavor through its development and design standards and decision making to provide consistent and predictable policy direction based on objective standards for multi-family residential project applicants.

- **Policy H-3.2 Inclusionary Housing**: The City shall continue to require inclusionary housing on all new for-sale units. The City may also consider inclusionary housing as a community benefit for non-City-initiated General Plan and/or Specific Plan amendments that result in rental housing.

- **Policy H-3.6 Density Bonus**: The City shall continue to make density bonuses available to affordable and senior housing projects, consistent with State law and Title 17 of the Folsom Municipal Code.

- **Policy H-6.3 Balance of Housing Types**: The City shall encourage residential projects affordable to a mix of household incomes and disperse affordable housing projects throughout the city, including the Folsom Plan Area, to achieve a balance of housing in all neighborhoods and communities.
In addition, housing element program H-2 commits the City to increasing opportunities for the development of high-density housing development. Specifically, it states:

- **Implementation Program H-2  Create Additional Lower-Income Housing Capacity:** The City shall create additional opportunities for high-density housing to ensure the City maintains adequate capacity to meet the lower-income RHNA throughout the planning period. The City shall increase maximum allowable densities in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay, SACOG Transit Priority Areas outside the Historic District, and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Town Center. In implementing this program, the City shall strive to disperse affordable housing opportunities and avoid fair housing issues related to overconcentration. The City shall coordinate with property owners along the East Bidwell Street corridor and within the Transit Priority Areas to identify and pursue residential development opportunities. The City shall review and revise Policy 4.7 of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan to increase the total number of dwelling units allowed in the Plan Area to satisfy the RHNA, as long as infrastructure needs are met. In addition, the City shall coordinate with property owners in the Folsom Plan Area to mitigate for the loss of lower-income housing sites to market-rate housing.
  
  o **Timeframe:** Increase maximum allowable densities by 2022; reach out to property owners at least annually.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**
The review and input by the Planning Commission is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the California Public Resources Code as there is no possibility that the workshop will have a significant effect on the environment. Once direction is provided by the City Council on design, density and development standards, the City will undertake an environmental analysis in compliance with CEQA to determine whether the changes, including amendments to the General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, would have a significant effect on the environment.

**RECOMMENDATION/PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**
Review and comment. Please review the recommendations presented in the staff report and accompanying memo from Opticos and provide input to staff to be shared with the City Council later this month.
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Folsom needs to provide more housing opportunities.

The State of California has identified the number of housing units that Folsom needs to provide through its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), and Folsom needs to plan for that growth. As a result, it is imperative that Folsom change the status quo in order to create additional opportunities for housing. This challenge raises a series of questions:

■ Where should additional housing opportunities be located?
■ What kind of housing should be built?
■ How should these additional housing opportunities be enabled?

Folsom needs an approach that can target particular locations that are best suited to accommodate additional housing and can incorporate community input on the form and scale of the new development in a way that makes the development financially feasible.

In setting the parameters for this study, the City has identified targeted study areas that are well-suited for additional housing. Within these targeted study areas, this memo addresses the remaining two questions, using community input and financial feasibility analysis to identify the preferred form and scale of new development at those locations (see Section 2, Opportunity Site Testing), and issuing recommendations for changes to existing development standards to enable this additional housing (see Section 3, Recommendations).
Key Issues

These issues convey the urgency of providing new housing in Folsom and barriers to meeting this need.

1. High housing demand with limited housing stock results in unaffordability for children of longtime residents, seniors who want to downsize or who don’t drive as often, and people who work in Folsom.

2. Folsom’s housing supply doesn’t provide enough options for diverse lifestyles, including for residents who want to live a compact, walkable and transit-oriented lifestyle.

3. One of the barriers to the production of diverse housing options is regulatory standards that end up making a site infeasible to develop as housing or that result in unattractive development.
Targeted Study Areas

This study provides recommendations for three targeted study areas within Folsom.

This project provides recommendations for changes to development standards, General Plan policies, and zoning regulations in targeted areas that can help to support infill housing in Folsom. Recommendations will be tailored to three general areas, which have been identified by the City as best suited to accommodate new housing.

- **The East Bidwell Mixed-Use Overlay Zone** along the East Bidwell corridor. With existing retail and service uses along this corridor, new infill housing would create a mixed-use environment where residents could have easy access to services, shopping, and jobs within walking distance of their homes. This new infill housing would also benefit from the planned improvements to the East Bidwell right-of-way.

- **The Folsom Boulevard TOD study area** along Folsom Boulevard. This area encompasses two light rail stations, Glenn Station and Iron Point, as well as the Folsom Parkway Rail Trail. As a result, housing in this location would have easy access to transit and bicycle infrastructure and offer built-in mobility alternatives for people interested in a less car-dependent lifestyle.

- **The New Town Center in the Folsom Plan Area** south of US-50. Planned through a Specific Plan process that included community engagement, this location is slated for new mixed-use and multi-family development that will create housing opportunities at a new node of retail, service, and public space.

*Note that the Historic District light rail station is excluded from this study.*
Opportunity site testing analyzes the housing capacity of actual sites on the ground. This study tested hypothetical buildout concepts on a site in each of the three targeted study areas where the City envisions opportunities for more housing.

The potential buildout scenarios were informed by community feedback about preferred building form, building scale, and key design elements received at a public workshop and through an online survey.

After beginning with the community’s desired vision, these hypothetical buildout concepts were then subject to multiple iterations of financial feasibility analysis in order to understand what conditions are necessary to make these projects feasible at these locations and arrive at a prototype in the realm of financial viability.

Because the sample designs plan for long-term value and livability, they may not always reach the theoretical maximum capacity of a site. However, they are representative of a desirable development approach that creates a place where people want to live.
Site 1
Snowline Hospice Thrift Store

Overview

Address
616 E. Bidwell St.

Targeted study area
East Bidwell Mixed-Use Overlay Zone

Current site condition
Single-story retail building

Site dimensions
170 ft wide x 350 ft deep

Existing Conditions
This is a deep lot bounded by East Bidwell Street in the front and an alley in the rear. It is surrounded on both sides by multi-tenant retail centers. Multi-family residential buildings are located directly behind the site across the rear alley. There is one single-story retail building onsite containing the Snowline Hospice Thrift Store.

What We Heard From The Community
Community members expressed that a height of three to four stories felt about right for this location. There was also some support for taller development on corner sites, such as up to five stories.

Given the scale and character of the East Bidwell corridor, it was also important to the community to explore ways to make the buildings look and feel smaller, with small to medium width and bulk.

Vision
The design concept for this site includes two courtyard buildings. One courtyard building, in the center of the rendering on the next page, faces East Bidwell. The second courtyard building is located in the rear half of the lot. The second courtyard building is nearly identical to the first, but is rotated ninety degrees to face a new pedestrian passage along the side lot line, visible on the left side of the rendering.

Parking for this project would be located behind these buildings in both surface parking lots and tuck-under spaces at the ground floor of the building.

Common open space in the form of courtyards would be accessed directly from the sidewalk. Additional open space would take the form of the tree-lined pedestrian passage pictured on the left of the rendering, which leads from East Bidwell Street to the rear courtyard and finally to the alley at the rear of the site.
Design Concept + Site Testing Outcome

Left: View looking across East Bidwell Street towards the opportunity site.

Below: Rendering depicting the design vision for this site looking across East Bidwell Street towards the opportunity site. Note that this rendering is illustrative only. It represents hypothetical build-outs used to calculate potential new housing and does not represent an actual development proposal.

### Site Test Assumptions + Yields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Units (du)</th>
<th>82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg type</td>
<td>Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (stories)</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg width (ft)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg depth (ft)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (du/ac)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (sp/du)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking type</td>
<td>Surface + tuck-under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front setback (ft)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width (ft)</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth (ft)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (ac)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above: Conceptual site plan. Arrow indicates vantage point for perspective rendering.
Architectural Style

The two renderings below illustrate how the design vision for this site could be expressed in two different architectural styles.

The top image represents a contemporary architectural style, while the bottom image represents a more traditional architectural style. Both images depict the same building types, building configurations, building scale, and building program. The difference is in the exterior architectural expression which conveys the building in a particular style.

If there are certain locations where particular architectural styles are important to the community, the City can consider opportunities to incorporate architectural style standards into future design standards for those areas.
Key Design Elements

Regardless of architectural style, there are aspects of the two example designs that accomplish the same design goals through key design elements. These design elements can be considered and regulated independent of architectural style and are important for ensuring that development will make positive contributions to the public realm.

Design Elements

- **Open space** creates a buffer between the public realm and individual unit entries and provides an amenity for residents.
- **Pedestrian entries** to individual units and to shared stairwells open directly onto the courtyard and onto the pedestrian passage.
- **Shopfront frontages** oriented towards East Bidwell Street could provide amenities to residents or could provide leasable service or retail space.
- **Upper story is located within the roof form** to reduce the perceived height of the building.
- **Building height steps down** from four stories in the rear down to three stories in the wings that project towards the street to reduce the perceived scale.

Key Regulatory Barriers

- **Parking standards.** Currently, the site requires 1.5 spaces per unit. The design concept tested for this opportunity site provides 1.0 spaces per unit.
- **Density.** The prototype tested 59 du/acre for feasibility, exceeding the current maximum of 30 du/acre.
Site 2
Glenn Station Park-and-Ride Lot

Overview

Existing Conditions
This site is adjacent to Glenn Station, a stop on the Gold Line of the Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT) light rail that connects Folsom to downtown Sacramento. The light rail runs along the western edge of the site, as does the Folsom Parkway Rail Trail. The site is used as a park-and-ride surface parking lot for people using the light rail.

What We Heard From The Community
The community expressed support for more intense development at this location given its adjacency to a light rail station. In general, we heard that five stories felt about right for this location. Community members were also open to buildings that felt and looked large in width and bulk.

The community also expressed interest in exploring additional design guidelines for this location in order to make larger buildings attractive and also transition in scale to adjacent lower-scale development. It is also important to the community and to SacRT to accommodate parking for the light rail users, whether onsite or on an adjacent parcel, when this site is redeveloped.

Vision
The design concept for this site includes one four-story building and two five-story podium buildings. These are arranged to create a common open space at the entrance to the station and a public pedestrian paseo leading through the site from the station to a potential parking lot across Coolidge Drive. These three buildings accommodate 305 units and 1,500 square feet of commercial space. The commercial space could be used for an amenity that serves residents, such as a day care.

Address
1025 Glenn Dr.

Targeted study area
Folsom Boulevard TOD study area

Current site condition
Park-and-ride parking lot serving light rail station

Site dimensions
315 ft wide x 370 ft deep
Design Concept + Site Testing Outcome

Left: View looking from the station pavilion east across the parking lot at the existing opportunity site.

Below: Rendering depicting the design vision for this site looking from the station pavilion east across the parking lot. The rail line is behind the vantage point. Note that this rendering is illustrative only. It represents hypothetical build-outs used to calculate potential new housing and does not represent an actual development proposal.

Above: Conceptual site plan. Arrow indicates vantage point for perspective rendering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Test Assumptions + Yields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Units (du)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (stories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg width (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg depth (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (du/ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (sp/du)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front setback (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (ac)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Design Elements

Design Elements

- **Open space** in the form of a green or plaza provides a gathering space at the station entrance, and a public pedestrian paseo leads through the site towards public parking across the street.

- **Pedestrian entries** to individual units and to shared stairwells open directly onto public space.

- **Corner element** near the entrance to the station anchors the public open space.

- **Shopfront frontage** facing public open space could provide amenities to residents or could provide leasable service or retail space.

- **Upper story is located within the roof form** to reduce the perceived height of the building.

- **Massing breaks down perceived bulk** by designing recesses in the wall plane and variations on style and material so that one large building actually reads as several smaller buildings.

- **Upper story stepback** with the top story set back 10 feet behind the facade plane to reduce perceived height from the pedestrian paseo.
Key Regulatory Barriers

In testing development standards for this site, the following standards were found to be key barriers to development that both satisfied the community’s preferred form and scale and also demonstrated financial feasibility.

**Building height.** Currently, this site allows building height up to 4 stories. The design concept depicted for this opportunity site shows buildings that could range from 4 stories to 5 stories in different areas of the site.

**Setbacks.** Currently, the site requires a 20 ft minimum front setback and a 15 ft minimum side street setback. The design concept depicted for this site shows 10 ft front and side street setbacks.

**Parking standards.** Currently, the site requires 1.5 to 2.5 spaces per unit, depending on unit size. The design concept depicted for this opportunity site provides 1.1 spaces per unit.

**Density.** Currently this site allows up to 30 du/acre. The design concept depicted for this site shows 112 du/acre.
Site 3
Block in New Town Center

Overview

**Address**
One hypothetical block within the New Town Center

**Study area**
Folsom Plan Area New Town Center

**Current site condition**
Undeveloped land

**Site dimensions**
380 ft wide x 620 ft deep

**Existing Conditions**
This site is currently undeveloped land in the Folsom Plan Area. Development is completed or underway for neighborhoods in other parts of the Folsom Plan Area, but the New Town Center is unbuilt. It is anticipated that this site will be made available for development in the near future.

**What We Heard From The Community**
In the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, this site was envisioned as a walkable, mixed-use town core for the Folsom Plan Area.

The community reiterated these desires in outreach for the present study and also expressed preference for a mix of scales, three stories up to six stories in height and medium in bulk, and making sure to transition in scale from a higher intensity at the town center’s core to a lower intensity at the edges where it interfaces with surrounding residential neighborhoods.

**Vision**
The New Town Center envisioned in the Specific Plan is composed of a series of medium to large-scale mixed-use buildings oriented around a public plaza or square.

The hypothetical block that was tested as part of the feasibility analysis for this study included mixed-use podium buildings up to six stories in height, multi-family corridor apartment buildings, and smaller surface-parked multi-family buildings.
Design Concept + Site Testing Outcome

Below and left: Renderings from the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan depicting design concepts for the New Town Center area. Note that these renderings are illustrative only. They represent hypothetical build-outs and do not represent an actual development proposal.

Above: Conceptual site plan developed for site testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Test Assumptions + Yields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Units (du)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail area (sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (stories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg width (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg depth (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (du/ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (sp/du)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front setback (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (ac)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Design Elements

- **Architectural projections** like balconies, awnings, and eaves create focal points of visual interest.
- **Corner elements** like facade expression that wraps around corners.
- **Massing breaks down perceived bulk** by designing recesses in the wall plane so that one large building actually reads as several smaller buildings.
- **Pedestrian entries** to individual residential units and to shared stairwells open directly onto the sidewalk or public space with frontages that transition from the building entries to the pedestrian realm.
Key Regulatory Barriers

In testing development standards for this site, the following standards were found to be key barriers to development that both satisfied the community’s preferred form and scale and also demonstrated financial feasibility.

**Building height.** Some of the images shared here, which were developed as part of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, show buildings up to approximately 70 feet in height. Currently, the maximum building height allowed by the Specific Plan development standards is 50 feet.

**Parking standards.** Currently, residential parking requirements are between 1.5 and 2.5 spaces per unit, depending on unit size, and the commercial parking requirement is 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet. What this study evaluated for purposes of feasibility testing was 1.1 spaces per residential unit and 1 space per 1,000 square feet of commercial space.

**Density.** Currently, this site has a maximum density of 30 du/acre. The design concept evaluated for purposes of feasibility had 90 du/acre.
The recommendations in this section can help promote a predictable built outcome that is aligned with the community’s vision for housing in these locations.

Folsom needs to provide more housing and more diverse types of housing to meet the housing needs of its residents. Development standards for mixed-use and multi-family housing, if regulated carefully, can promote more housing that is consistent with the desired character of the community.

Current regulations are not creating the housing diversity needed to serve the current and future needs of Folsom. In order to meet these needs, it is important to understand what targeted changes will be most impactful to unlocking opportunities for infill housing in these priority locations.
Overview of Key Standards

Regulatory standards help to shape development outcomes. Some of the key regulatory standards that will factor into recommendations are introduced here.

Key Standards for Built Form

Building Placement

Building placement standards regulate where buildings are situated on a lot. These regulations are frequently expressed as minimum setbacks, although build-to lines are a preferable regulatory tool to produce predictable built results.

Building Height

Building height can be regulated by number of stories, overall height, or both.

Massing and Articulation

The composition of building volumes and facades helps enliven the streetscape, helping people orient themselves and creating a more comfortable experience for pedestrians navigating the space. Standards for massing and articulation can include regulations for facade composition, patterns of openings, and corner elements.

This group of standards also includes strategies to reduce the perception of building scale and bulk and is frequently utilized to help new development relate to existing context. Strategies include upper-story stepbacks that require the facade to step back from the built-to line at upper stories, and facade articulation that may require a break in the wall plane after a maximum distance of unbroken facade.

Building Types

Buildings can be categorized according to their physical form. While certain uses or functions may be typical of certain building types, uses are not a primary determinant of building type. Different building types are appropriate for different contexts and site conditions, depending on lot dimensions, resident preferences, market conditions, and the nature of the adjacent street.

Regulating by building types creates more predictability in form and scale, and context-sensitive development. Each of the targeted study areas can allow a range of different building types that respond to existing contexts.

Parking Location

Although parking location does not directly impact the production of housing, regulating the location of parking is critical to creating the desired built environment. It is recommended to require the parking in the rear of the lot or at least behind a habitable ground floor whenever feasible, to encourage buildings closer to the sidewalk, creating a more active, more pedestrian-friendly, and safer environment.
Standards for Large Sites

For lots larger than 3 acres and longer than approximately 750 linear feet along a street, standards should require the creation of new streets and blocks to fit better into the existing context. This will avoid so-called “superblock” developments that are typically inward-facing and do not support walkability, livability, or safety.

Key Standards for Mixed-Use Environments

Frontages

A frontage is the part of a building that connects the public realm (street and sidewalk) with the private realm (yard or building), providing an important transition between the two. Examples of different frontage types include porches, stoops, and shopfronts.

Frontage standards can include regulations on which types of frontages are allowed in particular areas as well as dimensional standards for each frontage type.

In mixed-use environments, frontage standards should ensure that residential frontage types are crafted along with frontage types typical of retail environments in order to enable ground-floor residential uses on secondary facades.

Building Placement

Where the City wants to enable either ground-floor retail or residential uses on the front facade, consider flexible build-to lines.

Key Standards Impacting Economic Feasibility

Parking Requirements

Minimum requirements for parking space(s) per dwelling unit can play a large role in limiting development and feasibility if the standards are not properly calibrated for the context. Current standards for parking in the study areas are high, requiring larger lots for developments and limiting the sites’ capacity for new infill housing at these priority locations.

Reductions in parking requirements should be coordinated with the provision of...
of mobility alternatives, which can include bicycle infrastructure and storage, car-share programs with dedicated spaces for car-share vehicles onsite, and transit service with transit passes for residents.

One resource as an alternative mobility option is the new SmaRT Ride service. Sacramento Regional Transit (RT) now provides on-demand transit service through an app that can take users directly to major offices, shopping centers and light rail stations in Folsom. The new service will also be available in the Folsom Plan Area. The fee to use the service is half the cost of bus and light rail fares.

Another resource in planning for alternative mobility options is GreenTRIP, a program launched in the San Francisco Bay Area and expanding statewide, which offers a certification for new development that provides mobility alternatives in exchange for reduced parking.

Density Limits

A common misconception is that lower densities mean smaller buildings and that higher densities mean larger buildings. However, density is a numerical approach based on the lot size that does not regulate the size of buildings or how they relate to their surrounding contexts. A moderate-density building may still dwarf a house next to it, just as a high-density building may blend into the surrounding neighborhood as a house-scale building.

Why Density Alone Can Have Unexpected Built Outcomes

While people commonly assume that density limits ensure that new projects will be compatible with their context, this is not actually the case. See the images at right of projects which have nearly the same density but drastically different built form.

The number of dwelling units may have no correlation with the size of those units, their arrangement on the lot, or the form of the buildings within which they appear. There is a misconception that high density means big buildings, despite the fact that existing house-scale buildings often achieve higher densities.

In order to achieve the benefits of increased housing choices—including attainability, support for neighborhood walkability, and compatibility with context—a thoughtful approach to regulating form, scale, and building types is most important.

**Above: Large corridor apartment building**

60 units; 30 du/ac.
*Building 175' x165'; 3 Stories*

**Above: House-scale courtyard building**

8 units; 31.7 du/ac.
*Building back bar 84 x 32, wings coming to street 31 x 25, courtyard 30 x 36; 2 Stories*
Density should not be considered a standard that produces particular built form outcomes. Instead, a combination of building types and building massing regulations can create desirable results regardless of a project’s numerical density.

**Key Regulatory Tools**

**Objective Design Standards (ODS)**

Per state law, cities must have clear, objective standards for multi-family development projects, including affordable housing projects. These types of projects must be reviewed by city staff using only objective standards. Planning Commission and Council can no longer review design.

In many cases, Objective Design Standards may be one of the most important ways for local jurisdictions to influence the design of multi-family and mixed-use buildings.

The City of Folsom will undertake to create Objective Design Standards in the near future and can incorporate recommendations from this project into the new standards.

**A Note on Housing Affordability**

While recommendations for policies or programs that address housing affordability are outside the parameters of this project, the goal to provide housing opportunities for all income levels informs the thinking behind this study.

The enclosed recommendations can support housing affordability in myriad ways, including:

- Objective Design Standards create a predictable and streamlined approval process for developers who produce multi-family and affordable housing while also providing a predictable built outcome for the community
- Increases in density, when coupled with appropriate building form standards, can help encourage the provision of smaller units which are generally available at a more attainable price point than larger units
- Parking requirement reductions reduce development costs and enable developers to provide more units
- Unbundling parking, i.e. offering tenants the option to lease a dwelling unit without also leasing a parking space, can help bring down unit costs for individual tenants and can reduce the number of parking spaces required in a development
Emerging Best Practices on Density and FAR

**Density, FAR, and Predictability of Built Form**

As described in the previous section, density alone as a regulatory tool does not always result in predictable built form. Factors such as building length, size, and bulk, and the type and sizes of dwelling units can result in buildings with similar densities and different built outcomes. When the State Density Bonus is applied to mixed-income projects, the resultant building form can deviate even further from expectations. Density cannot yield predictable built form results.

FAR (floor area ratio) can result in more predictable buildings especially when used with other, form-based regulations to guide the outcome of the zoning envelope. FAR measures the ratio of total usable built floor area to the area of the lot. As an example, a single-story building that covers 100 percent of its lot has an FAR of 1.0, as does a two-story building that covers 50 percent of the lot. In this way, FAR directly regulates building square footage relative to lot size, which yields a level of predictability in a building’s mass, an important aspect of built form that can complement other building form standards in Objective Design Standards.

**Regulating with FAR Instead of Density**

Given density’s inability to deliver predictable built form, an emerging best practice is to replace density with FAR as a regulatory tool.

Some opponents of eliminating density requirements fear that it will result in buildings with very high numbers of micro-units or single room occupancy (SRO) units. While unlikely, additional standards can be considered to prevent this situation, such as establishing minimum requirements for “family units” or 2+ bedroom units in multi-family projects.

Eliminating density does not jeopardize density bonus projects. FAR can be used instead of density to determine base entitlements and also to determine density bonus allocations, as described in the El Cerrito example on the facing page.

**Establishing FAR Standards**

Rather than establishing FAR maximums up-front, determining FAR standards after other form standards have been established can better ensure that FAR furthers the City’s goals for desired built form.

The process of determining potential built outcomes in the opportunity site testing in this project can be helpful to determine an appropriate resultant FAR for projects in Folsom. Further site testing can help to determine appropriate FAR levels for future housing projects in Folsom.
Examples From Other Communities

Several other California cities have begun to eliminate density standards and rely on FAR instead. The following are some examples from Northern California.

**Roseville**
Roseville has recently adopted standards that allow projects to meet either density maximums or FAR maximums, whichever is more permissive. With its moderate density maximum (36 du/ac) and relatively high FAR maximum (4.0), FAR is likely to effectively replace density as the applicable regulatory tool for new projects.

**San Rafael**
In its 2020 General Plan, San Rafael eliminated density standards for its downtown and now relies on FAR instead. The intention behind this change was to increase the predictability of built form as the City pursues its housing goals. This policy change was implemented in the Downtown Precise Plan, which makes no mention of density.

**El Cerrito**
In its 2014 San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, El Cerrito eliminated density standards for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Planning Area. The City has established the legal precedent for using FAR in awarding state density bonuses by awarding additional square footage rather than additional density to state density bonus recipients.

Above: Locations of example communities in Northern California
### Recommendations for the East Bidwell Study Area

**Recommendations Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Adjustment</th>
<th>Implementation Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
<td>4 stories (50 ft) max.</td>
<td>5 stories max. on corner sites</td>
<td>Objective Design Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front setback</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>Build-to line of 5-10 ft min. to 15-20 ft max.</td>
<td>Objective Design Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Multi-Unit Dwellings</td>
<td>1.5 spaces per unit min.</td>
<td>0.7-0.9 space per unit min.</td>
<td>Objective Design Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Retail</td>
<td>1 space per 200 sf min.</td>
<td>Allow small retail spaces in mixed-use buildings to pool parking space with adjacent parcels rather than providing them onsite</td>
<td>Objective Design Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>20-30 du/acre</td>
<td>60-80 du/acre max., or eliminate density standard</td>
<td>General Plan + Objective Design Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Standards Considerations

- **Frontage types**: Allow frontage types appropriate to both retail uses (e.g. shopfronts) and ground-floor residential uses (e.g. porches). Create sufficient depth (10-15 ft) in residential frontages to buffer these building entries from the street.
- **Building types**: Regulating by building types can help create predictable built form. Building types can incorporate dimensional standards like building width.
- **Massing and articulation**: Consider requiring massing strategies such as upper-story stepbacks and facade articulation to reduce the perceived bulk of new development.
- **Standards for large sites**: Plan for the possibility of redevelopment of large parcels. Incorporate street and block standards and open space standards to encourage a walkable development pattern.
- **Pedestrian entry standards**: Regulate a minimum distance between pedestrian entries along a building facade and require that ground-floor units be accessed from the sidewalk or common open space.
- **Density minimums**: Consider density minimums that capture the City's housing goals for infill sites and helps the City meet its RHNA allocation goals.
- **Unbundling parking**: Unbundling parking, i.e. offering tenants the option to lease a dwelling unit without also leasing a parking space, can help bring down unit costs for individual tenants and can reduce the number of parking spaces required in a development.

---

Note: The existing standards evaluated in this matrix are from the C-2 zoning district and the East Bidwell Mixed-Use Overlay.
### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowing taller building heights on corner sites enables the creation of nodes of intensity along the corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regulate as a build-to line rather than a setback. Dimensions provided are flexible enough to accommodate either retail or residential use on the ground floor. Build-to lines will ensure that buildings are placed to engage the street and sidewalk. In order to improve comfort and safety for pedestrians, incorporate a small buffer into the dimension that can accommodate an expanded sidewalk and/or a frontage that transitions from the sidewalk to the building face.

A reduced parking ratio was required for feasibility on the opportunity site tested. Lowering the parking ratio further will increase development feasibility. This parking ratio should be paired with alternative mobility strategies like onsite car-share.

Particularly on small infill sites, parking requirements make it difficult to realize development potential due not only to the cost of providing parking but also because of the physical constraints of the lot. The parking ratio for retail square footage is more demanding than the parking ratio for residential square footage and can be difficult to physically accomplish on sites like the opportunity site studied on East Bidwell St. Currently, some of the retail centers along East Bidwell have an excess of parking spaces that could be used by patrons of small retail or service components in new mixed-use buildings. Eliminating the parking requirement for small retail spaces, provided there is adequate parking on adjacent parcels, can help enable mixed-use development on this corridor.

Higher density was required for feasibility in the opportunity site test. This increased density can enable smaller, more attainable units. Increase in density should be paired with the development of robust design standards to control built form.
## Recommendations for the Folsom Blvd. TOD Study Area

Note: The existing standards evaluated in this matrix are from the R-4 zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side street setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Multi-Unit Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Standards Considerations

- **Frontage types**: Allow frontage types appropriate to both retail uses (e.g. shopfronts) and ground-floor residential uses (e.g. porches). Create sufficient depth (10-15 ft) in residential frontages to buffer these building entries from the street.
- **Building types**: Regulating by building types can help create predictable built form. Building types can incorporate dimensional standards like building width and depth.
- **Massing and articulation standards**: Consider massing strategies such as upper-story stepbacks, facade articulation, and upper stories within roof forms to reduce the perceived bulk of new development.
- **Standards for large sites**: Plan for the possibility of redevelopment of large parcels. Incorporate street and block standards and open space standards to encourage a walkable development pattern.
- **Unbundling parking**: Unbundling parking, i.e. offering tenants the option to lease a dwelling unit without also leasing a parking space, can help bring down unit costs for individual tenants and can reduce the number of parking spaces required in a development.
- **Alternative mobility provisions**: Pair a reduction in parking requirements with a requirement for alternative mobility options, including transit passes.
### Rationale

Located along a transit corridor, this targeted area is a rational location for the greatest intensity of new residential development. Anticipating that podium buildings will be required in order to capture the desired development potential on this site, taller building heights will likely be necessary in order to offset the costs of this more expensive construction type. At the Glenn Station opportunity site tested, five stories across the site was in the realm of feasibility. Consider allowing some taller heights at this location to ensure that this development remains feasible. This will also allow development to be taller than 5 stories at the station entrance and step down to lower heights at the edges of the parcel to transition to the surrounding context.

Regulate as a build-to line rather than a setback. The proposed dimensions are flexible enough to accommodate either retail or residential use on the ground floor. Build-to lines will ensure that buildings are placed to engage the street and sidewalk. In order to improve comfort and safety for pedestrians, incorporate a small buffer into the dimension that can accommodate an expanded sidewalk and/or a frontage that transitions from the sidewalk to the building face.

Regulate as a build-to line rather than a setback. The proposed dimensions are flexible enough to accommodate either retail or residential use on the ground floor. Build-to lines will ensure that buildings are placed to engage the street and sidewalk. In order to improve comfort and safety for pedestrians, incorporate a small buffer into the dimension that can accommodate an expanded sidewalk and/or a frontage that transitions from the sidewalk to the building face.

A reduced parking ratio was required for feasibility on the opportunity site tested. Lowering the parking ratio further will increase development feasibility. This parking ratio should be paired with alternative mobility strategies like onsite car-share and transit passes.

Higher density was required for feasibility in the opportunity site test. This increased density can enable smaller, more attainable units. Increase in density should be paired with the development of robust design standards to control built form.
Recommendations for the New Town Center Study Area

Note: The existing standards evaluated in this matrix are from the SP-MU zoning district, which is the most intense of the zoning districts in the New Town Center.

### Recommendations Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Adjustment</th>
<th>Implementation Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
<td>50 ft max.</td>
<td>70 ft max.</td>
<td>Objective Design Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Multi-Unit Dwellings</td>
<td>1.5 spaces per unit min.</td>
<td>1 space per unit min.</td>
<td>Objective Design Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>9-30 du/acre</td>
<td>80-100 du/acre max., or eliminate density standard</td>
<td>Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan + Objective Design Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional Standards Considerations

- **Frontage types**
  - Allow frontage types appropriate to both retail uses (e.g. shopfronts) and ground-floor residential uses (e.g. porches). Create sufficient depth (10-15 ft) in residential frontages to buffer unit entries from the street or sidewalk.

- **Building types**
  - Regulating by building types can help create predictable built form. Building types can incorporate dimensional standards like building width and depth.

- **Massing and articulation standards**
  - Consider requiring massing strategies such as upper-story stepbacks and facade articulation to reduce the perceived bulk of new development.

- **Standards for large sites**
  - Plan for the possibility of redevelopment of large parcels. Incorporate street and block standards and open space standards to encourage a walkable development pattern.

- **Unbundling parking**
  - Unbundling parking, i.e. offering tenants the option to lease a dwelling unit without also leasing a parking space, can help bring down unit costs for individual tenants and can reduce the number of parking spaces required in a development.
### Rationale

- **Building height**
  - 50 ft max.
  - 70 ft max.
  - **Objective Design Standards**
    - These increased building heights are aligned with the renderings shown in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. They are also aligned with the density evaluated for feasibility as part of this project.

- **Parking for Multi-Unit Dwellings**
  - 1.5 spaces per unit min.
  - 1 space per unit min.
  - **Objective Design Standards**
    - A reduced parking ratio was required for feasibility on the opportunity site tested. This parking ratio should be paired with alternative mobility strategies like onsite car-share. Note that this recommended parking ratio is higher than in the other two study areas since the New Town Center does not yet have an established transit system and due to its location is more likely to require a certain level of auto-dependency.

- **Density**
  - 9-30 du/acre
  - 80-100 du/acre max., or eliminate density standard
  - **Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan + Objective Design Standards**
    - Higher density was required for feasibility in the opportunity site test. This increased density can enable smaller, more attainable units. Increase in density should be paired with the development of robust design standards to control built form.
# City of Folsom
## Feasibility Analysis
### Building Prototypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snowline Hospice Thrift Store 616 E Bidwell St</th>
<th>Glenn Station Park + Ride 620 Coolidge Dr</th>
<th>New Town Center Folsom Plan Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAR</strong></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DU/Acre</strong></td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Stories</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 and 5</td>
<td>3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Area SF</strong></td>
<td>60,632</td>
<td>118,925</td>
<td>211,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross SF</strong></td>
<td>63,250</td>
<td>234,900</td>
<td>387,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Residential SF</strong></td>
<td>63,250</td>
<td>233,400</td>
<td>309,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Residential SF</strong></td>
<td>54,100</td>
<td>197,900</td>
<td>257,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail SF</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Unit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studio</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-BR</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-BR</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Unit Size (SF)</strong></td>
<td>659</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Tuck Under/Surface</td>
<td>Tuck Under/Podium</td>
<td>Podium/Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Spaces</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of HW 50</td>
<td>South of HW 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folsom Cordova Unified School District</strong></td>
<td><strong>Folsom Cordova Unified School District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Folsom</td>
<td>City of Folsom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Fee</td>
<td>Transportation Management Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities Land Equalization Fee (Mixed Use District)</td>
<td>Public Facilities Land Equalization Fee (Mixed Use District)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Equalization Fee (Mixed Use District)</td>
<td>Parkland Equalization Fee (Mixed Use District)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Infrastructure Fee Water Treatment Plant Set-Aside</td>
<td>Specific Plan Infrastructure Fee Water Treatment Plant Set-Aside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Plan Admin Fee</td>
<td>Waste Management Plan Admin Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per first 10,000 sf</td>
<td>per each additional 10,000 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Folsom Plan Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North of HW 50</th>
<th>South of HW 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folsom Cordova Unified School District</strong></td>
<td><strong>Folsom Cordova Unified School District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Folsom</td>
<td>City of Folsom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Fee</td>
<td>Transportation Management Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities Land Equalization Fee (Mixed Use District)</td>
<td>Public Facilities Land Equalization Fee (Mixed Use District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Equalization Fee (Mixed Use District)</td>
<td>Parkland Equalization Fee (Mixed Use District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Infrastructure Fee Water Treatment Plant Set-Aside</td>
<td>Specific Plan Infrastructure Fee Water Treatment Plant Set-Aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Plan Admin Fee</td>
<td>Waste Management Plan Admin Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per first 10,000 sf</td>
<td>per each additional 10,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Impact fees are reduced by 50 percent for efficiency and studio apartments up to 35 percent of the total number of units - Section 16.70 of the Folsom Municipal Code.
# Table 3
## City of Folsom
### Feasibility Analysis
#### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snowline Hospice Thrift Store 616 E Bidwell St</th>
<th>Glenn Station Park + Ride 620 Coolidge Dr</th>
<th>New Town Center Folsom Plan Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Rate Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-BR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Size (SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-BR</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Rate Rent PSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>$ 3.10</td>
<td>$ 3.10</td>
<td>$ 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>$ 2.85</td>
<td>$ 2.85</td>
<td>$ 2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>$ 2.65</td>
<td>$ 2.65</td>
<td>$ 2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>$ 2.40</td>
<td>$ 2.40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Rate Rent per-Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>$ 1,550</td>
<td>$ 1,550</td>
<td>$ 1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>$ 1,853</td>
<td>$ 1,853</td>
<td>$ 1,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>$ 1,988</td>
<td>$ 1,988</td>
<td>$ 1,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>$ 2,280</td>
<td>$ 2,280</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Rate Unit Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>$ 41,850</td>
<td>$ 159,650</td>
<td>$ 342,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>$ 42,608</td>
<td>$ 172,283</td>
<td>$ 314,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>$ 47,700</td>
<td>$ 174,900</td>
<td>$ 95,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>$ 18,240</td>
<td>$ 47,880</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Revenues</td>
<td>$ 1,804,770</td>
<td>$ 6,656,550</td>
<td>$ 9,034,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Vacancy (2.5%)</td>
<td>2.5% $ 45,119</td>
<td>$ 166,414</td>
<td>$ 225,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gross Income</td>
<td>$ 1,759,651</td>
<td>$ 6,490,136</td>
<td>$ 8,808,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Operating Expenses (including reserves)</td>
<td>32.5% $ 571,886</td>
<td>$ 2,109,294</td>
<td>$ 2,862,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Net Operating Income</td>
<td>$ 1,187,764</td>
<td>$ 4,380,842</td>
<td>$ 5,945,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 36,000</td>
<td>$ 1,872,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Vacancy (5.0%)</td>
<td>5.0% $ -</td>
<td>$ 1,800</td>
<td>$ 93,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gross Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 34,200</td>
<td>$ 1,778,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Operating Expenses (including reserves)</td>
<td>12.0% $ -</td>
<td>$ 4,104</td>
<td>$ 213,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Net Operating Income</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$ 30,096</td>
<td>$ 1,564,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Operating Income</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,187,764</td>
<td>$ 4,410,938</td>
<td>$ 7,510,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Folsom
### Feasibility Analysis

#### Development Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snowline Hospice 616 E Bidwell St</th>
<th>Glenn Station Park + Ride 620 Coolidge Dr</th>
<th>New Town Center Folsom Plan Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU/Acre</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area SF</td>
<td>60,632</td>
<td>118,925</td>
<td>211,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross SF</td>
<td>63,250</td>
<td>234,900</td>
<td>387,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Residential SF</td>
<td>63,250</td>
<td>233,400</td>
<td>309,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Residential SF</td>
<td>54,100</td>
<td>197,900</td>
<td>257,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Efficiency</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential Units</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck Under</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Costs</td>
<td>$44 per land SF</td>
<td>$2,644,684</td>
<td>$5,187,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Costs Subtotal</td>
<td>$2,644,684</td>
<td>$5,187,344</td>
<td>$9,229,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Construction Costs</td>
<td>$195 per GSF</td>
<td>$12,333,750</td>
<td>$45,513,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo/On-Site Improvements</td>
<td>$10 per land SF</td>
<td>$606,320</td>
<td>$1,189,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Construction Costs1</td>
<td>$93 per GSF</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$139,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>$2,500 per space</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>$8,500 per space</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck Under</td>
<td>$11,500 per space</td>
<td>$471,500</td>
<td>$149,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>$45,000 per space</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$14,175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>4% x Hard Cost subtotal</td>
<td>$540,663</td>
<td>$2,446,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Costs Subtotal</td>
<td>$14,057,233</td>
<td>$63,612,900</td>
<td>$83,012,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking costs as % of Hard Costs</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cost per sf</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Permits and Fees</td>
<td>See Fees Tab</td>
<td>$1,567,007</td>
<td>$5,820,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;E/Other Professionals</td>
<td>6% x Hard Costs</td>
<td>$843,434</td>
<td>$3,816,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Leasing Commissions</td>
<td>$7.50 x Net Leasable SF</td>
<td>$454,740</td>
<td>$891,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>2% x Hard Costs</td>
<td>$281,145</td>
<td>$1,272,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>2% x Hard Costs</td>
<td>$281,145</td>
<td>$1,272,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Opening Expenses</td>
<td>$4.0 x Net Leasable SF</td>
<td>$242,528</td>
<td>$475,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Fee</td>
<td>6% x Hard Costs</td>
<td>$843,434</td>
<td>$3,816,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>3% x Soft Costs subtotal</td>
<td>$135,403</td>
<td>$521,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs Subtotal</td>
<td>$4,648,835</td>
<td>$17,897,560</td>
<td>$40,055,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Hard Costs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Costs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Loan Balance</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan Interest Rate</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Term</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan Interest</td>
<td>$1,353,104</td>
<td>$5,494,473</td>
<td>$8,384,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan Fees</td>
<td>2.0% x subtotal</td>
<td>$427,015</td>
<td>$1,733,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Loan Percent</td>
<td>75.0% x capitalized value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Loan Fees</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$295,941</td>
<td>$1,102,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs Subtotal</td>
<td>$2,077,060</td>
<td>$8,331,164</td>
<td>$12,908,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Development Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$23,427,811</th>
<th>$95,028,967</th>
<th>$145,206,004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Unit Cost</td>
<td>$285,705</td>
<td>$311,570</td>
<td>$330,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per SF</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>$405</td>
<td>$375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Assumes construction cost for building substructure and shell only

Source: RS Means, Los Angeles, 2021
# Table 5

## City of Folsom

### Feasibility Analysis

#### Proforma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snowline Hospice Thrift Store 616 E Bidwell St</th>
<th>Glenn Station Park + Ride 620 Coolidge Dr</th>
<th>New Town Center Folsom Plan Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Area SF</td>
<td>60,632</td>
<td>118,925</td>
<td>211,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 and 5</td>
<td>3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Building SF</td>
<td>63,250</td>
<td>234,900</td>
<td>387,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU/Acre</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Gross SF</td>
<td>63,250</td>
<td>233,400</td>
<td>309,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Efficiency</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Unit Size (SF)</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Tuck Under/Surface</td>
<td>Tuck Under/Podium</td>
<td>Podium/Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spaces</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Development Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snowline Hospice</th>
<th>Glenn Station Park + Ride</th>
<th>New Town Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Cost</td>
<td>$2,644,684</td>
<td>$5,187,344</td>
<td>$9,229,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>$14,057,233</td>
<td>$63,612,900</td>
<td>$83,012,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs (include Financing)</td>
<td>$6,725,895</td>
<td>$26,228,724</td>
<td>$52,963,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Development Costs</td>
<td>$23,427,811</td>
<td>$95,028,967</td>
<td>$145,206,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sales Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snowline Hospice</th>
<th>Glenn Station Park + Ride</th>
<th>New Town Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
<td>$1,187,764</td>
<td>$4,410,938</td>
<td>$7,510,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Value (Cap Rate 4.5%)</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>$26,394,761</td>
<td>$166,907,163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Developer Profit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snowline Hospice</th>
<th>Glenn Station Park + Ride</th>
<th>New Town Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues Less Total Development Costs</td>
<td>$2,966,950</td>
<td>$2,991,876</td>
<td>$21,701,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield on Cost %</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Feasibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snowline Hospice</th>
<th>Glenn Station Park + Ride</th>
<th>New Town Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility: Cap Rate +1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility: Hurdle Rate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snowline Hospice</th>
<th>Glenn Station Park + Ride</th>
<th>New Town Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Rent Increase Required for Target Yield-on-Cost</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility with above % Rent Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>