CALL TO ORDER PLANNING COMMISSION:  Thomas Scott, Vice Chair John Arnaz, Jennifer Lane, Kevin Mallory, Justin Raithel, Aaron Ralls, Chair Ross Jackson

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 August 2, 2017 will be presented for approval.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **PN 17-247: McDonald’s Restaurant Commercial Design Review and Determination that the Project is Exempt from CEQA**

A Public Hearing to consider a request from Kevin McAuley for approval of a Commercial Design Review application for façade alterations, new exterior paint colors, and minor site improvements to an existing 3,621-square-foot McDonald’s Restaurant building at 697 East Bidwell Street. The zoning classification for the project is C-2 (Central Business District), and the General Plan land use designation is CCD (Central Commercial Mixed Use District). This project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines (Existing Facilities). (Project Planner: Assistant Planner, Joshua Kinkade / Applicant: Kevin McAuley)
2. **PN 17-113, Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Specific Plan Amendment**

   A Public Hearing to consider a joint application request by the City of Folsom and the Folsom Plan Area Landowners for approval of a Specific Plan Amendment to add lot coverage standards to the Specific Plan, and to create a Planned Development Overlay District for specific properties located within the Folsom Plan Area. The 3,514-acre Folsom Plan Area is generally located north of White Rock Road, south of U.S. Highway 50, east of Prairie City Road, and west of the El Dorado County/Sacramento County line. An EIR/EIS and associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program was previously adopted for the Folsom Plan Area project on June 28, 2011 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). *(Project Planner: Principal Planner, Steve Banks / Joint Applicants: City of Folsom / Folsom Plan Area Landowners)*

**PLANNING COMMISSION / PLANNING MANAGER REPORT**

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for **September 20, 2017**. 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 355-7222 and FAX number is 355-7274.

**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.
CALL TO ORDER PLANNING COMMISSION: Justin Raithel, Aaron Ralls, Thomas Scott, Vice Chair John Arnaz, Jennifer Lane, Kevin Mallory, Chair Ross Jackson

ABSENT: None

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: None

MINUTES: The minutes of June 21, 2017 were approved as submitted.

NEW BUSINESS

1. PN17-225, 405 Parkshore Drive, Farmhouse at Willow Creek – Residential Design Review

A Public Hearing to consider a request from BlackPine Communities for approval of a Design Review Application for a previously-approved 126-unit single-family residential subdivision located on a 18.5-acre site at 405 Parkshore Drive. Specifically, BlackPine Communities is requesting design review approval of four (4) master plans for the residential subdivision. The zoning is SP 93-2 with an underlying designation of RM-PD and the General Plan is MLD. An Addendum to the 1992 Silverbrook Island EIR has previously been approved in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. (Project Planner: Principal Planner, Steve Banks / Applicant: BlackPine Communities)

COMMISSIONER SCOTT MOVED TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION FOR ARCHITECTURAL AND DESIGN-RELATED MODIFICATIONS TO 126 PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL UNITS SITUATED WITHIN THE PHASE II PORTION OF THE ISLAND SUBDIVISION FOR THE FARMHOUSE AT WILLOW CREEK SUBDIVISION PROJECT WITH THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS: GENERAL FINDINGS A & B; CEQA FINDING C; DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS D & E; CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL NO. 1 – 14.

COMMISSIONER RAITHHEL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: RALLS, SCOTT, ARNAZ, LANE, MALLORY, RAITHHEL, JACKSON
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
PLANNING MANAGER REPORT

None

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

______________________________
Amanda Palmer, SECRETARY

APPROVED:

______________________________
Ross Jackson, CHAIRMAN
## PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

**PROJECT TITLE**

McDonald's Restaurant Commercial Design Review

**PROPOSAL**

Request for Commercial Design Review
Approval for façade alterations, new exterior paint colors, and minor site improvements to an existing 3,621-square-foot McDonald's Restaurant building at 697 East Bidwell Street

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Approve, based upon findings and subject to conditions

**OWNER/APPLICANT**

McDonald's US LLC/ Kevin McAuley

**LOCATION**

697 East Bidwell Street

**SITE CHARACTERISTICS**

The project site is fully developed with a 3,621-square-foot commercial building (McDonald's Restaurant) and associated site improvements including a trash enclosure, parking, lighting and landscaping

**GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION**

CCD (Central Commercial Mixed Use District)

**ZONING**

C-2 (Central Business District)

**ADJACENT LAND USES/ZONING**

North: East Bidwell Street and commercial property (C-2) beyond
South: Commercial property (C-2)
East: Wales Drive and commercial property (C-2 PD) beyond
West: Commercial property (C-2)

**PREVIOUS ACTION**

Approval of a Design Review application for a remodel of a McDonald's Restaurant by the Architectural Review Commission on October 28, 2004 (PN 04-552)
APPLICABLE CODES
FMC 17.06, Design Review
FMC 17.22, Commercial Land Uses

ATTACHMENTS
1. Vicinity Map
2. Existing and Proposed Site Plan, Floor Plan, and Landscaping, dated June 29, 2017
3. Proposed Color Elevations, Dated August 29, 2017
4. Photographs of the Existing McDonald’s Restaurant and Folsom Faire Shopping Center
5. Photographs of Similar Recent McDonald’s Remodels

PROJECT PLANNER
Josh Kinkade, Assistant Planner

BACKGROUND
In 1981, a 3,621-square-foot McDonald’s Restaurant was constructed at 697 East Bidwell Street, at the southwest corner of East Bidwell Street and Wales Drive, adjacent to the Folsom Faire Shopping Center. A “McDonald’s Playland” is immediately adjacent to the west elevation of the building. In 2004, the Architectural Review Commission approved a Design Review application for a remodel of the building, which also included additional landscaping around the Playland and trash enclosure. The exterior of the building consists of cream stucco siding, a red tile roof, and a stone wainscot. Illuminated letters spelling “McDonald’s” are found on three sides of the parapet. The majority of the parking is located in the back of the building with the remainder of the parking located closer to East Bidwell Street and the west side of the building.

APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL
The applicant, Kevin McAuley, is requesting Commercial Design Review approval for façade alterations to the existing McDonald’s Restaurant at 697 East Bidwell Street (see Attachments 2 and 3). The proposed remodel includes:

- Removal of portions of the existing roof tiles, roof light beams, lower mansard roofs and fascia;

- Removal of one window on the northwest elevation;

- Construction of a new corrugated metal building parapet, painted silver;

- Construction of new aluminum trellises and canopies, painted grey, white and gold;

- Construction of two tower elements on the northwest and northeast elevations painted “Iron Mountain” grey;

- Painting the building Greenbriar Beige;

- Removal of the stone wainscoting along the bottom of the structure;

- Installation of new light fixtures and accent lighting; and

- Removal of the existing Playland.
The applicant is also proposing minor site improvements which include:

- Addition of three parking spaces and two landscaped curbs on the northwest elevation (in place of the Playland)

- Moving the two accessible parking spaces to be directly northwest of the building; and

- Addition of a new accessible ramp and path of travel from the East Bidwell Street sidewalk to the restaurant.

ARCHITECTURE / DESIGN
In reviewing the applicant’s proposed façade modifications and minor site improvements, staff took into consideration consistency with surrounding development. It should be noted that, while they share a parking lot, the McDonald’s Restaurant building is not part of the Folsom Faire Shopping Center (and is under different ownership). While the existing building is not formally part of this shopping center, staff has concluded that the exterior remodel of the McDonald’s needs to be compatible with the larger center in order to meet the finding that it features a compatibility of building materials, textures, and colors with surrounding development and consistency with the general design theme of the neighborhood.

The existing McDonald’s Restaurant building features a cream colored stucco finish and a red tile mansard roof with a red parapet. The applicant is proposing to remodel the building by removing the existing stone wainscoting, painting the siding grey, removing the existing roof parapet and mansard and replacing them with a silver aluminum parapet, constructing two towers painted grey, removing one window, adding light fixtures and accent lighting, and constructing new aluminum trellises and canopies, painted charcoal, white and gold. Staff has conditioned that all exterior lighting be directed downward (Condition No. 12).

The new flat roof and beige stucco siding would match the colors and design of the nearby Folsom Faire center, which consists primarily of earth-tone buildings with flat roofs. However, the proposed grey tower and aluminum parapet would not match any buildings in this center. Staff notes that the proposed remodel is for a freestanding building which is not technically part of Folsom Faire, and therefore, a certain level of flexibility is warranted in architecture and color. Furthermore, staff found other recent examples of McDonald’s that have been remodeled with grey towers and metal parapet elements (as shown in Attachment 5). Staff concluded that the metal parapet and grey towers provide some unique architectural characteristics to the building. Staff therefore determined that the proposal is generally compatible building materials, textures, and colors with surrounding development and consistency with the general design theme of the neighborhood.

TRASH/RECYCLING ENCLOSURE
The project site includes an existing trash/recycling enclosure which is located on the southwest side of the existing restaurant building. The enclosure is currently stucco painted cream to match the existing restaurant building. Staff has conditioned that the enclosure be painted beige to match the new color scheme of the building (Condition No. 15).
PARKING
The proposed project includes restriping of existing parking spaces and moving three spaces (including two accessible spaces) to the northwest elevation, directly adjacent to the restaurant building. The restriping will result in the addition of three new parking spaces, increasing the number from 26 spaces to 29 spaces. Per the Folsom Municipal Code, Chapter 17.57, the parking requirement for retail commercial uses and restaurants located in shopping centers is one space per 200 square feet of gross floor area. At 3,621 square feet, the McDonald’s Restaurant has a parking requirement of 18.1 spaces. Therefore, adequate parking will be provided upon completion of the proposed project. The restriping will be reviewed for ADA compliance by the City of Folsom Building Division upon submittal of a Building Permit application. New accessible spaces are proposed to be 18 feet x 9 feet. Section 17.57.050 of the FMC requires spaces to be 19 feet deep. Therefore, staff has provided Condition No. 13, which requires newly-striped spaces to increase depth by one foot to meet this requirement.

LANDSCAPING
Existing site landscaping includes a combination of trees, shrubs, and groundcover located in a landscape buffers adjacent to East Bidwell Street and Wales Drive and within landscape planters situated throughout the parking lot area. In addition to the removal of the Playland, the applicant proposes to remove the landscaping surrounding the Playland, which consists of shrubs and plants. However, the applicant proposes new planters filled with similar shrubs and plants in two new finger islands that would offset this loss of landscaping. Staff supports this new proposed landscaping.

SIGNAGE
The applicant will be removing all existing signage from the building. The applicant is not proposing any signage with this particular Commercial Design Review application, although conceptual signage is shown on the elevations submitted. Signage is subject to the sign regulations established by the Folsom Municipal Code, Chapter 17.59. Condition No. 11 has been included to require all future proposed signage to go through a separate sign permit process.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
The project is categorically exempt under Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION/PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
MOVE TO APPROVE COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR FAÇADE ALTERATIONS, NEW EXTERIOR PAINT COLORS, AND MINOR SITE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE EXISTING 3,621-SQUARE-FOOT MCDONALD’S RESTAURANT BUILDING LOCATED AT 697 EAST BIDWELL STREET WITH THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (NO. 1-19):

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 ZONING CODE OF THE CITY.

CEQA FINDING

C. THE PROJECT IS CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT UNDER SECTION 15301 EXISTING FACILITIES OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) GUIDELINES.

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

D. THE PROPOSED PROJECT COMPLIES WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND ANY APPLICABLE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY.

E. THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS COMPATIBLE WITH BUILDING MATERIALS, TEXTURES, AND COLORS WITH SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT AND CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL DESIGN THEME OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Submitted,

ELAINE ANDERSEN
Assistant City Manager/Acting Community Development Director

CONDITIONS
See attached tables of conditions for which the following legend applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>WHEN REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD (P) CD (E) CD (B) CD (F)</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW (P) PR (P) PD (P) PD (P)</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR (P) PR (P) PD (P) PD (P)</td>
<td>Park and Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD (P) PD (P) PD (P) PD (P)</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>When Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below:</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site Plan, dated June 29, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Floor Plans, dated June 29, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building Elevations, dated June 29, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Color Elevations, Dated August 29, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project approval is for a McDonald’s Restaurant Commercial Design Review, which includes façade alterations, new exterior paint colors, and minor site improvements to an existing 3,621-square-foot building at 697 E. Bidwell St., as shown on the above-referenced plans. Modifications may be made to the above-referenced plans to respond to site-specific conditions of approval as set forth herein.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building plans and any required civil engineering 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>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The project approval granted under this staff report shall remain in effect for one year from final date of approval (September 6, 2018). 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>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td>OG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The City bears its own attorney’s fees and costs; and</td>
<td>PW, PR, FD, PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The City defends the claim, action or proceeding in good faith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>When Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. This project shall be subject to all applicable City-wide development impact fees, unless exempt by previous agreement. This project shall be subject to all applicable 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, Quimby, 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 has begun. The fees shall be calculated at the rate in effect at the time of building permit issuance.

9. If applicable, the owner/applicant shall pay off any existing assessments against the property, or file necessary segregation request and pay applicable fees.

10. 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.
# CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MCDONALD'S COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW (PN 17-247)

**697 E. BIDWELL ST.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. All signs for the project shall comply with the sign regulations established by Section 17.59 of the Folsom Municipal Code.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The exterior lighting shall be limited to downward-facing lighting attached to the building. 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>
<tr>
<td>13. Newly-striped accessible parking spaces shall be 19 feet x 9 feet.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHITECTURE/DESIGN REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment, including satellite dish antennas, shall not extend above the height of the parapet walls. Ground-mounted mechanical equipment shall be shielded by landscaping or trellis type features to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The trash enclosure shall be painted beige to match the building’s new color scheme.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The owner/applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit for any work conducted in the public right-of-way prior to issuance of a Building Permit.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOISE REQUIREMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Compliance with Noise Control Ordinance and General Plan Noise Element shall be required. Hours of construction operation shall be limited from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction equipment shall be muffled and shrouded to minimize noise levels.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Approved building address numbers shall be placed near the main entrance on the building in such a position as to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property. Numbers shall be either externally or internally-illuminated on a lighting circuit powered dusk to dawn and the color shall contrast with their background. The size of the address numbers shall be a minimum of 10 inches.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Plans and specifications must be submitted and approved by the City of Folsom Fire Department prior to the start of construction.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

## PROJECT TITLE
Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Amendment

## PROPOSAL
Request for approval of a Specific Plan Amendment to expand the previously approved boundaries of the Planned Development Overlay District, add maximum building coverage ratios, and modify the Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) section of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan

## RECOMMENDED ACTION
Approve, based upon findings

## OWNER/APPLICANT
Folsom South Area Group/City of Folsom

## LOCATION
The FPASP area is generally bounded by Prairie City Road to the west, U.S. Highway 50 to the north, White Rock Road to the south, and the Sacramento County/El Dorado County boundary to the east

## SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The FPASP area is situated near the base of the Sierra Nevada foothills. The topography is generally characterized by gently rolling hills covered in non-native and naturalized grasslands. Historically, the area has been used for grazing, farming, and mining activities

## PREVIOUS ACTION
City Council Approval of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan in 2011

## FUTURE ACTION
None

## APPLICABLE CODES
- FMC 17.37, Specific Plan District
- FMC 17.38, Planned Development District
- Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (SPASP)
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

An Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPRSP) was previously adopted by the City Council on June 28, 2011.

ATTACHED REFERENCE MATERIAL

1. Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Amendment Exhibit, dated April 13, 2017
2. Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Parcel Exhibit, dated April 13, 2017

PROJECT PLANNER

Steve Banks, Principal Planner

BACKGROUND

The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) area is generally bounded by U.S. Highway 50 to the north, White Rock Road to the south, Prairie City Road to the west, and the Sacramento County/El Dorado County boundary to the east. The FPASP, which was adopted in 2011 and has since been amended on numerous occasions, currently includes 11,337 residential units at various densities on approximately 1,625 acres; 320 acres designated for commercial and industrial use; 276 acres designated for public/quasi-public uses, elementary-middle school/high schools, and community/neighborhood parks; and 1,065 acres for open-space areas and open-space preserves.

Subsequent to approval of the FPASP in 2011, a number of Planned Development Overlay Districts were established for individual projects within the Folsom Plan Area including Broadstone Estates, Hillsborough, Russell Ranch, and Westland/Eagle. The remaining properties within the Folsom Plan Area do not currently have a Planned Development Overlay District designation.

On May 12, 2015, the City Council approved a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Large-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, and Planned Development Permit for development of the Russell Ranch Subdivision project. As part of the aforementioned approval, maximum building coverage ratios of 55% for single-family residential lots with an SF (Single-Family) land use designation, 60% for single-family residential lots with an SFHD (Single-Family High Density) land use designation, and 60% for single-family residential lots with an MLD (Multi-Family Low Density) land use designation were established. On November 8, 2016, the City Council approved a Tentative Parcel Map, Tentative Subdivision Map, and Planned Development Permit for development of the Enclave at Folsom Ranch project. As part of the aforementioned approval, maximum building coverage ratios of 60% for single-family residential lots with an MLD (Multi-Family Low Density) land use designation were established.

On April 4, 2017, the Community Development Department approved a Minor Administrative Modification (MAM) to establish maximum lot coverage standards for four projects within the Folsom Plan Area including Folsom Heights (Parcels 236-238), Gragg Ranch (Parcels 214, 215A, 215B, 215C, and 217), Mangini Ranch (Parcel 134), and White Rock Springs (Parcel 134). For the aforementioned projects, the MAM established maximum building coverage ratios of 45% for single-family residential lots with an SF (Single-Family) land use designation and 50% for single-family residential lots with an SFHD (Single-Family High Density) land use designation.
APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL
The City of Folsom and the Folsom South Area Group are requesting approval of a Specific Plan Amendment for further expansion of the previously approved boundaries of the Planned Development Overlay District within the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, to add maximum building coverage ratios, and to modify the Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) section of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

As noted above, the Specific Plan Amendment will further expand the previously approved boundaries of the Planned Development Overlay District within the FPASP. Specifically, the Amendment will add the Planned Development Overlay District designation to specific residential and commercial-zoned parcels within the FPASP including Arcadian Heights (Parcel 211), Eagle Office Properties (Parcels 55-56), Folsom Heights (Parcels 233-238), Folsom Real Estate South (Parcels 132, 134, 137, 138, 141, 148, 167, 168, 169, 170, 172, 173), J&Z Properties (Parcels 254-256), Mangini North Holdings (Parcel 144), West Prairie Estates (Parcel 58), West Scott Road (Parcel 166), and White Rock Land Investors (Parcel 143). Attachment No. 1 to this staff report illustrates the aforementioned parcels within the FPASP to which the Planned Development District Overlay designation would be apply.

In addition to the expansion of the boundaries of the Planned Development Overlay District within the FPASP, the Specific Plan Amendment proposes to amend FPASP Tables A.2, A.3, and A.4 in order to create maximum building coverage ratios for properties located in the SF (Single-Family) land use category, the SFHD (Single-Family High Density) land use category, and the MLD (Multi-Family Low Density) land use category. Specifically, the Amendment proposes to establish maximum building coverage ratios of 45% for single-family residential lots with an SF (Single-Family) land use designation, 50% for single-family residential lots with an SFHD (Single-Family High Density) land use designation, and 50% for single-family residential lots with an MLD (Multi-Family Low Density) land use designation.

Lastly, the proposed Specific Plan Amendment includes a modification to the Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) section of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. Specifically, the Amendment proposes additional language that will allow for placement of the Planned Development Overlay District designation on a public/quasi-public property in the event that the public/quasi-public property is vacated in favor of a more suitable location. In addition, the Amendment proposes additional language that allows for elimination of the Planned Development Overlay District designation from a new public/quasi-public property in the event that the public/quasi-public property is transferred to a residential parcel.

SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT
The Specific Plan Amendment request proposes a further expansion of the previously approved boundaries of the Planned Development Overlay District for the FPASP. The Specific Plan Amendment will add the Planned Development Overlay District designation to the following SF, SFHD, MLD, MMD, MHD, MU, CC, and IND/OP parcels (as shown in Attachment No. 1 and No. 2): Arcadian Heights, Eagle Office Properties, Folsom Heights, Folsom Real Estate South, J&Z Properties, Mangini North Holdings, West Prairie Estates, West Scott Road, and White Rock Land Investors. The addition of the Planned Development Overlay District designation to the above referenced parcels will not amend the permitted land uses of the subject properties as specified in the FPASP; however, it will allow a more thorough and critical review of future development projects by City staff and the Planning Commission.
The primary purpose of the Planned Development Permit process is to allow greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of land use regulations. The Planned Development Permit process is also designed to encourage creative and efficient uses of land. Topics typically evaluated and considered as part of the Planned Development Permit process include existing/proposed development standards, traffic/access/circulation, parking requirements, noise impacts, walls/fencing, site lighting, site landscaping, trash/recycling, grading/drainage, and architecture/design. Staff has determined that the establishment of an expanded Planned Development Overlay District within the Folsom Plan Area will allow for a more comprehensive review for of proposed development projects by City staff and the Planning Commission, which in turn will result in more creative planning and design solutions than otherwise possible through the strict interpretation of the FPASP land use regulations and development standards.

The Specific Plan Amendment also proposes to amend FPASP Tables A.2, A.3, and A.4 in order to create maximum building coverage ratios for properties located in the SF (Single-Family) land use category, the SFHD (Single-Family High Density) land use category, and the MLD (Multi-Family Low Density) land use category. Specifically, the Amendment proposes to establish maximum building coverage ratios of 45% for single-family residential lots with an SF (Single-Family) land use designation, 50% for single-family residential lots with an SFHD (Single-Family High Density) land use designation, and 50% for single-family residential lots with an MLD (Multi-Family Low Density) land use designation.

In evaluating the proposed maximum building coverage ratios for the FPASP, staff considered a variety of factors including building coverage ratios for existing developments in Folsom north of U.S. Highway 50, building coverage ratios for approved developments in the Folsom Plan Area, approved building coverage ratios for similar development projects in the Sacramento region, and building coverage ratios for various jurisdictions in the Sacramento region. The following table includes maximum building coverage ratios for the aforementioned categories:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Single-Story</th>
<th>Two-Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF (Single Family Proposed)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFHD (Single Family High Density Proposed)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD (Multi-Family Low Density Proposed)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Ranch Subdivision (Approved)</td>
<td>55-60%</td>
<td>55-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclave at Folsom Ranch Subdivision (Approved)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Folsom (North of U.S. Highway 50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom Municipal Code</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstone Specific Plan</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Specific Plan</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Ranch Specific Plan</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various New Subdivisions</td>
<td>45-85%</td>
<td>45-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Roseville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville Municipal Code</td>
<td>45-NA%*</td>
<td>35%-NA%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer Vineyards Subdivision</td>
<td>40-55%</td>
<td>35-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Municipal Code</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Shores Subdivision</td>
<td>50-60%</td>
<td>50-60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* City of Roseville has no upper limit

As shown in the table above, the proposed building coverage ratios for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan are slightly lower than the building coverage ratios that were recently approved for two subdivisions (Russell Ranch Subdivision and Enclave at Folsom Ranch Subdivision) within the Folsom Plan Area. In terms of the Folsom Municipal Code, the proposed ratios are moderately higher; however, this is not unexpected as these particular ratios were established almost thirty years ago under very different development and market conditions. The proposed building coverage ratios are slightly higher than the more-recently approved large-scale residential developments located on the north side of U.S. Highway 50 including the Empire Ranch Subdivision, the Parkway Subdivision, and the Broadstone Subdivision. In relation to other jurisdictions in the Sacramento region, the proposed ratios are comparable to the City of Roseville Municipal Code and the City of Sacramento Municipal Code requirements, which provide a fairly wide degree of flexibility. With regard to recently approved large-scale residential subdivisions in the Sacramento region, the proposed ratios are quite similar.

In reviewing the proposed maximum building coverage ratios, staff also took into consideration overall concept and purpose of the FPASP. The FPASP is a comprehensively planned community that proposed new development patterns based on the principals of “Smart Growth” and Transit Oriented Development. Consistent with these principles, the Plan Area encompasses a mix of residential, commercial, employment, and public uses complemented by recreational amenities including a significant system of parks and open spaces, all within close proximity to each other. The FPASP also acknowledges the changes that are occurring in community planning from a low-
density automobile dependent pattern to one of higher density, mixed-use communities served by alternative transportation modes. Staff has determined that the proposed building coverage ratios, which are consistent with higher density residential development trends, meet the overall concept and purpose established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

Finally, the proposed Specific Plan Amendment includes a modification to the Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) section of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP, Section 4.3.2). Specifically, the Amendment proposes additional language that will provide for placement of the Planned Development Overlay District designation on a public/quasi-public property in the event that the public/quasi-public property is vacated in favor of a more suitable location. In addition, the Amendment proposes additional language that allows for elimination of the Planned Development Overlay District designation from a new public/quasi-public property in the event that the public/quasi-public property is transferred to a residential parcel. Shown below is the existing and proposed language (shown in bold and underlined) for the Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) section of the FPASP:

4.3.2 NON-RESIDENTIAL LAND USES

Public/Quasi-Public (PQP)

The Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) land use designation encompasses a variety of uses that are both desired and required within a comprehensive community setting. PQP uses include schools, government offices, fire and police substations, public utilities, and cultural, recreational and religious facilities.

Consistent with FPASP Policy 4.24, all public/quasi-public sites shown on Figures 4.1 and 11.1 may be relocated or abandoned as minor administrative modifications of the FPASP. The land use of the vacated sites will revert to the lowest adjacent residential land use and will also include the Planned Development (PD) overlay designation. If a public/quasi-public site is transferred to a residential parcel, the parcel’s PD designation shall be deleted (refer to Section 13.3 – Minor Administrative Modifications and Amendments).

The PQP land use designation is consistent with the General Plan Public/Quasi-Public land use designation. Refer to Table A.13 for complete list of permitted and non-permitted uses.

This particular Specific Plan Amendment is being proposed due to the possibility that the middle/high school site (Parcel 171 shown on Attachment No. 2) may be shifted to a new location within the Plan Area. Staff has determined that the proposed Amendment is warranted, as it will ensure the Planned Development (PD) Overlay District designation will track with any changes that may occur to properties assigned a Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) land use designation within the FPASP.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

An Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPRSP) was previously adopted by the City Council on June 28, 2011. Staff has determined that no new impacts will result from implementation of the proposed Specific Plan Amendments that were not already considered with the previous approval of the FPASP. No further environmental review is required.
RECOMMENDATION/PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

MOVE TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL THE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT TO EXPAND THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BOUNDARIES OF THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT, ADD MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE RATIOS, AND MODIFY THE PUBLIC/QUASI-PUBLIC (PQP) SECTION OF THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN WITH THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS:

GENERAL FINDINGS

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


CEQA FINDING

C. AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIR/EIS) FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN (FPAS) WAS PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON JUNE 28, 2011. NO NEW IMPACTS WILL RESULT FROM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS THAT WERE NOT ALREADY CONSIDERED WITH THE PREVIOUS APPROVAL OF THE FPAS. NO FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW IS REQUIRED.

SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT FINDING

D. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN ARE CONSISTENT WITH TH CITY’S GENERAL PLAN, THE ZONING CODE OF THE CITY, AND THE FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE.

Submitted

ELAINE ANDERSEN
Assistant City Manager/Acting Community Development Director
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