DATE: April 25, 2006
TO: Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Community Development Department
SUBJECT: VANCE LANE ESTATES REZONE, TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM – EAST END OF VANCE LANE

i. RESOLUTION NO. 7790 – A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, APPROVE THE VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP TO SUBDIVIDE A 2.13-ACRE PARCEL INTO 7 lots, AND APPROVE THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 4 RESIDENCES AND ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS

ii. ORDINANCE NO. 1055 – AN UNCODIFIED ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING DESIGNATION FOR A 2.13-ACRE SITE FROM RESIDENTIAL, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, LARGE LOT DISTRICT (R-1-L) TO RESIDENTIAL, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, LARGE LOT DISTRICT, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (R-1-L PD) FOR VANCE LANE ESTATES (FIRST READING) (PN05-273)

BACKGROUND / ISSUE
With this current application, the owner/applicant, JPS Properties, LLC is requesting a rezone from R-1-L (Residential, Single-family Dwelling, Large Lot District) to R-1-L PD (Residential, Single-family Dwelling, Large Lot District, Planned Development) and a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map for the development of a 2.13-acre site located at the east end of Vance Lane off of Folsom-Auburn Road. The project is proposed to include seven parcels, four of which are proposed for residential development and three unbuildable remainder parcels. As part of the project, the existing 20-foot road/public utility easement that provides access to current residents of Vance Lane and the proposed property will be abandoned. To provide access to the current and future residents of Vance Lane, a 20-foot private drive will be constructed from Folsom-Auburn Road and terminate in a cul-de-sac at the center of the subject site.

The proposed project was presented to Planning Commission on March 1, 2006, at which the applicant requested that the project be continued to allow time for staff and the applicant to discuss the condition pertaining to the acquisition of off-site rights-of-way and easements to construct the proposed access road (Condition No. 22). The Commission unanimously adopted a motion (6-0-0-1) to continue the hearing to April 5, 2006 (See Attachment 9).

The proposed project returned to the Planning Commission on April 5, 2006 (See Attachment 10). Staff informed the Commission that City staff and the applicant discussed Condition No.
22, and the condition is now acceptable to the applicant/owner. The Commission unanimously adopted a motion (5-0-0-2) to recommend approval of the project, subject to the conditions of approval included with this report.

**POLICY / RULE**

The Folsom Municipal Code (FMC) requires that Rezone requests and Tentative Subdivision Maps be forwarded to the City Council for final action. City Council actions regarding Rezoning are covered under Section 17.68.050 of the Folsom Municipal Code and Tentative Subdivision Maps are covered under Section 16.16.080 of the Folsom Municipal Code.

**ANALYSIS**

**General Plan and Zoning Consistency**

The site is designated SF (Single Family) on the General Plan Land Use Map. The permitted density range is 2–3.9 dwelling units per acre. The project's density is 1.8 dwelling units per acre. The current zoning for the site is R-1-L (Residential, Single-family Dwelling, Large Lot District). The lot widths and front setbacks depicted on the tentative map are not consistent with the requirements of the R-1-L zone (building envelopes are depicted on Attachment 4). Therefore, the owner/applicant is requesting a rezone to a Planned Development overlay to allow flexibility from zoning standards. The following table illustrates the relationship between the current zone and the proposed zone:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGULATED DESIGN ELEMENTS</th>
<th>CODE REQUIREMENT FOR R-1-L ZONING</th>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT DESIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>14,500 s.f.</td>
<td>14,510 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width</td>
<td>75 ft.</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>5 ft./11 ft.</td>
<td>5 ft./11 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Rear Setback</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of the Planned Development Permit process is to allow greater flexibility in the design of 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. The owner/applicant's intent is to provide four large-lot residences while minimizing grading and disturbance to trees. Staff has determined that the proposed large-lot residences will be physically, functionally and visually compatible with the neighboring uses. The proposed development will also be furnished with public utilities. In addition, the proposed development will not cause unacceptable vehicular traffic levels on surrounding streets. Moreover, adequate provision is made for the furnishing of sanitation services and emergency services to the development. Therefore, staff has determined that the proposed project meets the intent, purpose, and standards set forth in the Planned Development District (FMC Section 17.38).

**Land Use Compatibility**

The project site is surrounded by other large single-family lots, most of which are developed. Only the Moyer property, west of the project site (as shown on Attachment 4) is undeveloped. The project area has varying topography, including slopes in excess of 20 percent, trees, and a substantial drainage swale. Due to the steep natural slopes and substantial area covered by oak canopies, these proposed lots may not be suitable for level yard areas or pools. The requirements of the City's Hillside Development Standards will ensure minimal disruption of the existing hillsides, while protecting the natural landforms. Also, staff recommends that building and
grading be limited to the building envelopes as depicted on Attachment 4. Condition 49 has been added to reflect this requirement.

Access and Circulation
As stated previously, the existing 20-foot road/public utility easement that provides access to current residents of Vance Lane and the proposed property will be abandoned. The proposed private road to the project site (Vance Lane) crosses an undeveloped commercial site (adjacent to Folsom-Auburn Road), and serves three other residential parcels northwest and south of the subject property (Moyer, Vance and Kendall). Specifically, the Grading and Drainage Plan shows a 20-foot-wide access road/utility crossing between two undeveloped commercial parcels adjacent to Folsom-Auburn Road. At the property line of the proposed Vance Lane Estates, the road expands to 27 feet in width within a 40-foot right-of-way. The 40-foot right-of-way includes parking and a sidewalk on one side. The road ends at a cul-de-sac with a 50-foot radius. The owner/applicant shall attempt to acquire all required off-site rights-of-way and easements necessary for the construction of the new private access roadway between Folsom-Auburn Road and the project boundary prior to the submittal of the Final Map. Condition 22 has been added to reflect this requirement. Staff further recommends that the owner/applicant restore existing access points to access the project’s private roadway for the Kendall and Vance parcels. Condition 29 has been included to reflect this requirement. Staff also recommends that the owner/applicant install “No Parking” signs on both sides of the private road between Folsom-Auburn Road. In addition to the “No Parking” signs, staff recommends that the owner/applicant install a guide sign displaying the message “Vance Lane” and a directional arrow along northbound Folsom-Auburn Road in advance of the intersection. Conditions 31 and 32 have been added to reflect these requirements.

The proposed project was reviewed by the Traffic Safety Committee at its October 27, 2005 meeting (See Attachment 8). The Committee expressed concerns with respect to the safety of the proposed project access intersection, particularly regarding project-related left turns. To control the left turns, the Committee suggested that the existing Vance Lane private road remain with the implementation of traffic control measures such as a signal at the intersection. Prior to the meeting, staff asked the owner/applicant to undertake a realignment study to see if a four-way signalized intersection at the existing Vance Lane was feasible. The study revealed that the grades of the existing Vance Lane exceeded 12 percent, which would prohibit emergency vehicle access. Moreover, the property owner of the commercial property adjacent to Folsom-Auburn Road and Vance Lane would lose a considerable amount of the developable portion of his property, and thus, the property owner would not agree to the realignment. Ultimately, the Traffic Safety Committee recommended that the owner/applicant install a “Right Turn Only” sign at the intersection of Folsom-Auburn Road and Vance Lane, which would encourage right-in, right-out access only. Condition 33 has been included to reflect this requirement. The Committee also encouraged that the ultimate design provide access that is more directly in line with Old Oak Avenue.

Grading and Drainage
As stated previously, the site is subject to the City's hillside grading ordinance. To reiterate, staff recommends that building and grading be limited to the building envelopes depicted on Attachment 4. Condition 49 has been added to reflect this requirement.
Fire Protection
In light of the project's proximity to flammable vegetation and the topography of the site, staff has determined that the owner/applicant submit a Wildfire Protection Plan to the City's Fire Department's Fire Prevention Division for approval. The plan shall address defensible space, fuel management, access, building resistance and fire resistance. Condition 55 has been included to reflect this requirement.

Emergency vehicle access (EVA) is provided from Folsom-Auburn Road via the proposed access road. Since the road exceeds 600 feet in length and no additional EVA is proposed, the Fire Department and staff have determined that an approved automatic fire sprinkler system be installed in all dwelling units within this project. Condition 53 has been included to reflect this requirement.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW/PUBLIC INPUT
Staff has prepared an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project and determined that with the proposed mitigations, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment (See Attachment 7). A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and noticed for public comment on the project, and mitigation measures have been included as Conditions of Approval.

Staff has received telephone calls and a letter from residents within the project vicinity. Concerns raised include existing easements, the location of the proposed private road, and drainage. The owner/applicant met with owners of the Kendall and Moyer properties in early December 2005 to discuss the project. In addition, the owner/applicant has been in contact with representatives of the David Wilson property.

Several residents from and within the vicinity of Vance Lane attended the March 1, 2006 Planning Commission meeting (See Attachment 9). Joseph C. Clifford of 114 Hillswood Drive, supported the project and wanted to make sure access to the back of his property was maintained. Charlotte Kendall, of 9910 Vance Lane, voiced concern regarding the right-turn only access on to Folsom-Auburn Road and possible tree removal that acts as a buffer to the adjacent property. Wayne Kelly, of 9911 Vance Lane, voiced concern about the location of the new access road in relation to his residence. He further voiced concern about the traffic, noting that it was very difficult to turn left out on to Folsom-Auburn Road. However, a right turn only was not the best alternative for them because when they leave Vance Lane, they are usually going into Folsom, which requires them to turn left. Mr. Jody Perry, of 170 Sunrock, supported the project, stating that development of the site would ensure that the fire department would have better access to protect the homes in the area.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Resolution No. 7790 – A Resolution to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program, approve the Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide a 2.13-acre parcel into 7 lots, and approve the Planned Development Permit for the development of 4 residences and associated site improvements for Vance Lane Estates
2. Ordinance No. 1055 – An Uncodified Ordinance to amend the zoning designation for a 2.13-acre site from Residential, Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District (R-1-L) to Residential, Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District, Planned Development (R-1-L PD) for Vance Lane Estates (PN05-273)
3. Vicinity Map
RECOMMENDATION/CITY COUNCIL ACTION
Staff forwards the Planning Commission recommendation to approve the Rezone and Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map for Vance Lane Estates, based upon the following findings and subject to the conditions of approval included with this report.

CITY COUNCIL ACTION
MOVE TO CONTINUE RESOLUTION NO. 7790 - A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, APPROVE THE VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP TO SUBDIVIDE A 2.13-ACRE PARCEL INTO 7 LOTS, AND APPROVE THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 4 RESIDENCES AND ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS FOR VANCE LANE ESTATES;

AND

MOVE TO INTRODUCE THE FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE NO. 1055 – AN UNCODIFIED ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING DESIGNATION FOR A 2.13-ACRE SITE FROM RESIDENTIAL, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, LARGE LOT DISTRICT (R-1-L) TO RESIDENTIAL, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, LARGE LOT DISTRICT, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (R-1-L PD) FOR VANCE LANE ESTATES.

Submitted,

AMY FEAGANS
Neighborhood Services Director
Attachment 1

Resolution No. 7790 – A Resolution to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program, approve the Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide a 2.13-acre parcel into 7 lots, and approve the Planned Development Permit for the development of 4 residences and associated site improvements for Vance Lane Estates
RESOLUTION NO. 7790

A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, APPROVE THE VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP TO SUBDIVIDE A 2.13-ACRE PARCEL INTO 7 LOTS, AND APPROVE THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 4 RESIDENCES AND ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS FOR VANCE LANE ESTATES (PN 05-273)

WHEREAS, the applicant, JPL Properties, LLC., has proposed to subdivide a 2.13-acre parcel located at the end of Vance Lane into seven lots; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission on April 5, 2006, held a public hearing on the proposed Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map and Planned Development Permit, considered public comment, and adopted a motion (5-0-0-2) to recommend approval of the project to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, notice has been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and City Code; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map meets all standards set forth in the Subdivision Map Act and the Tentative Subdivision Map Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Vance Lane Estates meets all standards set forth in the Planned Development District Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, the proposed Vance Lane Estates is consistent with the General Plan, Zoning Code, and other applicable provisions of the Folsom Municipal Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program, approve the Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide a 2.13-acre parcel into 7 lots, and approve the Planned Development Permit for the development of 4 residences and associated site improvements for Vance Lane Estates with the conditions of approval as set forth on Exhibit A and 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.

B. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING CODE OF THE CITY.
C. THE REZONE FROM R-1-L TO R-1-L PD IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN.

CEQA FINDINGS
D. THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS CONSIDERED THE PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION BEFORE MAKING A DECISION ON THE PROJECT.

E. THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS CONSIDERED COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS.

F. THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION REFLECTS THE INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT AND ANALYSIS OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM.

G. THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION HAS BEEN PREPARED IN COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA AND THE STATE CEQA GUIDELINES, AND AS ADOPTED IS DETERMINED TO BE COMPLETE AND FINAL.

H. ALL POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH THE INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES.

VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FINDINGS
I. THE PROPOSED TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP IS CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY’S SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT.

J. THE DESIGN OF THE VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS WILL NOT CAUSE ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE OR INJURE FISH OR WILDLIFE OR THEIR HABITAT.

K. THE DESIGN OF THE TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS WILL NOT CAUSE PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY PROBLEMS.

L. THE DESIGN OF THE TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND THE TYPE OF IMPROVEMENTS WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH EASEMENTS FOR ACCESS THROUGH, OR USE OF PROPERTY WITHIN, THE TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP.

M. THE SITE IS SPECIFICALLY SUITABLE FOR THIS TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT.

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT FINDINGS
N. 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.

O. THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF THE CITY.
P. THE PROJECT IS PHYSICALLY, FUNCTIONALLY AND VISUALLY COMPATIBLE WITH THE EXISTING AND FUTURE ADJACENT USES AND AREA CHARACTERISTICS.

Q. THERE ARE 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 THIS PROPOSAL.

R. THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT CAUSE UNACCEPTABLE VEHICULAR TRAFFIC LEVELS ON SURROUNDING ROADWAYS, AND THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL PROVIDE ADEQUATE INTERNAL CIRCULATION.

S. THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND GENERAL WELFARE OF PERSONS OR PROPERTY WITHIN THE VICINITY OF THE PROJECT SITE, AND THE CITY AS A WHOLE. ADDITIONALLY, THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL DESIGNED TO ENSURE THAT DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE WILL BE COMPATIBLE TO THE ADJACENT PROPERTY AND THE CITY AS A WHOLE.

HILLSIDE GRADING FINDINGS

T. THE PROPOSED GRADING IS THE MINIMUM NECESSARY TO ALLOW FOR THE REASONABLE USE OF THE SITE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.

U. THE PROPOSED GRADING WILL NOT SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE EROSION OR FLOODING, DEGRADE RIPARIAN HABITATS, OR ENDANGER THE STABILITY OF THE SITE OR ANY ADJACENT PROPERTIES.

V. THE PROPOSED GRADING, WHEN COMPLETED, WILL BE VISUALLY COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING LAND. THE PROJECT HAS BEEN DESIGNED TO MAINTAIN TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT POSSIBLE THE EXISTING VIEWSHEDS ENJOYED BY ADJACENT RESIDENTS. THE OWNER/APPLICANT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MINIMIZING CUT AND FILL ON THE SITE.

W. THE PROPOSED GRADING PRESERVES PROTECTED TREES AS DEFINED IN THE TREE PRESERVATION ORDINANCE ON THE SITE TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE.

X. THE LOTS ON EXISTING SLOPES OF 20 PERCENT OR MORE ARE NECESSARY TO COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 17 (ZONING), AND THAT THE PURPOSES OF THE HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS ORDINANCE CAN BE MET BY ALLOWING LOTS WITH STEEPER BUILDING SITES.
PASSED AND ADOPTED on this 9th day of May 2006, by the following roll-call vote:

AYES: Council Member(s)
NOES: Council Member(s)
ABSENT: Council Member(s)
ABSTAIN: Council Member(s)

Andrew J. Morin, MAYOR

ATTEST:

Christa Schmidt, CITY CLERK
# CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR VANCE LANE ESTATES
## REZONE AND VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP (PN 05-273)

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the attachments referenced below:</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rezone Exhibit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, dated January 26, 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, dated December 19, 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preliminary Sewer and Water Plan, dated December 19, 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This Rezone Exhibit and Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map are approved for creation of seven parcels on a 2.13-acre site located at the east end of Vance Lane. Modifications may be made to the map to respond to site-specific conditions of approval as set forth herein. Minor modifications may be made to this map and/or adopted conditions of approval. Any proposed modifications shall be subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director for substantial compliance with this approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>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, review, set aside, void, or annul any approval by the City or any of its agencies, departments, commissions, agents, officers, employees, or legislative or advisory body concerning or in any way related to the project. The City will promptly notify the owner/applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. If the City should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the owner/applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City or its agents, officers, and employees pursuant to this condition. 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>I, B</td>
<td>CD (P, E) NS (B, RA) PW PR FD PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The City bears its own attorney’s fees and costs; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The City defends the claim, action or proceeding in good faith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>This Rezone and Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map approval granted under this staff report shall remain in effect for two years, to April 5, 2008. Failure to record the Final Map within this time period, without the subsequent extension of this approval, shall result in the termination of this approval.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CD (P, E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Building plans, including all civil engineering and landscape plans, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval to insure conformance with relevant codes, policies, and other requirements of the City of Folsom.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>CD (P, E) NS (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall participate in a mitigation-monitoring program pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 2364 and Public Resources Code 21081.6. The mitigation monitoring and reporting measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for this project 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 with a check mark (✓) in the mitigation measure column. The purpose of this monitoring program is to ensure compliance with the environmental mitigations during project implementation and operation.</td>
<td>G, I</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND FEE REQUIREMENTS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>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>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</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 improvement plans, or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</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>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>If applicable, the owner/applicant shall pay off any existing assessments against the property, or file necessary segregation request and pay applicable fees.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>This project shall be subject to all Citywide development impact fees. These fees may include, but are not limited to, fees for fire protection, park facilities, park equipment, Quimby, Light Rail, TSM, capital facilities and traffic impacts. The fees shall be calculated at the fee rate in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SITE DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the owner/applicant shall have a geotechnical report prepared by an appropriately licensed engineer that includes the analysis of site suitability, proposed foundation design for all proposed structures, and roadway and pavement design.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall be required to place underground all electrical (less than 69 kv), gas, telephone, utility and cable television/communication lines within the boundaries of the project site, whether existing or proposed. Such design and construction shall be to the satisfaction of the affected utilities and the Community Development Department.</td>
<td>B, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall submit a water, sewer and drainage study and provide sanitary sewer, water and storm drainage improvements with corresponding easements, as necessary, in accordance with these documents as approved by the Community Development Department. The minimum fire flow for the site shall be 2,000 gpm at 20-psi pressure in combination with equipping all the homes with approved N.F.P.A. 13D residential fire sprinkler systems. The requirement for residential sprinklers shall be recorded prior to or concurrently with the recording of the Final Map.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall coordinate the planning, development and completion of this project with the various utility agencies (i.e., SMUD, PG&amp;E) and provide the City with verification of their acceptance of the improvements prior to the issuance of a building permit.</td>
<td>B, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>For any improvements constructed on private property that is not under ownership or control of the owner/applicant, a right-of-entry or grant by easement, and if necessary, a permanent easement shall be obtained and provided to the City prior to approval of grading and/or improvement plans.</td>
<td>G, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STORMWATER REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The storm drain improvements shall provide for “Best Management Practices” that meet the requirements of the water quality standards of the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit issued by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board. These facilities shall be constructed concurrent with construction of grading and the initial public improvements and completed and accepted by the City prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for the first building of the first building permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAP REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall acquire private roadway easement(s), slope easement(s), and public utility easement(s) to accommodate required improvements between the project boundary and Folsom-Auburn Road prior to the approval of the Final Map. The owner/applicant shall provide fully executed copies of all required easements to the Community Development Department prior to Final Map approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to the recording of the Final Map, the owner/applicant shall enter into a subdivision improvement agreement with the City, identifying improvements, if any, to be constructed. The owner/applicant shall provide security acceptable to the City, guaranteeing construction of the improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall dedicate to SMUD all necessary underground easements for the electrical facilities that will be necessary to service development of the project. The City will require the owner/applicant to submit written verification from SMUD that any necessary underground easements have been dedicated to SMUD prior to approval of the Final Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall dedicate a 12.5-foot wide public utility easement for underground facilities and appurtenances adjacent to the new roadway within the boundaries of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Legal access from the project to Folsom-Auburn Road must be shown prior to approval of the Final Map. The owner/applicant shall attempt to acquire all required off-site rights-of-way and easements necessary for the construction of the private access roadway between Folsom-Auburn Road and the project boundary prior to approval of the Final Map. If the owner/applicant is unsuccessful in acquiring all required rights-of-way and easements, the owner/applicant shall submit evidence to the City that a &quot;good faith&quot; effort was made in attempting to acquire said rights-of-way and easements. The owner/applicant shall then enter into an agreement or agreements with the City that obligates the owner/applicant for the cost of acquisition of interests in real property for the rights-of-way and/or easements. The agreement shall provide that the owner/applicant shall be responsible for the cost of litigation and other associated costs involved in acquiring the necessary interests in real property and that the owner/applicant shall deposit at least half of the estimated costs of litigation and other associated costs prior to the City obtaining an appraisal of the required property acquisitions. The agreement shall also provide that the owner/applicant shall deposit 125% of the fair market value of the real property interests being acquired within 15 days of the appraisal being obtained. The owner/applicant understands and acknowledges that if the City acquires the access road from the project to Folsom-Auburn Road by eminent domain that the road will be a public street, and not a private road, and it must be constructed to standard City specifications.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Standard subdivision improvements as required by the Folsom Municipal Code, including off-site improvements, shall be provided in accordance with the latest edition of the City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards. Specifically, streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, streetlights and underground infrastructure within the project limits shall be installed to meet City standards for a minor residential street and cul-de-sac. Sidewalk shall not be required on the south side of the private road within the project boundaries. For the off-site portion of the access roadway, a paved private road of a minimum width of 20 feet, without curb, gutter and sidewalk, shall be constructed from Folsom-Auburn Road to the project boundary to the satisfaction of the Community Development and Fire Departments.</td>
<td>M, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The water and sewer mains required to serve this project shall be publicly owned and maintained. A public easement shall be provided to cover these public improvements. The required easements shall be shown on the Final Map.</td>
<td>M, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New water and sewer mains shall be installed from Folsom-Auburn Road to the project. The owner/applicant shall reconnect and/or replace existing sewer laterals to the existing parcels on Vance Lane, which have frontage on the new private roadway serving the project. The sewer laterals shall be shown on the improvement plans for the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall dedicate a public utility easement for underground facilities and appurtenances within and/or adjoining the private roadway, subject to the approval of electric, gas, telephone, and cable providers. All required public utility easements shall be shown on the Final Map.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>The Final Map shall show easements or other mapped provisions for the placement of centralized mail delivery units. The owner/applicant shall provide a concrete base for placement of the centralized mail delivery unit. Specifications and location of such base shall be determined pursuant to the applicable requirements of the Postal Service and the City of Folsom, with due consideration for street light location, traffic safety, security, and consumer convenience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits, the owner/applicant shall provide two copies of the Final Map to the Community Development Director. One copy shall be a hardcopy and the other on a computer diskette in the AutoCAD format.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall restore existing access points to access the project’s private roadway for the Kendall Parcel (APN 213-0580-006) and the Vance Parcel (APN 213-0580-033).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Any reimbursement for improvements constructed by the owner/applicant shall be in accordance with a formal reimbursement agreement entered into between the City and the owner/applicant prior to the approval of the Final Map.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING AND CIRCULATION REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The owner/applicant shall install “No Parking” signs on both sides of the private road between Folsom-Auburn Road and the project boundary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>A guide sign displaying the message “Vance Lane” and a directional arrow shall be erected along northbound Folsom-Auburn Road in advance of the intersection, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall install a “Right Turn Only” sign at the intersection of Folsom-Auburn Road and Vance Lane, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TREE PRESERVATION / LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The City shall retain a certified arborist for the project. The project arborist shall oversee tree removal and preservation of the trees on site during and after construction. The owner/applicant shall provide funding for this arborist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>The Tree Survey shall be updated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of the first grading permit to assess changes in tree condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIR QUALITY REQUIREMENTS**

|   | ✓ | In compliance with Rule 201 of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the owner/applicant of Vance Lane Estates shall verify with SMAQMD if a permit is required before equipment capable of releasing emissions to the atmosphere are used at the project site. The owner/applicant shall comply with the approved permit or provide evidence that a permit is not required. | B, I | CD (P, E) |
| 42. | ✓ | In compliance with Rule 422 of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the owner/applicant of Vance Lane Estates shall use architecture coatings that comply with the volatile organic compound content limits specified in the general rule. | B, I | CD (P, E) |
44. The owner/applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management approved by the Air Quality Attainment Plan regarding fugitive dust. In compliance with the District's Rule 403, the owner/applicant shall comply with the dust-control measures outlined below. These conditions shall be included on the approved construction drawings:
   - All unpaved construction areas shall be sprayed with water as often as necessary to assure that fugitive dust from this project site does not impact adjacent properties. Spraying shall occur more frequently under hot, windy conditions.
   - Stockpiles of soil or other fine materials being left for periods in excess of one day during site construction shall be sprayed and track-walked after the stockpiling is completed.
   - Construction equipment access shall be restricted to defined entry and exit point to control the amount of soil deposition.
   - Paved area at the controlled access points shall be swept and/or washed a minimum of once each day or more frequently than necessary. Haul trucks used for moving material off the project site shall employ appropriate measures to minimize spillage.

**NOISE REQUIREMENTS**

45. Compliance with noise restrictions during the construction phase of the project 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. No construction shall be permitted on Sundays. Construction equipment shall be muffled and shrouded to minimize noise levels.

**SOIL/SITE GRADING REQUIREMENTS**

46. The applicant/owner shall comply with all requirements of Section 14.22 (Hillside Development Standards), in the design and construction of all improvements associated with this subdivision map.

47. Native vegetation shall be retained and protected wherever possible. Exposure of soil areas shall be limited to the immediate areas required for construction operations. The native vegetative ground cover shall not be destroyed, removed or disturbed more than 15 days prior to grading unless otherwise approved by the Community Development Department.

48. Erosion control measures shall be incorporated into construction plans. Erosion control measures shall conform to the City of Folsom requirements and the County of Sacramento Erosion and Sedimentation Control- Standards and Specifications, latest edition and as directed by the Community Development Department.

49. Building and/or grading shall be limited to the building envelopes depicted on the Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map. The building envelopes shall be shown on the Final Map within each lot.
### CULTURAL RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>If any archaeological, cultural, historical resources, artifacts or other features are discovered during the course of construction anywhere on the project site, work shall be suspended in that location until a qualified professional archaeologist assesses the significance of the discovery and provides consultation with staff, the Folsom Historical Society, and the Historic Preservation League of Folsom. Appropriate mitigation, as recommended by the archaeologist, shall be implemented. If agreement cannot be reached, the Planning Commission shall determine the appropriate implementation measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENTS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall obtain, if necessary all required State and Federal permits and provide evidence that said permits have been obtained, subject to the review and approval of staff prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall provide the Folsom-Cordova Unified School District with a copy of the recorded Final map.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A deed restriction requiring all new residences to be equipped with automatic fire sprinkler systems shall be recorded in conjunction with recording of the Final Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Prior to the recording of the map, the Community Development and Fire Departments shall review and approve all detailed design plans for accessibility of emergency fire equipment, fire hydrant flow location, and other construction features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall submit a Wildfire Protection Plan (FPP) to the Fire Prevention Division of the City of Folsom Fire Department for approval. The FPP shall include mitigation measures consistent with the unique problems resulting from flammable vegetation and topography of the proposed site. In addition, the FPP shall address defensible space, fuel management, access, building resistance, and fire resistance. The annual maintenance and funding of the FPP shall be the responsibility of the Home Owners' Association and recorded in CC&amp;R's. The Wildfire Protection Plan (FPP) shall be approved by the City of Folsom Fire Department prior to approval of the Final Map.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICE/SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 56.    | The owner/applicant shall consult with the Police Department in order to incorporate all reasonable crime prevention measures. The following security/safety measures are required during the construction phase of the project:  
- A security guard shall be on-duty at the site or a six-foot security fence shall be constructed around the perimeter of construction areas.  
- Employ proper security measures for the safety of all construction equipment and unit appliances.  
- Landscaping shall not cover exterior doors or windows, block line-of-sight at intersections or screen overhead lighting. | B, FD PD |

### MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall form a Homeowners Association, Mello-Roos Community Facilities Services Maintenance District, and/or other funding mechanism as approved by the City, for the maintenance and upkeep of all common areas and improvements within the project area boundary (i.e., street, landscape, street lighting and sidewalks).</td>
<td>M, I CD (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>To discourage the migration of undesirable small animals into adjacent developed areas during the development of the project, the owner/applicant shall install a barrier along the project boundary to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. The barrier shall consist of wire-mesh fabric with openings not exceeding 1/2-inch. The height of the barrier shall be at least 18 inches (above the ground surface), and shall be buried into the ground at least twelve inches. The barrier shall be installed by the owner/applicant, as approved by the Community Development Department, prior to any construction disturbance on the site, including clearing and grading operations.</td>
<td>G CD (P, E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ordinance No. 1055 – An Uncodified Ordinance to amend the zoning designation for a 2.13-acre site from Residential, Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District (R-1-L) to Residential, Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District, Planned Development (R-1-L PD) for Vance Lane Estates (PN05-273)
ORDINANCE NO. 1055

AN UNCODIFIED ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING DESIGNATION FOR A 2.13-ACRE SITE FROM RESIDENTIAL, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, LARGE LOT DISTRICT (R-1-L) TO RESIDENTIAL, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, LARGE LOT DISTRICT, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (R-1-L PD) LOCATED AT THE END OF VANCE LANE (PN05-273)

The City Council of the City of Folsom hereby does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. PURPOSE
A. A certain property, including 2.13-acre parcel, located at the end of Vance Lane off of Folsom-Auburn Road, is proposed for rezoning, from Residential, Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District (R-1-L) to Residential, Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District, Planned Development District (R-1-L PD); and
B. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the objectives, goals and policies of the Folsom General Plan; and
C. A duly noticed public hearing was held before the Planning Commission on April 5, 2006; and
D. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Initial Study are incorporated herein by reference; and
E. Notice of hearing before the City Council has been given in the form and in the manner required by State statute and Folsom City Code.

SECTION 2. CHANGE OF ZONING MAP DESIGNATION
The Zoning Map designation for the subject parcel is hereby amended from Residential, Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District (R-1-L) to Residential, Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District, Planned Development District (R-1-L PD) as set forth on Exhibit A.

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY
If any section, subsection, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this Ordinance and each section, subsection,
sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, clauses, phrases or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days from and after its passage and adoption, provided it is published in full or in summary within (20) days after its adoption in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Folsom.

This ordinance was introduced and the title thereof read at the regular meeting of the City Council on April 25, 2006 and the second reading occurred at the regular meeting of the City Council on May 9, 2006.

On a motion by Council member ______________________, seconded by Council member ______________________, the foregoing was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Folsom at a regular meeting thereof, on this 9th day of May 2006, by the following vote to wit:

AYES: Council member(s):

NOES: Council member(s):

ABSTAIN: Council member(s):

ABSENT: Council member(s):

Andrew J. Morin, MAYOR

ATTEST:

Christa Schmidt, CITY CLERK
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Vicinity Map
Vicinity Map
Attachment 4

Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, dated January 26, 2005
VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT EXHIBIT
VANCE LANE ESTATES
CITY OF FOLSOM, CALIFORNIA

PROJECT NOTES

ACCESS DETAIL MAP

VICINITY MAP
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Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, dated December 19, 2005
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Preliminary Sewer and Water Plan, dated December 19, 2005
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Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Mitigation Monitoring Program
City of Folsom
Mitigated Negative Declaration
Vance Lane Estates
Rezone and Tentative Subdivision Map
(PN05-273)

The Community Development Director of the City of Folsom, California, a Charter City, does prepare, make, declare, and publish this Mitigated Negative Declaration for the following described project:

Project Description
The applicant, JPS Properties, LLC, is requesting approval of a Rezoning from R-1-L (Residential, Single-family Dwelling, Large Lot District) to R-1-L PD (Residential, Single-family Dwelling, Large Lot District, Planned Development) and a Tentative Subdivision Map for the development of a 2.19 acre site located on the east end of Vance Lane. The project is proposed to include seven lots, four of which are proposed for single-family homes. The General Plan land use designation for the site is SF, Single Family (2-3.9 dwelling units per acre) and the zoning is R-1-L, Residential Single-Family-Dwelling Large-Lot District. The project site is an infill site, surrounded by existing single-family development on all sides as well as vacant commercial property and Folsom-Auburn Road to the west. Residential lot sizes range from 14,510 to 24,659 square feet. The gross density of the site is less than 2 units per acre. A private street within a 40’ road/public utility easement is proposed to provide access to all four residential lots along the southern boundary of the site. The private drive will be improved from Folsom-Auburn Road and terminate in a cul-de-sac at the center of the subject site.

The City of Folsom, Community Development Department has reviewed the proposed project and concludes that no impacts will result from the implementation of the proposed project with the incorporation of identified mitigation measures. This environmental review process and Mitigated Negative Declaration filing is pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 6, Sections 15070 and 15071 of the California Administrative Code. A copy of this document may be reviewed/obtained at the City of Folsom, Community Development Department at 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California 95630. (Project Planner – Nelia Dyer, Associate Planner (916) 355-7383)

Copies of the proposal are on file in the Community Development Department, 50 Natoma Street. Interested persons are invited to express their opinions. If you challenge the actions in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearings or in written correspondence delivered to the City at, or prior to, the public hearings.

GAIL FURNESS DE PARDO
City of Folsom
January 31, 2006
Description of Project: The applicant, JPS Properties, LLC, is requesting approval of a Rezoning from R-1-L (Residential, Single-family Dwelling, Large Lot District) to R-1-L PD (Residential, Single-family Dwelling, Large Lot District, Planned Development) and a Tentative Subdivision Map for the development of a 2.19 acre site located on the east end of Vance Lane. The project is proposed to include seven lots, four of which are proposed for single-family homes. The project site is an infill site, surrounded by existing single-family development on all sides as well as vacant commercial property and Folsom-Auburn Road to the west. Residential lot sizes range from 14,510 to 24,659 square feet. The gross density of the site is less than 2 units per acre. A private street within a 40’ road/public utility easement is proposed to provide access to all four residential lots along the southern boundary of the site. The private drive will be improved from Folsom-Auburn Road and terminate in a cul-de-sac at the center of the subject site.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Folsom-Auburn Road, vacant commercial property and residential uses bound the site to the west, and single-family development to the north, south, and east. The site is currently vacant with moderate to steep sloping topography, with the highest point at the center of the site, sloping down to the east and west. Along the eastern edge of the site is a large drainage swale. The site contains oak trees, pine trees, and non-native grasses.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected: The project that is the subject of this Initial Study is consistent with the Folsom General Plan and with the applicable zoning on this project site. In preparing this Initial Study, the City has relied on the General Plan and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared with that General Plan, together with the Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Consideration adopted by the City Council in October 1988 when the Council adopted the General Plan and certified the EIR. Pursuant to Section 21083.3 of the Public Resources Code, the City incorporates by reference these documents and their associated Statements of Overriding Consideration, which are available for examination at the Office of the City Clerk and the Community Development Department, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California.

This Initial Study focuses on whether the proposed project may cause significant effects on the environment that were not examined in the General Plan EIR or the previous environmental analysis prepared for this project site. In particular, consistent with Section 21083.3, this Initial Study is intended to assess any effects on the environment which are peculiar to the proposed project or to the parcels on which the project would be located and which were not addressed or analyzed as significant effects in the General Plan EIR, or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the previous EIR. The Initial Study is also intended to assess whether any environmental effects of the project are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or by other means [Section 15152(b)(2) of the California Environmental Quality Act]. If such revisions, conditions or other means are identified, they will be identified as mitigation measures.
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

(Check the appropriate boxes that are discussed in the body of the study)

- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Transportation/Traffic
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Noise
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Public Services
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation

Determination: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects: (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards; and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon this proposed project, no further analysis is required.

Signature: [Signature]
Printed Name: Gail Furness de Pardo
For: The City of Folsom
Date: January 31, 2006
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

Environmental Impacts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Incorporation</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. Land Use and Planning: Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community? 
   - 

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, Specific Plan, Local Coastal Program, or Zoning Ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
   - X

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?
   - X

Discussion: There are no established communities (including low-income or minority communities) on the project site that will be impacted or disrupted with the development of the proposed project. In addition, with single-family development surrounding the subject property, the proposed project will be a continuation of the adjacent uses. Therefore, no established community in the surrounding area will be physically divided.

The General Plan land use designation is SF (Single Family) and zoning designation for the project site is R-1-L (Single Family Dwelling, Large Lot District). The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation. Also, the proposed Planned Development overlay will not conflict with any known applicable plans or policies by agencies with jurisdiction over the project.

No other adverse land use impacts will result from the implementation of the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

II. Agricultural Resources: Would the project:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of State-wide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
   - X

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
   - X

c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, as a result of their location or nature, could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?
   - X

Discussion: No agricultural crops are currently grown on the project site or in the project area, and the development of the site will not impact farmlands nor create an incompatible use for agricultural activities (as none-exist in the immediate project area). The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract.

No adverse agricultural resource impacts will result from the implementation of the project. No mitigation is required.
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III. Aesthetics: Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  

b. Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?

c. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Discussion:
The site is in a natural condition and is located off of the Folsom-Auburn Scenic Corridor. Because of its elevation above the road level, there are few points along Folsom-Auburn Road from which this site is visible. Therefore, impacts to the Corridor are considered less than significant.

The project area contains approximately 118 trees, 81 of which meet the criteria to be considered under the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance. Of the 81 protected trees, 31 trees are proposed to be removed as a result of the development of the subdivision. Specifically, 12 trees have been identified that will need to be removed to allow for the construction of the roadway and other infrastructure, while an additional 20 trees have been identified for removal to allow for the development of individual lots within the project. Pursuant to Chapter 12.16 of the Folsom Municipal Code, the owner/applicant will be required to mitigate the removal of the 31 protected trees. Mitigation measures regarding tree preservation are found in the Biological Resources section.

Although the project will introduce new light sources to the site in the form of individual residential lighting and street lighting, impacts are considered less than significant due to the small size of the project. In addition, a standard condition will require the project to shield and direct the streetlights to further minimize impacts. Light generated by this project will be comparable to that of the surrounding residential development.

IV. Population and Housing: Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new residences and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through the extension of roadways or other infrastructure)?

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing residences, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion: The project proposes 4 residential lots, but because of the small size of the project, implementation of the project will not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. Because the project site is considered an infill development project (i.e., all of the properties surrounding the site are either developed or approved for development), implementation of the project will not induce substantial growth in the area, which had not already been anticipated in the City’s approved General Plan. There are no existing residences or affordable housing which will be replaced by this project. This proposed project will not significantly affect the existing housing supply nor would it create a demand for additional housing. No adverse impacts will result.
V. Geology and Soils: Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:
   
   i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most-recent Alquist-Pilo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? _ _ _X _
   
   ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? X
   
   iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? _ _ _X
   
   iv. Landslides? _ _ _X _

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil? _ _ _X _

c. Be located on strata or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? _ _ _X _

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? _ _ _X _

Discussion: Historically, seismic activity in the Folsom area has been limited. There are no known faults or fault-related features on or near the project site. However, moderately strong ground shaking from earthquakes originating on active faults within a 50-mile radius of the project site can be experienced. Construction of the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of the State Building Code will reduce potential seismic impacts to a less than significant level.

The project is subject to provisions of the City’s Hillside Development ordinance, which will require engineered grading plans prior to development.

Development of the project site is not anticipated to require any significant movement of soils or compaction of said materials. The applicant will be required to provide a complete geotechnical report before the design of the building foundations are finalized. All City and County requirements for erosion control will be applied to the graded project site. To minimize any impacts related to erosion, the following mitigation measure is recommended:

- Erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be incorporated into construction plans. These measures shall conform to the City of Folsom requirements and the County of Sacramento Erosion and Sedimentation Control Standards and Specifications—current edition and as directed by the Community Development Department.

No other geology and soils impacts were identified. Implementation of the above-stated mitigation measures will reduce the identified geology and soils impacts to less than significant levels.
VI. **Hydrology and Water Quality:** *Would the project:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrology and Water Quality</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off the project site?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface run-off in a manner that would result in flooding on or off the project site?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute run-off water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Potential impact of project construction on storm water runoff?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Potential impact of project post-construction activity on storm water runoff?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Potential for discharge of storm water from material storage areas, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas or loading docks, or other outdoor work areas?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Potential for discharge of storm water to impair the beneficial uses of the receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefit?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Potential for the discharge of storm water to cause significant harm on the biological integrity of the waterways and water bodies?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Potential for significant changes in the flow velocity or volume of storm water runoff that can cause environmental harm?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Potential for significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** In the adoption of the General Plan and the certification of the EIR which accompanied the General Plan, the City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations to address the unavoidable significant adverse impacts which may result from the implementation of the General Plan. While it is the intent of the
General Plan to provide policies and implementation actions for protecting important environmental and human resources in the City, the policies and implementation actions may be insufficient in certain areas, because the General Plan’s land use designations and development policies will accommodate growth that may have significant adverse impacts. In consideration of the environmental effects which may result from the implementation of the General Plan, the City Council concluded that, for increased water demands, the economic, social and environmental benefits which will be derived from the implementation of the General Plan, when weighed against the inherent uncertainties affecting the growth in and around the City, override the unavoidable and irreversible environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the General Plan. Although this project will incrementally contribute to increased water demands, the project in and of itself will not create significant water demand impacts which were not considered in the General Plan or accompanying EIR.

Because the site is currently undeveloped, implementation of the project will result in the addition of new impervious surfaces to the project site. However, this is a normal consequence associated with the development of impervious surfaces to the project site.

The project site is not within a 100-year flood plain as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Accordingly, development of the proposed project will not expose persons to water-related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves.

Because there are no waterways or bays of water on or adjacent to this project site, implementation of the proposed project will not expose people or property to water-related hazards. To offset any potential water-related impacts, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

- The storm drain improvement plans shall provide for “Best Management Practices” that meet the requirements of the water quality standards of the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit issued by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board. These facilities shall be constructed concurrent with construction of grading and the initial public improvements and shall be completed prior to final occupancy of the first building.

- The owner/applicant shall submit a water, sewer, and drainage study and provide sanitary sewer, water, and storm drainage improvements with corresponding easements, as necessary, in accordance with these documents as approved by the Community Development Department.

A breach of the right wing of Folsom Dam, located approximately 1 mile north of the project site would result in the inundation of the project site to a level in excess of 5 feet, within 55 minutes. The maintenance program by the Bureau of Reclamation and the State Department for Parks and Recreation mitigates the risk for a breach to a less than significant level.

No other hydrology and water quality impacts were identified. Implementation of the above-stated mitigation measures will reduce the identified hydrology and water quality impacts to less than significant levels.
VII. Transportation/Traffic: Would the project:

a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic volumes and capacity of the roadway system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?  
   - No Impact

b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roadways or highways?  
   - No Impact

c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?  
   - No Impact

d. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?  
   - No Impact

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?  
   - Significant Mitigation

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?  
   - Significant Mitigation

g. Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?  
   - Significant Mitigation

Discussion: In the adoption of the General Plan and the certification of the EIR, which accompanied the General Plan, the City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations to address the unavoidable significant adverse impacts that may result from the implementation of the General Plan. While it is the intent of the General Plan to provide policies and implementation actions for protecting important environmental and human resources in the City, the policies and implementation actions may be insufficient in certain areas, because the General Plan’s land use designations and development policies will accommodate growth that may have significant adverse impacts. In consideration of the environmental effects which may result from the implementation of the General Plan, the City Council concluded that, for the underattainment of transportation Level of Service goals, the economic, social and environmental benefits which will be derived from the implementation of the General Plan, when weighed against the inherent uncertainties affecting the growth in and around the City, override the unavoidable and irreversible environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the General Plan. Although this project will incrementally contribute to the underattainment of transportation Level of Service goals, the project in and of itself will not create significant transportation impacts that were not considered in the General Plan or accompanying EIR.

A private street within a 40’ road/public utility easement is proposed to provide access to all four residential lots along the southern boundary of the site. The private drive will be improved from Folsom-Auburn Road and terminate in a cul-de-sac at the center of the subject site. To minimize any impacts related to traffic, parking, and circulation, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

- The owner/applicant shall install “No Parking” signs on both sides of the private road between Folsom-Auburn Road and the project boundary.

- A guide sign displaying the message “Vance Lane” and a directional arrow shall be erected along northbound Folsom-Auburn Road in advance of the intersection, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.
The owner/applicant shall install a “Right Turn Only” sign at the intersection of Folsom-Auburn Road and Vance Lane, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

This project will have no effect on alternative transportation policies.

VIII. Noise: Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact Incorporation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to, or the generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to, or the generation of, excessive noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion: The proposed project will result in construction noise impacts on surrounding properties. To address temporary construction-related noise impacts, the following standard condition is recommended:

- 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. weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays. Construction equipment shall be muffled and shrouded to minimize noise levels.

With the construction of single-family residences, a compatible buffer will be created with neighboring properties minimizing sound impacts. Daily sound would be increased at the project site when compared to its current undeveloped state, but the impact of noise generated would be minimal to surrounding residences due to lot sizes and rear setbacks. In addition, the project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

The proposed project is located approximately 860 feet from Folsom-Auburn Road. Vehicular noise from Folsom-Auburn Road will be minimized by the distance from the road along with the buffer created with neighboring properties and trees.
Air Quality: Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan? 

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? 

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Discussion: In the adoption of the General Plan and the certification of the EIR, which accompanied the General Plan, the City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations to address the unavoidable significant adverse impacts that may result from the implementation of the General Plan. While it is the intent of the General Plan to provide policies and implementation actions for protecting important environmental and human resources in the City, the policies and implementation actions may be insufficient in certain areas, because the General Plan's land use designations and development policies will accommodate growth that may have significant adverse impacts. In consideration of the environmental effects, which may result from the implementation of the General Plan, the City Council concluded that, for air quality, the CO (carbon monoxide) measurements forecasted for the build-out of the General Plan would be over the eight-hour standard for CO. This proposed project would be an incremental contributor to the overall exceedence of these air quality standards. Although this project will incrementally contribute to air quality impacts, the project in and of itself will not create significant air quality impacts which were not considered in the General Plan or accompanying EIR.

Construction of the proposed project will result in short-term air quality impacts such as dust generated by clearing and grading activities, exhaust emissions from gas- and diesel-powered construction equipment, and vehicular emissions associated with the commuting of construction workers. Local particulate concentrations would increase during construction, and it is likely that the State's particulate standard may be temporarily exceeded in surrounding areas.

With regards to the alteration of air movement in the project area, development of the currently undeveloped site will result in an incremental alteration to the existing air movement in the project area. This alteration would result from any development project on this site. The applicant is proposing the construction of 4 single-family homes that will be similar in size and scale to other homes constructed within the project area. The presence of the new homes will have an incremental impact on air movement patterns in the project area, but should not significantly change air movement patterns in the project area.

The property owner will be required to comply with the rules and regulations of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), during the development of the Vance Lane Estates. Specific rules that relate to the grading and construction activities include, but are not limited to the following requirements:

- In compliance with Rule 201 of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the applicant/developer of Vance Lane Estates shall verify with SMAQMD if a permit is required before equipment capable of releasing emissions to the atmosphere are used at the project site.
The applicant/developer shall comply with the approved permit or provide evidence that a permit is not required.

- In compliance with Rule 442 of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the applicant/developer of Vance Lane Estates shall use architectural coatings that comply with the volatile organic compound content limits specified in the general rule.

- The owner/applicant shall comply with the recommendations found in the Air Quality Attainment Plan approved by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. In compliance with the District’s Rule 403, the owner/applicant shall comply with the dust-control measures outlined below. These conditions shall be included on the approved construction drawings:
  - All unpaved construction areas shall be sprayed with water as often as necessary to assure that fugitive dust from this project site does not impact adjacent properties. Spraying shall occur more frequently under hot, windy conditions.
  - Stockpiles of soil or other fine materials being left for periods in excess of one day during site construction shall be sprayed and track-walked after the stock-piling is completed.
  - Construction equipment access shall be restricted to defined entry and exit point to control the amount of soil deposition.
  - Paved area are the controlled access points shall be swept and/or washed a minimum of one each day or more frequently than necessary. Haul trucks used for moving material off the project site shall employ appropriate measures to minimize spillage.

Implementation of these air quality control measures will reduce the potential impacts of the project development to a less than significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>With Less than Significant Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact Incorporation</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Biological Resources: Would the project:

- Adversely impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, any endangered, rare or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?
- Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service?
- Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service?
- Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal areas) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native
resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of
native wildlife nursery sites?  X

f. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological
Resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  X

g. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation
Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved
local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?  X

Discussion: The project site is comprised of primarily oak woodlands, a drainage swale and slopes that exceed
20% in some locations. Building envelopes have been identified on the lots identified for residential development,
and the project is subject to the City’s Hillside Development Ordinance, minimizing site disturbance. In addition
to the City’s Hillside Development Ordinance, the project is subject to the Tree Preservation Ordinance. To
minimize any impacts related to trees, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

- The City shall retain a certified arborist for the project. The project arborist shall oversee tree removal and
  preservation of the trees on site during and after construction. The applicant shall provide funding for this
  arborist. A deposit based on the estimated costs for these services as determined by the City of Folsom
  shall be provided in advance of the start of work.

- The Tree Survey shall be updated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department prior to
  the issuance of the first grading permit to assess changes in tree condition.

- A Tree Permit issued by the Community Development Department shall be obtained prior to the
  commencement of any work within the dripline of a Protected Tree.

- A copy of the approved Tree Removal Permit shall be maintained on the job site, in a visible location, for
  the duration of construction. Failure to comply with this condition shall result in the issuance of a “Stop
  Work” order until compliance with the condition is met.

- Trees to be preserved on the site shall be protected during construction by placing a highly visible, orange
  mesh construction fence, four feet or more in height, a minimum of one foot outside the dripline of each
  tree or group of trees identified for preservation. Said fencing shall be in place for the duration of
  construction. Placement of the protective fencing shall be subject to the review and approval of staff prior
  to the issuance of any grading or building permits.

- Signs shall be posted on all sides of the protective fencing stating that the enclosed trees are to be
  preserved. Said signs shall comply with the language requirements provided by the City of Folsom (i.e.,
  penalty for damage to, or removal of, the protected tree). The number of posted signs required for the site
  shall be determined by City staff.

- Any existing paving or concrete that is to be removed that is within the dripline of trees identified for
  preservation shall be removed by hand. No heavy-duty construction equipment (i.e., bulldozers, tractors)
  shall be permitted within the dripline of trees identified for preservation.

- The parking of vehicles or equipment or storage of materials within the protected zone of trees is
  prohibited at all times.

The Environmental Impact Report prepared in conjunction with the adoption of the City’s General Plan did not
identify this site as containing significant habitat. Because it is surrounded by existing development, it is not part
of a wildlife corridor. In addition, it is not part of any adopted habitat conservation plan.
No other biological impacts were identified. Implementation of the above-stated condition will reduce the identified impacts to a less than significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### XI. Mineral Resources: Would the project:

- a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist that would be of value to the region and residents of the State?  
  - X

- b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, Specific Plan or other land use plan?  
  - X

**Discussion:** The project site is not identified on the City’s General Plan as having a resource (e.g., quarry material) that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State. No mitigation is required.

### XII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Would the project:

- a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  
  - X

- b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  
  - X

- c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  
  - X

- d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?  
  - X

- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  
  - X

- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  
  - X

- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  
  - X

- h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?  
  - X
Discussion: No hazardous materials beyond those typical for single-family housing and its construction, such as household chemicals and fuel for construction equipment, are anticipated to be used on site. The project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. At the time of developing the site, all existing roads will remain open during the construction period so there will be no interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. To minimize any impacts related to wildland fires, the following mitigation measure is recommended:

- The applicant/owner shall submit a Wildfire Protection Plan (FPP) to the Fire Prevention Division of the City of Folsom Fire Department for approval. The FPP shall include mitigation measures consistent with the unique problems resulting from flammable vegetation and topography of the proposed site. In addition, the FPP shall address defensible space. Fuel management, access, building resistance, and fire resistance. The annual maintenance and funding of the FPP shall be the responsibility of the Home Owners’ Association and recorded in the CC&R’s.

The proposed project is located outside of the geologic units that are likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos in the City of Folsom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XIII. Public Services: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

a. Fire protection? 
   - X
b. Police protection? 
   -
c. Schools? 
   - X
d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? 
   - X
e. Other government services or facilities? 
   - X

Discussion: Implementation of the proposed project will result in an incremental increase in demand for all listed municipal services, but the demand is considered to be less than significant because the development of this site has been anticipated in the City’s General Plan, and impact fees have been established based upon the development of this project site. To reduce the potential impact to public services, conditions of approval are included with this project requiring the applicant to participate in the funding of its pro-rata share of the public services.

To offset any potential impacts related to fire protection, the following mitigation measure is recommended:

- Prior to the issuance of any building permits for this project, the applicant will be required to verify that the fire-flow requirements and the adequacy of rights-of-way for fire and police vehicles are sufficient to ensure compliance with City and State standards, as well as the availability of all services required by this project.

No other public service impacts were identified. Implementation of the above-stated mitigation measures will reduce the identified impacts to less than significant levels.
### IXV. Utilities and Service Systems: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Are sufficient supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Has the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Comply with Federal, State and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** Because the proposed project would permit development of a presently undeveloped site, there will be incremental impacts on all above-listed utilities and service systems. The development is consistent with the General Plan and these impacts have been considered as part of the adoption of the General Plan, and policies and implementation programs are in place to serve the proposed level of development. The project is expected to generate amounts of solid waste typical of single-family residences. The Sacramento County Landfill is expected to be available through 2040.

### XV. Cultural Resources: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource (i.e., an artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that the resource contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best available example of its type, or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? X

Discussion: Extensive excavation has occurred in the project area without recovery of cultural or archaeological resources of human remains. In the event that resources are discovered, the following mitigation measure is recommended:

- If any archaeological, cultural, historical resources, artifacts or other features are discovered during the course of construction anywhere on the project site, work shall be suspended in that location until a qualified professional archaeologist assesses the significance of the discovery and provides consultation with staff, Folsom Historical Society, and the Historic Preservation League of Folsom. Appropriate mitigation, as recommended by the archaeologist, shall be implemented. If agreement cannot be reached, the Planning Commission shall determine the appropriate implementation measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Potentially With Less than Significant Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Incorporation Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVI. Recreation: Would the project:

a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? X

b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? X

Discussion: The City charges development impact fees to all new development to mitigate the project’s impacts on park and recreation facilities. These impact fees will then be used to address the identified future needs for the City’s park system. These fees, and the associated-funded improvements, would mitigate any impacts of this project. No additional mitigation is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Potentially With Less than Significant Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Incorporation Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? X

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects) X
c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  

Discussion: Appropriate mitigation measures, in recognition of potential environmental impacts, have been included in the project to reduce the identified impacts to a less than significant level. The applicant has agreed to implement each of the mitigation measures recommended or suggested in this document to reduce potentially adverse effects to a less than significant level.

XVIII. Earlier Analyses:

a. Earlier Analyses Used: City of Folsom General Plan; EIR for the Folsom General Plan; EIR for the Broadstone Unit No. 2 Master Plan; Mitigated Negative Declaration approved for the Elliott Broadstone II Affordable Housing Site General Plan Amendment/Rezoning. All documents identified above and elsewhere mentioned in this document, and cited herein, are available for review at the City of Folsom Community Development Department, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California, 95630.

b. Impacts Adequately Addressed: As noted above, the project that is the subject of this Initial Study is consistent with the Folsom General Plan. Each of its potentially significant effects is within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the EIR prepared in connection with that General Plan, and the mitigation measures incorporated into the project are based upon the analysis in that document.

c. Mitigation Measures: The mitigation measures incorporated into the project, which mitigate all potentially significant effects of the project to less than significant levels, are consistent with the General Plan and related EIR findings, and were based upon site-specific conditions for the project, as described in detail above.
Mitigation Monitoring Program

LAND USE AND PLANNING
- No mitigation is required.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES
- No mitigation is required.

AESTHETICS
- No mitigation is required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING
- No mitigation is required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS
- Erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be incorporated into construction plans. These measures shall conform to the City of Folsom requirements and the County of Sacramento Erosion and Sedimentation Control Standards and Specifications-current edition and as directed by the Community Development Department.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY
- The storm drain improvement plans shall provide for “Best Management Practices” that meet the requirements of the water quality standards of the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit issued by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board. These facilities shall be constructed concurrent with construction of grading and the initial public improvements and shall be completed prior to final occupancy of the first building.

- The owner/applicant shall submit a water, sewer, and drainage study and provide sanitary sewer, water, and storm drainage improvements with corresponding easements, as necessary, in accordance with these documents as approved by the Community Development Department.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC
- “No Parking” signs shall be installed on both sides of the private road between Folsom-Auburn Road and the project boundary.

- A guide sign displaying the message “Vance Lane” and a directional arrow shall be erected along northbound Folsom-Auburn Road in advance of the intersection, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

- The owner/applicant shall install a “Right Turn Only” sign at the intersection of Folsom-Auburn Road and Vance Lane, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

NOISE
- 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. weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays. Construction equipment shall be muffled and shrouded to minimize noise levels.

AIR QUALITY
- In compliance with Rule 201 of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the applicant/developer of Vance Lane Estates shall verify with SMAQMD if a permit is required before equipment capable of releasing emissions to the atmosphere are used at the project site. The applicant/developer shall comply with the approved permit or provide evidence that a permit is not required.
In compliance with Rule 442 of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the applicant/developer of Vance Lane Estates shall use architectural coatings that comply with the volatile organic compound content limits specified in the general rule.

The owner/applicant shall comply with the recommendations found in the Air Quality Attainment Plan approved by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. In compliance with the District’s Rule 403, the owner/applicant shall comply with the dust-control measures outlined below. These conditions shall be included on the approved construction drawings:

- All unpaved construction areas shall be sprayed with water as often as necessary to assure that fugitive dust from this project site does not impact adjacent properties. Spraying shall occur more frequently under hot, windy conditions.
- Stockpiles of soil or other fine materials being left for periods in excess of one day during site construction shall be sprayed and track-walked after the stock-piling is completed.
- Construction equipment access shall be restricted to defined entry and exit point to control the amount of soil deposition.
- Paved area are the controlled access points shall be swept and/or washed a minimum of one each day or more frequently than necessary. Haul trucks used for moving material off the project site shall employ appropriate measures to minimize spillage.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

- The City shall retain a certified arborist for the project. The project arborist shall oversee tree removal and preservation of the trees on site during and after construction. The applicant shall provide funding for this arborist. A deposit based on the estimated costs for these services as determined by the City of Folsom shall be provided in advance of the start of work.

- The Tree Survey shall be updated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of the first grading permit to assess changes in tree condition.

- A Tree Permit issued by the Community Development Department shall be obtained prior to the commencement of any work within the dripline of a Protected Tree.

- A copy of the approved Tree Removal Permit shall be maintained on the job site, in a visible location, for the duration of construction. Failure to comply with this condition shall result in the issuance of a “Stop Work” order until compliance with the condition is met.

- Trees to be preserved on the site shall be protected during construction by placing a highly visible, orange mesh construction fence, four feet or more in height, a minimum of one foot outside the dripline of each tree or group of trees identified for preservation. Said fencing shall be in place for the duration of construction. Placement of the protective fencing shall be subject to the review and approval of staff prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits.

- Signs shall be posted on all sides of the protective fencing stating that the enclosed trees are to be preserved. Said signs shall comply with the language requirements provided by the City of Folsom (i.e., penalty for damage to, or removal of, the protected tree). The number of posted signs required for the site shall be determined by City staff.

- Any existing paving or concrete that is to be removed that is within the dripline of trees identified for preservation shall be removed by hand. No heavy-duty construction equipment (i.e., bulldozers, tractors) shall be permitted within the dripline of trees identified for preservation.
• The parking of vehicles or equipment or storage of materials within the protected zone of trees is prohibited at all times.

**MINERAL RESOURCES**
• No mitigation is required.

**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**
• The applicant/owner shall submit a Wildfire Protection Plan (FPP) to the Fire Prevention Division of the City of Folsom Fire Department for approval. The FPP shall include mitigation measures consistent with the unique problems resulting from flammable vegetation and topography of the proposed site. In addition, the FPP shall address defensible space. Fuel management, access, building resistance, and fire resistance. The annual maintenance and funding of the FPP shall be the responsibility of the Home Owners' Association and recorded in the CC&R's.

**PUBLIC SERVICES**
• Prior to the issuance of any improvement plans or building permits, the Community Development and Fire Departments shall review and approve all detailed design plans for accessibility of emergency fire equipment, fire hydrant flow location, and other construction features.

**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**
• No mitigation is required.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**
• If any archaeological, cultural, historical resources, artifacts or other features are discovered during the course of construction anywhere on the project site, work shall be suspended in that location until a qualified professional archaeologist assesses the significance of the discovery and provides consultation with staff, Folsom Historical Society, and the Historic Preservation League of Folsom. Appropriate mitigation, as recommended by the archaeologist, shall be implemented. If agreement cannot be reached, the Planning Commission shall determine the appropriate implementation measure.
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Minutes from the October 27, 2005
Traffic Safety Committee Meeting
CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Maxfield at 4:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes for the September 22nd meeting were approved as written.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Project Review

VANCE LANE SUBDIVISION

The Community Development Department is processing an application for a proposed residential development on Vance Lane, a private road that intersects with Folsom-Auburn Road near Oak Avenue. The applicant has proposed a development consisting of 4 custom single-family lots, ranging in size from 14,500 to 24,600 square feet on a 2-acre site. The project would be accessed via a private drive connecting to Folsom-Auburn Road. Staff recommendation for this project is to provide traffic-related comments for city staff to forward to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Ms. Nelia Dyer, Community Development Planner, addressed the Committee. She began by saying that the applicant for this project is requesting a tentative parcel map to create four parcels located on a proposed cul-de-sac on a private drive on a 2.13 acre site.

Referring to the site plan, Ms. Dyer went on to say that the location is north of the intersection of Greenback Lane and Folsom-Auburn Road and north of Hillswood Drive. Currently there is an ingress/egress easement along the Vance Lane private drive to Folsom-Auburn Road to the west.

The applicant is now proposing to abandon this particular easement and create a 40-foot public utility and road easement along the southern boundary of the site. Specifically from Folsom-Auburn Road to the property line it will be a 40-foot easement with a 20-foot access road. From the property line to the west, to the cul-de-sac, there will be a 40-foot easement as well, but there will be a sidewalk and parking on one side.

A similar project at this location was presented to the Traffic Safety Committee in September, 1999, at that time the Committee recommended...
that the applicant make necessary improvements at the intersection of Vance Lane and Folsom-Auburn Road, including a right-turn deceleration lane. It was also recommended that the applicant include a guide sign that says Vance Lane, prior to the approach to Vance Lane. The Committee also recommended that the turn-around meet the criteria for the Fire Department.

Mr. Steve AuClair, with GC Wallace and Associates, addressed the Committee. He said that the current project is similar to the 1999 one. However, when the project was originally approved there were some zoning constraints, in terms of set-backs and lot frontages. Those elements were not adhered to as well as the size of the cul-de-sac. So they’ve attempted to, when working with staff, is to get the access in the cul-de-sac more up to public standards.

The four lots were configured a little differently than the previous project, also on the previous parcel map, there are a number of oak trees within the parcels that were not looked at in terms of preservation and removal. Currently, they have met with City staff to determine which oak trees would be removed and which would be permanently retained, so that staff isn’t put to the task of having a builder come in and want to remove all of the trees. Especially after they’ve done the street improvements and taken some of the trees out initially.

The applicant does plan on selling these lots as a Custom Lot sale program. So that was also another reason staff wanted to identify which trees would be removed and which trees would be preserved, so that wouldn’t be an issue later on. One of the other things we did was to put building envelopes on the lots, which they were willing to limit the lots in terms of development so that the trees outside of the building envelopes would non-buildable areas- those would be recorded on the final map, so that the trees that are left on the lots will be preserved in the future.

Mr. Maxfield stated that this is a problematic site, because of the steep slopes, but probably would make neat homesteads.

Mr. AuClair agreed that there is a deep access. Also, there are a couple of elements of the access that are 12% Fire Department, there was a 20% grade in one location that concerned the Fire Department that they couldn’t work with a 20% access grade, so GC Wallace redesigned the access to bring it to 12%. Another element to note is the access easement, which they are working with the property owner to let them have the two lots fronting Folsom-Auburn Road. His plan is to merge the two lots together and put a single large building on his site. In order to do that, he desires to abandon this right of way and make the access in another location. There are other parcels in that area that also have access rights. They will have to get access rights worked out with the fronting property
owner, but will have to get some signatures from some adjacent parcels around their project that need to realign that access.

Mr. Maxfield asked whether the road that goes out to Folsom-Auburn is right along the car wash there.

Mr. AuClair responded that the car wash is the next one down.

Referring to the site map, Mr. Powers asked what the status of some of the other lots. Mr. AuClair answered that they have access to the road down below and the last lot is land locked and needs access. The other lots that have access to the road below are not dependent on the access in question for their development.

Mr. Sterling shared his concerns regarding Folsom-Auburn Road, at that location, is horrendous for traffic. Every morning and every evening it is backed up. At some point, we will have to do something about Oak Avenue/Old Oak Avenue where it comes in, because you take your life in your hands trying to make a left onto Oak Avenue Parkway during rush hour. The Police Department responds to a lot of collisions there. If we do take control of the intersection with some kind of traffic control measures, where Vance Lane is now, it will be within that intersection and will be controlled on the same intersection controls- but if you realign that down lower, there is no way we could reasonably control traffic, because it would no longer be a four-way intersection. It would be two three-way intersections so close together that it would be impossible to control that kind of area and we would lose all our stacking for Folsom-Auburn at Greenback Lane.

Mr. AuClair stated that staff did ask them to do a realignment study for this very concern. They were looking at the opportunity to make this a four-way here at Oak Avenue, (pointing to the site map) he showed where Old Oak Avenue does align. The problem is that there is so much grade drop throughout the area, so it puts a significant impact on the building site, to where they would lose a lot of area in the building. So from their standpoint, if it were to be realigned, they would probably lose a lot of the development portion of that lot and that property owner would not agree to it.

Mr. Sterling stated that future property owners would not be able to get in and out. They are not going to be able to make a left turn going southbound on Folsom-Auburn. They will all have to come from northbound make right turns only and to exit they are only going to be able to make right turns, which is going to make a significant increase in U-turns, etc. occurring at those intersections above Oak Avenue Parkway and Greenback.
Committee members stated that you cannot make a U-turn at Oak Avenue Parkway, but at Folsom Dam Road.

Mr. Sterling went on to say that there would be a significant issue regarding access for the residents.

Discussion continued regarding access for current residents of the street.

Mr. Rackovan asked about the property owner along Folsom-Auburn who wanted to merge the two lots. He wanted to know what type of building would be proposed. Ms. Dyer responded that she didn’t know what the square footage is, but it would be a large commercial building. Discussion continued regarding the access to the property and traffic control at the intersection. Mr. AuClair stated that they were anticipating having only right-in, right-out access only.

Mr. Rackovan stated that looking at the situation from a cumulative standpoint, there are three house there now and four more will be added, plus the commercial building and the land-locked parcel.

Mr. Darrin Wilson, Community Development Engineer, stated that they would pursue having the Roger Wilson development potentially realign the Vance Lane. The David Wilson proposal was for a dental office. Mr. Rackovan noted that either of the Wilson parcels will be the trigger for some substantial modification. Mr. Sterling commented that if these developments continue in the direction they are going, we may only have for lots generating residential traffic, but there will be substantial traffic coming off that site ultimately.

Discussion continued regarding having the Community Development department intended to require the Roger Wilson project to realign the road. Ms. Dyer stated that they couldn’t determine when they would come through with their development, or if they are. In developing this now, Community Development is only looking at Vance Lane and the four additional parcels.

Mr. Sterling expressed public safety and traffic concerns regarding this project. Mr. Wilson stated that they could condition the commercial property to put a signal in. Mr. Rackovan said that they should condition the other parcels as well, because ultimately they would benefit from it.

Mr. AuClair stated that there is a significant issue there now, but is it appropriate that because these are the last few parcels coming into the site that they get hit with the full expense of installing a signal. Mr. Rackovan responded by saying that in the past, they had worked out a cost-sharing agreement, but the burden is put on the developer to actually construct it and then be reimbursed for some portion of the cost. He thought the City would pay a share.
Discussion continued regarding realigning the present road.

Mr. Powers brought up the topic of sidewalks and discussion ensued.

Mr. Rackovan made a motion recommending approval of the project with the realigned driveway. He would make the motion limited to right-turn only by signage and encourage that the ultimate design be to provide access that is more directly in line with Old Oak Avenue.

Mr. Maxfield asked if he meant a sign that would be at that road saying No Left Turn or Right Turn Only. If anyone were to try to make that left turn, they could then be ticketed.

Discussion continued regarding the Right Turn Only. Mr. Powers asked was it right-turn only out and in. Mr. Sterling commented that they should put a raised center divider, when that road goes in, it will be inviting someone to break the law. Mr. Rackovan stated that the drivers were liable for not knowing the traffic laws.

Mr. Maxfield seconded the motion. Discussion continued regarding installing a raised island to discourage illegal left turns, installing a signal at the intersection, access easements and sidewalks.

AYES: Butler, Marr, Maxfield, Rackovan
NOES: Powers, Sterling
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT: Nielson

Discussion was closed.

2. MIRABELLA CONDOMINIUMS

The applicant, Elliott Homes, is requesting approval of a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Tentative Subdivision Map and Planned Development Permit to develop a 154-unit condominium project to be known as Mirabella at Empire Ranch. The proposed project, which is part of the Empire Ranch Specific Plan, is located on an 11.47-acre site located at the southwest corner of East Natoma Street and Golf Links Drive. The project is zoned SP92-3 and designated C-1 PD (Neighborhood Business, Planned Development District) within the Empire Ranch Specific Plan, and the General Plan land-use designation for the site is NC (Neighborhood Commercial). The applicant is proposing to change the General Plan land use designation to MMD (Multifamily Medium Density) and to change the specific plan designation to R-M PD (Residential Multifamily-Dwelling District) within the Empire Ranch Specific Plan. A site plan is attached for your information.
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Minutes from the March 1, 2006
Planning Commission Meeting
CALL TO ORDER PLANNING COMMISSION: Vice Chair Pat Dunbar; Commissioners: John Arnaz, Michael Gordon, Treaver Hodson, Lance Klug, Brian Martell

ABSENT: Greg Eldridge

STAFF PRESENT: Interim Assistant Community Development Director Gail Furness de Pardo, Associate Planner Nelia Dyer, Senior Civil Engineer Steve Krahn, Neighborhood Services Director Amy Feagans, Assistant City Attorney Steve Johns

MINUTES: The minutes of February 15, 2006 were approved as submitted.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: None

OLD BUSINESS:

1. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:
   - Nominations for Chair
     COMMISSIONER ARNAZ NOMINATED GREG ELDRIDGE TO SERVE AS CHAIR OF THE FOLSOM PLANNING COMMISSION.
     COMMISSIONER MARTELL SECONDED THE NOMINATION WHICH CARRIED WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE:
     AYES: DUNBAR, MARTELL, GORDON, KLUG, HODSON, ARNAZ
     NOES: NONE
     ABSTAIN: NONE
     ABSENT: ELDRIDGE
   - Nominations for Vice Chair
     COMMISSIONER KLUG NOMINATED MICHAEL GORDON AS VICE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION.
     COMMISSIONER HODSON SECONDED THE NOMINATION.
     Commissioner Gordon declined the nomination for Vice Chair.
     COMMISSIONER GORDON NOMINATED PATRICK DUNBAR AS VICE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION.
     COMMISSIONER MARTELL SECONDED THE NOMINATION WHICH CARRIED WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE:
     AYES: DUNBAR, GORDON, HODSON, KLUG, ARNAZ, MARTELL
     NOES: NONE
     ABSTAIN: NONE
     ABSENT: ELDRIDGE

NEW BUSINESS:

2. PN05-273, Vance Lane, Tentative Subdivision Map, Rezone, Planned Development Permit, and Mitigated Negative Declaration
Associate Planner Nelia Dyer gave the staff report, stating the applicant, JPS Properties, is requesting a Rezone from R-1-L (Residential Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District) to R-1-L PD (Residential, Single-Family Dwelling, Large Lot District Planned Development). In addition, the applicant is seeking approval of a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map to develop a 2.13-acre site at the east end of Vance Lane. The location of the site was pointed out for the Commission. Vance Lane is a private road accessed from Folsom-Auburn Road, between Hillswood Drive to the south and Oak Avenue Parkway to the north. An aerial of the project was shared with the Commission to show the surrounding area (adjacent residential property, Blue oaks, native grasses, etc.).

The applicant is proposing to subdivide the property into seven lots – four of which are proposed for residential development. The remaining three lots include two landscape corridors and the private road within the property boundaries. The relationship between the current zoning and proposed zoning was discussed. The lot widths and the front setbacks are not consistent with the requirements for the R-1-L zone. It is the applicant's intent to provide four large-lot residences, while minimizing grading and the disturbance to trees. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a rezone to a Planned Development overlay to allow flexibility in the zoning standards. Staff has determined that the project meets the intent, purposes, and standards of the Planned Development District. Vance Lane provides access to three residences (Kendall, Vance, and Moyer). This access will be abandoned as part of this project and the proposed Vance Lane will be located south of the current access.

In order to construct the private road from Folsom-Auburn Road, Condition 22 has been modified as outlined below:

22. **Legal access from the project to Folsom-Auburn Road must be shown prior to approval of the Final Map.** The owner/applicant shall attempt to acquire all required off-site rights-of-way and easements necessary for the construction of the private access roadway between Folsom-Auburn Road and the project boundary prior to submittal approval of the Final Map. If the owner/applicant is unsuccessful in acquiring all required rights-of-way and easements, the owner/applicant shall submit evidence to the City that a "good faith" effort was made in attempting to acquire said rights-of-way and easements prior to approval of the Final Map. The owner/applicant shall be responsible for advancing all costs associated with rights-of-way and easement acquisition, including any costs the City incurs in attempting to acquire any rights-of-way and easements. In addition, if the City does not pursue acquisition of the said rights-of-way and easements, the owner/applicant shall be required to construct the private access roadway to the project by way of the existing access easements on the adjoining properties.

The owner/applicant shall then enter into an agreement or agreements with the City that obligates the owner/applicant for the cost of acquisition of interests in real property for the rights-of-way and/or easements.

The agreement shall provide that the owner/applicant shall be responsible for the cost of litigation and other associated costs involved in acquiring the necessary interests in real property and that the owner/applicant shall deposit at least half of the estimated costs of litigation and other associated costs prior to the City obtaining an appraisal of the required property acquisitions. The agreement shall also provide that the owner/applicant shall deposit 125% of the fair market value of the real property interests being acquired within 15 days of the appraisal being obtained.

The owner/applicant understands and acknowledges that if the City acquires the access road from the project to Folsom-Auburn Road by eminent domain that the road will be a public street, and not a private road, and it must be constructed to standard City specifications.

The Traffic Safety Committee recommended that a sign be installed at the intersection of Folsom-Auburn Road and Vance Lane indicating that there should be "right turns only" out of Vance Lane onto Folsom-Auburn Road.

Photographs of the existing Vance Lane were shared with the Commission. With the Conditions of Approval, staff recommended approval of the project.
In regards to lots widths, Associate Planner Dyer responded to Commissioner Arnaz that there were 83, 74, 35, and 64 feet. Lot 3 was the narrowest.

In response to Commissioner Martell, Associate Planner Dyer pointed out access off of Folsom-Auburn Road. Commissioner Martell voiced concern about the current traffic problems in this area, especially with the two proposed commercial projects, noting that there was no deceleration lane onto the proposed Vance Lane.

Associate Planner Dyer noted that concern was expressed at the Traffic Safety Committee meeting but because those two commercial projects were currently undeveloped and no applications existed, the focus was only on Vance Lane.

Senior Civil Engineer Steve Krahn added that the four residential-lot project would not warrant the need for a deceleration lane or deceleration taper. Staff looked at a certain number of peak hour trips to generate a taper (10-50). Over 50 trips would warrant a deceleration lane. This project wouldn't warrant a need for either. There was a wide shoulder and when the driveway was constructed, there would be enough room to allow some deceleration.

Commissioner Martell felt that when the two commercial projects come before the Commission, a deceleration lane would be warranted and that the timing of all the projects should be considered.

Senior Civil Engineer Krahn noted that when either one of the commercial projects was submitted, a traffic study would be required because those thresholds would be met - just on access alone.

Access into and out of the site was discussed at length.

Commissioner Klug voiced concern about traffic stacking on Folsom-Auburn Road in the vicinity of the project, the easements that the applicant would be required to obtain, and grading / drainage restraints for the project.

Senior Civil Engineer Krahn responded that with regard to access onto Folsom-Auburn Road, there would be a paved AC access because there were no frontage improvements proposed. It would most likely be a paved driveway access to meet the existing shoulder.

In response to Vice Chair Dunbar, Senior Civil Engineer Krahn concurred that it was possible that the proposed Vance Lane could be abandoned when the future commercial projects are proposed if it were the recommendation of the traffic study. The Vance Lane project and its impacts is the only project under consideration at this time.

In response to Commissioner Arnaz, Assistant City Attorney Johns clarified that the Subdivision Map Act states that if the conditions of approval require off-site improvements, on a third party's property - not City property - and if the applicant is unsuccessful in their attempts to acquire the rights to build those off-site improvements, once the applicant files their final map, the City has an obligation to decide within 120 days if it's going to commence eminent domain. It's essential that this project have access if there was a subdivision map. If the applicant were unable to successfully acquire the rights and didn't want the City to commence eminent domain, they could choose not to final the map. If eminent domain is undertaken, it will be at the cost of the applicant. He concurred with Commissioner Klug that the road would be a public street if eminent domain was used and would affect the underlying property owners. That would be part of the valuation that would be analyzed when determining the fair-market value that would be paid to the property owners for the rights on that land.

Commissioner Arnaz asked why a reduced front setback and a lot width (35 feet) would be allowed.

Associate Planner Dyer responded that staff was looking at minimizing the grading and disturbance to trees. By having a minimum setback of 20 feet, it allows most of the trees to remain. In terms of lot width, she stated the applicant would answer that question.
Commissioner Hodson asked if the Commission was prohibited from declining approval or waiting until the easements are approved. He realizes that it was a condition, but if they approve the map then they have obligations to commence eminent domain if the applicant doesn’t obtain the easements. Having the other property owners agree to the easements beforehand would be preferable.

Assistant City Attorney Johns stated that the application has been deemed complete. Hopefully the easements will be acquired and eminent domain will not be an issue. There is a condition on the project that requires the applicant to prove they have access. The Commission is not prohibited from requiring the applicant to get the easements before approving the project, however, it would not be an enviable legal position for the City. It was reiterated that it would be a “conditional” approval – the applicant would have to meet the conditions then they could move forward.

Steve Au Clair, GC Wallace, understood the Commission’s concerns, but Condition 22 would mean that there would be no project. He suggested that the project be continued to allow them to work with staff on this particular condition. Each parcel has a partially vested interest that can’t go forward without the other parcels. From a cost standpoint they can’t make the project work without the alignments or configuration the way it is proposed. Some of the property owners have agreed to grant easements when the project is entitled. The issue was that no one can get to entitlement. He didn’t want to tell his clients to go and spend all this money without entitlement rights. He requested conditional approval of the project with the elimination of Condition 22.

Commissioner Arnaz clarified that as he reads Condition 22 it only goes to a public road if there is eminent domain. He asked if Mr. Au Clair was assuming that it would go to eminent domain. He didn’t see why approving the project with this condition would hurt the applicant if everyone was in agreement.

Mr. Au Clair explained that if his clients decided that it was too costly to resolve the easements, they would be unable to sell the property without entitlements. Their project was presented with a private road – to go to a public street does not represent the project they were asking the Commission to approve.

In response to Vice Chair Dunbar, Assistant City Attorney Johns explained that eminent domain can only be done to acquire property for a public purpose – it would have to be a public road. In response to Commissioner Arnaz, he added that the City would go after the property owner to pay for the expense of acquiring the easements.

In response to Commissioner Klug, Mr. Au Clair stated that for four lots, a commercial access is not warranted. He added that with regard to the grade, they wanted to get it down to 12%. There is a 4-5 foot retaining wall on the front parcel, a 10-foot retaining wall at the back of the building, a 2-foot retaining wall at the upper parking lot, and then there is a 3-foot grade through the parking lot bringing it to 15 feet. They would be able to get access out of both parking lots on to the drive without any difficulty.

Commissioner Martell asked if a lift station was going to be needed to get water to the site. Mr. Au Clair stated that it was going to be tight, but felt they could make it work. They needed entitlement before they could be more in depth analysis.

Vice Chair Dunbar opened the Public Hearing.

Joseph C. Clifford, 114 Hillswood Drive, wanted to make sure access to the back of his property was maintained, and supported the project.

Charlotte Kendall, 9910 Vance Lane, voiced concern regarding the right-turn only access on to Folsom-Auburn Road and possible tree removal that acts as a buffer to the adjacent property.

Wayne Kelly, 9911 Vance Lane, voiced concern about where the new access road easement would come through the back properties. The alignment was pointed out for Mr. Kelly and it was not an issue. He further voiced concern about the traffic, noting that it was very difficult to turn out on to Folsom-Auburn Road. A right turn only was not the best alternative for them because when they leave they are usually going into Folsom, which requires them to turn left. Access in and out of the site was an issue that needed to be resolved.

Jody Perry, 170 Sunrock, supported the project, stating that development of the site would ensure that the
Vice Chair Dunbar closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Klug reiterated his concerns regarding traffic, grading, and access.

Commissioner Martell suggested aligning the access road along Folsom-Auburn to Oak Avenue for perhaps a future signal at the intersection.

COMMISSIONER HODSON MOVED TO CONTINUE PN05-273, VANCE LANE TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP, REZONE, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION TO APRIL 5, 2006.

COMMISSIONER GORDON SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: GORDON, DUNBAR, HODSON, ARNAZ, MARTELL, KLUG
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: ELDRIDGE

REPORTS:
Planning Commission/Director:

Interim Assistant Community Development Director Pardo updated the Commission on the issue of neon light use at California Family Fitness brought up by Chair Eldridge at the last meeting and the issue of McFarland Park access. Public Works will be installing signs and delineating the median to prevent turn entry into the park driveway as soon as possible. The Parks & Recreation Department will initiate the design of the new left-turn park pocket as soon as funding is available. Commissioner Arnaz was under the impression that funding was currently available.

Neighborhood Services Director Feagans suggested that staff bring the lighting issue back after discussing the issue further with legal staff. It was noted that trying to control interior lighting could be problematic.

Senior Engineer Steve Krahn updated the Commission on Commissioner Martell’s comments regarding a painted crosswalk on Scholar Way at East Bidwell. He stated that the crosswalk would be installed when the LDS Church was developed.

Staff also informed the Commission of a MTP 2030 Workshop to be conducted by SACOG (similar to the Blue Print Workshops), which will be held for Folsom and Rancho Cordova in April.

Commissioners Martell and Dunbar stated that they would be in attendance at the March 15th meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Omega Deppe, Administrative Assistant

APPROVED:

CHAIR GREG ELDRIDGE
Attachment 10

Minutes from the April 5, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting
COMMISSIONER GORDON SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: DUNBAR, MARTELL, GORDON, HODSON, ARNAZ
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: ELDRIDGE, KLUG

2. **PN05-273, Vance Lane, Tentative Subdivision Map, Rezone, Planned Development Permit, and Mitigated Negative Declaration**

Associate Planner Nelia Dyer gave the staff report, stating the applicant, JPS Properties, is requesting a rezone from R-1-L, which is Residential, Single-Family Large Lot, to R-1-L PD. A Vesting Tentative Subdivision is also being requested to develop a 2.13-acre site at the east end of Vance Lane. The existing Vance Lane was pointed out to the Commission, as well as the proposed location for Vance Lane Estates.

The applicant is proposing to subdivide the property into seven lots, four of which are proposed for residential use and the three remaining lots include two landscape corridors and a street. To provide access to Vance Lane Estates, as well as the current Vance Lane residents, a private road will be constructed from Folsom-Auburn Road and terminate at the cul-de-sac at the center of the site. This project was presented to the Commission on March 1st and at that hearing the applicant requested that the project be continued to this hearing to allow staff and the applicant time to discuss the condition pertaining to the acquisition of off-site rights-of-way and easements for the proposed access road. City staff and the applicant have discussed this condition and no changes have been made. In addition, no changes have been made to project.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend City Council adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, approval of the rezone as well as the approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map.

In response to Commissioner Hodson, Associate Planner Dyer stated that Condition 22 was the condition that was discussed and was now acceptable to the applicant.

Steve Au Clair, GC Wallace on behalf of the applicant, stated that they have worked through the condition with staff and were in agreement with the rest of the conditions and looked forward to approval from the Commission.

Vice Chair Dunbar opened the Public Hearing; no one came forward to speak so the Public Hearing was closed.

COMMISSIONER MARTELL MOVED TO RECOMMEND THAT CITY COUNCIL ADOPT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM FOR VANCE LANE ESTATES (PN05-273) AS ILLUSTRATED IN ATTACHMENT 7; AND MOVED TO APPROVE REZONING OF A 2.13-ACRE SITE FROM R-1-L (RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, LARGE LOT DISTRICT) TO R-1-L PD (RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, LARGE LOT DISTRICT, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT) AS ILLUSTRATED IN ATTACHMENT 3; AND MOVED TO APPROVE THE VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP TO DIVIDE A 2.13-ACRE PARCEL INTO SEVEN PARCELS FOR THE VANCE LANE ESTATES PROJECT (PN05-273) AS ILLUSTRATED IN ATTACHMENTS 4 THROUGH 6 WITH THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS: GENERAL FINDINGS "A" THROUGH "C;" CEQA FINDINGS "D" THROUGH "H;" VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FINDINGS "I" THROUGH "M;" PLANNED DEVELOPMENT FINDINGS "N" THROUGH "S;" HILLSIDE GRADING FINDINGS "T" THROUGH "X" AND CONDITIONS 1 THROUGH 58.

COMMISSIONER HODSON SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE:
AYES: GORDON, HODSON, ARNAZ, MARTELL, DUNBAR
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: ELDRIDGE, KLUG

3. PN06-069, Street Name Request

Interim Assistant Director Gail Furness de Pardo introduced the item, stating that this item was continued at the March 15th meeting. The request is for a street name of College Parkway, which would be the primary access into Folsom Lake College. The new street name meets all the requirements of Fire Department and Post Office. The project was continued because there were questions brought up about the East Bidwell frontage (where shoulder is reduced to a foot). Staff has met with the Folsom Lake College staff and the commitment is to complete and/or fund the improvements within the next two weeks. The City is going to complete some of the items on the punch list and the college will be funding those items - the rest of the items the College will have completed.

Pablo Manzo, Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Management for the Los Rios Community College District assured the Commission of their commitment to complete the work within the next two weeks.

Vice Chair Dunbar opened the Public Hearing; no one came forward to speak so the Public Hearing was closed.

COMMISSIONER GORDON MOVED TO APPROVE THE STREET NAME OF COLLEGE PARKWAY FOR THE FOLSOM LAKE COLLEGE ACCESS AT EAST BIDWELL STREET.

COMMISSIONER HODSON SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: DUNBAR, GORDON, HODSON, ARNAZ, MARTELL
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: ELDRIDGE, KLUG

NEW BUSINESS:

4. PN05-520, Folsom Gateway, Phase 2, 2371 Iron Point Road, Tentative Parcel Map and Initial Study

Associate Planner Jane Talbot gave the staff report, stating that Trey Gundlach on behalf of Evergreen Folsom II, is requesting approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to merge three existing parcels and re-subdivide the 12.8-acre site into six parcels. Staff pointed out that the staff report and conditions incorrectly identified four existing parcels – it is only three parcels that are merging. Plans of the site were shared with the Commission. Staff re-evaluated all the zoning requirements in light of the newly proposed property lines and all of the buildings and parcels still meet all of the zoning requirements. Staff has included a condition requiring reciprocal access, parking, sewer, and drainage easements.

Staff recommended approval of the Tentative Parcel Map for Folsom Gateway, Phase 2.

Trey Gundlach, Everygreen Company, stated that they were very pleased with the way the first phase has come together, and this was an application to divide the second phase where every building will be on its own parcel.

Vice Chair Dunbar opened the Public Hearing; no one came forward to speak so the Public Hearing was closed.

COMMISSIONER HODSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP TO MERGE THE THREE EXISTING PARCELS AND TO RE-SUBDIVIDE THE 12.8-ACRE SITE INTO SIX PARCELS AT FOLSOM GATEWAY SHOPPING CENTER (PN05-520) AS SHOWN ON ATTACHMENT 3, WITH THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL INCLUDED WITH THIS