January 26, 2017

VIA EMAIL

Subject: Lincoln40 Project: Incompleteness Letter on PA # 16-01 for General Plan Amendment (GPA) #3-16; Gateway / Olive Drive Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) #1-16; Zoning Amendment #2-16, Lots Merger / Tentative Map #1-16; Design Review #10-16, Demolition #4-16; Development Agreement (DA); and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) #3-16

Dear Paul,

Thank you for the re-submitted materials in response to the August 2015 completeness letter. As you are aware, we have collaboratively reviewed a number of these materials and some changes have been made to reflect the concerns. Several of the comments have been sent before and some may be in the process of being worked through. However, there still remain a few items that are needed to assist staff in the efficient and effective review and processing of the project applications. These items are identified below.

We will continue to review and process the project applications. Once the requested items are provided the review and processing of the project applications would be facilitated. It is our mutual goal to process the Draft EIR and the project applications concurrently, thus timely provision of the requested items would be helpful.

Please contact me as usual with questions about this letter or requested items at the following number (530) 757-5610, extension no. 7230 or e-mail at injoku@cityofdavis.org.

Sincerely,

Ike Njoku, Planner & Historical Resources Manager

cc: City Staff
Lincoln40 Incompleteness Items and Comments

A. Project Description / Narrative.
As you are aware, staff and Raney Management Inc. have provided suggestions regarding areas of improvement to the submitted project narrative. Thank you for the most recently submitted project narrative, which will be used in the Draft EIR. However, if you wish to have the narrative included in the staff report to decision-makers, it might be useful to re-visit and revise it to fully incorporate all aspects of the project. For instance, the narrative should address the appropriate amendments envisioned to the Gateway / Olive Drive Specific Plan. We agree that the amendments description should be simplified to show only the necessary texts and Table 5 changes. This includes adding a subarea for Medium High Residential to the Specific Plan and establishing uses, development standards and design guidelines for Lincoln40, which is to be incorporated to the Specific Plan as well.

The goal of this format is to reduce the number individual text amendments to be made to the Specific Plan. This format is somewhat similar to what was done for the Youmans property. The key point is that the amendment request is adding a new land use category of Medium High Density (already adopted by Council) to the Specific Plan; identifying references to the Hickory Lane Properties and Callori Property that need to be modified; and identifying any other portions of the Specific Plan that ought to be modified to accommodate the Lincoln40 proposal. The concept Community Development and Sustainability staff reviewed today is acceptable.

It is envisioned that a Lincoln40 subarea would be added to the East Olive section of the Specific Plan that include uses, development standards and design guidelines. Thus, the amendment to the Specific Plan texts and Table 5 would accommodate this new subarea into the East Olive section of the plan.

Please revise the project narrative to incorporate this envisioned approach and submit the same to the City at your earliest convenience.

Land Use Map Exhibit. As we have discussed, there will be a need to revise Table 5 and the land use maps in the Specific Plan. For better presentation, it makes sense to provide existing land use maps and Table 5 in addition to the proposed revision maps. Please note that it is not necessary to have three land use maps for the General Plan, Specific Plan and Zoning. One exhibit titled “GP, SP and Zoning Land Use Map” will be adequate. This is because there is no difference between the three land use maps in name or otherwise; the “specific plan” consists of all three categories.

B. Site Plan.
We have discussed the revisions to be made to the site plan since the last re-submittal. You have also shown staff some revisions based to address staff comments and other issues. It is now useful to submit the revised site to staff and the EIR consultant.

Some of the concerns with the current submitted site plan include the following:

Very Busy Site Plan. The current site plan has a lot of information (i.e., many layers) that make it impossible to fully appreciate the proposal. Please provide a basic site plan that is well dimensioned, depicts all structures, parking spaces, and property lines. A second site plan that
reflects amenities, fencing, detention basins, and any other features that you wish to call out can be provided under any descriptive name that you choose to illustrate the features intended to be presented.

**Landscape Plan.** Please provide a separate landscape plan exhibit with the necessary details associated with landscaping.

**Tree Plan.** Please provide an existing trees exhibit (maybe the same one in the Arborist Report) so as to assist decision-makers in visualizing all existing trees and another exhibit reflecting proposed project and trees being retained. Given the existence of Landmark trees, it becomes necessary to extract the trees exhibit from the Arborist Report and make them separate exhibits to answer prior to being asked questions regarding trees.

**Fencing Plan.** If the landscape plan is very busy, please provide a separate fencing plan.

**Project Data.** As you are aware, typically the project data is provided within the site plan. Given the configuration of the parcels involved it becomes necessary to provide a different table of project data. The table of project data to be provided must include the following:

- Properties total area
- Project density
- Lot coverage
- Floor area ratio
- Building height
- Usable open space
- Total bike and vehicle parking spaces
- Total units count
- Total bedrooms
- Breakdown of bedrooms
- Other rooms and spaces within the project
- Project properties addresses and sizes

**C. Uses and Zoning Standards.**
Please prepare and submit Residential Medium High Density (RMHD) subarea uses similar to those currently in the High Density (RHD) of the Specific Plan. However within the zoning standards, list standards are that consistent with Lincoln40 proposal. See below the existing RHD development standards and map exhibit that you can use to create the new RMHD section for Lincoln40.

**D. Information on Plans for Relocation of Existing Tenants.**
Please provide the details of the relocation plan for current residents of the project’s housing. This information may be provided separately or included to the project description or narrative. It is important to note that decision-makers would be interested in this information.

**E. Affordable Housing Plan.**
There is a need to establish the affordable housing requirements (i.e., the required affordable units) proposed to be provided through in-lieu fee. It is recommended that a person-to-person meeting be held on this issue between the development team and staff to arrive at the specifics of the affordable housing provision.
Other Departments Comments

Building Division Comments.
The following comments were provided by Building Division, and had been passed onto you previously.

a. The project shall comply with 2016 Cal Green Building standards – Code section 4.601.4 with both pre-requisite and elective measures.
b. Page 11 of Sustainability plan in “Energy” row (table) indicates a 10% compliance margin; please note that 15% compliance margin is the minimum.
c. The project shall comply with CBC 11A and 11B for access compliance.

Consolidated Public Works Department Comments.
Public Works Review Lincoln 40 General.
Some or most of these items might have been addressed. However, they are being provided again to assist you in verifying that they have been adequate addressed.

a. Shared use path at the west property line shall be 12’ wide
b. Provide 6’ wide sidewalks and curb & gutter on all public ROW frontage
c. Verify that accessible ramps at Hickory and Olive are compliant and upgrade as necessary.
d. Project will be treated as a merger and re-subdivide and will require a Tentative Map and Parcel Map.
e. Per Note 2 of the preliminary tentative map, we agree that easements are subject to the final design and further discussion.
f. At this time, we cannot commit to the vacation of Hickory Lane to a 12’ PUE as shown. There will need to be future discussions as this is still a possible point of connection across the UPRR tracks to the train depot.
g. Comments on Traffic related issues will be provided after receiving the traffic study. This includes any possible bike connection to downtown core and improvements to Olive Drive.
h. Utility layout comments will be generated after receiving utility plan.
i. Please provide the Preliminary Title Report that is referenced in Note 5 of the Preliminary Tentative Maps.

SWQ.
1. The project appears to be large enough to trigger the determination of a regulated project. However, I did not find any information related to how much impervious surfacing is being created or replaced. This is the key trigger for projects. Without it I can’t be sure about a project being in compliance with City and state regulations with regards to SW Quality. So I would have to determine at this point the project is incomplete. What is needed is the following:

a. A SW quality diagram with the following information:
   • The total area of the site.
   • The total area of existing impervious surfacing currently on site.
   • The total area for proposed impervious surfacing to be created or replaced?
- The delineation of all the drainage sheds or drainage management areas (DMAs) proposed on site with the direction of flow and the size of each DMA.

- Preliminary calculations on the amount of runoff being created prior to the project versus post project for the entire project site based upon the 85th percentile 24 hour storm event for Davis (0.65 inches).

- Within each DMA, identify the proposed location and treatment control measures to treat runoff generated by impervious surfaces.

- Preliminary calculations for the sizing of all proposed treatment control measures for each DMA as applicable dependent upon the type of treatment control measure proposed.

- If on bullet point #3 above shows the project is creating or replacing 1 acre or more of impervious surfacing, the hydromodification requirements for the entire site will be required to show that the post-project runoff shall not exceed estimated pre-project flow rate for the 2-year, 24-hour storm. A preliminary calculation will be required to show that site design measures proposed on site have enabled the project to meet this standard. For projects that trigger this requirement, post-project runoff will not have to be less than or equal to pre-project runoff rates as determined by the 85th percentile 24 hour storm event.

b. A preliminary grading plan showing all proposed elevations and direction of flow of surface water on site.

c. A preliminary utility diagram showing the proposed SW conveyance on the property to the City’s SW conveyance system.

d. A preliminary landscape diagram showing a list of proposed plant species for the all SW treatment control measures and any bioretention facilities. The landscape plan should provide some level of irrigation for proposed plantings within SW treatment control measures and bioretention areas.

2. Some things to expect are listed below as we progress towards COAs.

a. Given that this site appears to be completely redeveloped, it is required that all drainage on site shall flow to appropriate treatment control measures or bioretention prior to being released to the City’s storm drain system. Only the sidewalks, curb and gutter for the public right of way along Olive Drive will not be required to have its drainage collected and treated prior to discharge to the City’s storm drain system.

b. At the time of building permits a preliminary SW maintenance agreement shall be required. The maintenance agreement shall be fully executed and recorded with the county clerk’s office and a copy of the agreement provided to the PW director prior to issuance of occupancy.

c. Prior to the disturbance of any soil on site a SWPPP plan along with a WDID # shall be submitted subject to the review and approval of Public Works.

Bike/ Ped Coordinator Jennifer Donofrio & Brian Abbanat comments.
These are recommended conditions of approval, which may be made part of the DA, for the project by transportation staff.
a. Keep the “long term” parking structure on the site plan as currently shown with a condition of approval requiring that the applicant/developer shall provide active recorded video surveillance on the structure to minimize the potential threats of theft and vandalism, prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy to the project.

b. Add a condition of approval, or a DA condition that long term secured bike parking, that the applicant/developer shall be responsible (i.e., relocation occurs at applicant/developer’s expense) for the provision of bike parking spaces beneath the spiral ramp of a future grade-separated crossing no later than 90 days from the structure’s completed construction and acceptance by the City.

Associate Civil Engineer Terry Jue Sewer Shed Calculations.
These comments had already been provided to the development team and it is possible that most, if not all comments had been addressed. However, it is being provided again for reference and verification that all requested changes had been made.

The d/D ratio for PWWF shall not exceed 0.7 for new and existing small diameter sewer pipes (12” or less). The following shall be incorporated in the sewer design:

1. The existing 8” sewer from 2nd to 3rd Street on L Street (stretch C-D) is at d/D=0.75. This sewer shall be upsized to a 10” sewer (d/D=0.6<0.7).

Fire Department Comments.
These comments are already incorporated in the Draft EIR process.

1. Based on the last two response time maps that were created this project straddles a line for 5 min. 1st due response. Another map showing call’s greater than 5 min throughout the city shows Olive Drive having a number of calls for service where response times exceed 5 min. I’m happy to explain why this occurs in greater detail if needed.

2. Based on studies over the last 10 years of response times to Olive Dr. I believe the adequacy of response time is questionable and should be researched further.

3. There is no service ratio. Service ratio’s for fire and police are not based on data; they are simply used in absence of any other formula to provide a benchmark. Speed of deployment, response time, and weight of response are more important. If a project has a negative impact on those factors mitigation should be considered.

Police Department Comments.

1. The project shall comply with the City’s security ordinance in terms of lighting and addressing.

2. All recreational areas and bike facility areas shall be appropriately secured to minimize theft.

3. Given that the proposed project exceeds the current vision of land use for the area, the proposed project shall provide for additional police services envisioned. The project’s EIR shall provide for appropriate mitigation measures.

Unitrans Comments.
Please ensure that the concerns expressed by Mr. Anthony Palmere of Unitrans were addressed in the revised plans and discussion, if they are not already addressed. You have been provided a copy of his email with letter, and if you would like it again, please let me know.
**High Density.** Includes apartment, condomini-um, townhouse, and other development types with five or more units in a structure. Also includes detached residential developments at allowed densities, such as mobile-home parks. Densities are limited to 10.0 and 15.0 units per net acre.

**Area, Lot Width, Yard and Related Requirement:**

(a) Lot area. None.
(b) Usable open space. Twenty-five percent of net area of district or of any individual lot in the district.
(c) Lot coverage. Not more than forty percent.
(d) Lot width. None.
(e) Front yard. None.
(f) Side yards. For each side yard, 5 feet for one story building, ten feet at both first and second floor for two story building.
(g) Rear Yard. Ten feet for one story building, twenty feet for two story building.
(h) Height. Height requirements shall be as specified in the Specific Plan design guidelines.
(i) Existing mature trees shall be preserved as feasible, subject to design review.
(j) Land uses fronting along the railroad or freeway uses shall provide a minimum twenty foot building setback. The setback shall be fully landscaped, subject to design review.
Hickory Lane Properties
Mix of uses on each parcel containing a combination of any two or more of the plan following:
(a) Multi-family not to exceed 15 du/acre.
(b) Restaurants.

Land Use and Zoning Pla

- CS: Commercial Service
- RMD: Residential Medium Density
- RHD: Residential High Density
- EOMU: East Olive Multiple Use
- R: Retail
- P: Parks / Recreation

(2) East Olive Drive Subarea

Note: TI Zone. T.

Dowling
(1) East Olive Drive Neighborhood

Building Setbacks

Front and street side yards: 15 feet from the property line
Side: 5 feet on each side
Rear: None
Overhang: 5 feet from front property line

(Youmans Property)
Front and street side yards: 5 feet for commercial storefront buildings and 15 feet for residential buildings (measured from the property line)
Side: 5 feet on each side
Rear: 5 feet.

Building Massing

New buildings adjacent to existing residences shall be designed to be compatible in scale and use with those residences.

Building Height

All buildings or portions, thereof adjacent to or within 50-feet of East Olive Drive shall be a maximum of one-story (10-feet) in height.