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October 9, 2008

Mike Wahba
Global Investors Network
1023 Front Street, Suite C
Sacramento CA 95814

RE: Callori Property, Olive Drive

Dear Mr. Wahba:

Thank you for meeting with us and Shellan Miller last week. Yesterday, I met with two senior staff members to discuss the permitted uses of the Callori properties. Our read of the Gateway-Olive Drive Specific Plan is that the reference to 49 units and 8,000 square feet of commercial applies to the combined properties, including the Hickory Lane parcels, not just APN 70-29-01.

The following factors led to this conclusion:

1. The buildout table (Table 5) assumes only 49 new units in addition to the units approved for the Youmans property (now Lexington and Cesar Chavez Plaza) across the street. There is no assumption for additional residential development on Hickory Lane.
2. The 8,000 square feet of commercial development would not be a permitted use in the Residential Medium Density district (APN 70-29-01). We have concluded that this must, therefore, refer to the Hickory Lane parcels because the East Olive Multiple Use district does allow restaurants, office, and retail uses.
3. 49 units on the 2.5-acre parcel would exceed the allowable density of 4.2-10 units per acre for the Medium Density Residential area.

Any planning document is subject to interpretation, but City staff is comfortable with this determination. If you disagree, the next step might be to file an application for a zoning verification, which we would schedule for Planning Commission review. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me or Principal Planner Mike Webb at (530)757-5610.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Hess, AICP
Community Development Director

C: Shellan Miller, Pacific West Communities
    Danielle Foster, Housing and Social Services Superintendent
    Mike Webb, Principal Planner
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CHAPTER I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
CHAPTER I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. BACKGROUND

165 acres in the City of Davis adjacent to the Core Area. The area is bounded on the north by First Street, on the west by the University, on the south by Interstate 80, and on the east by the railroad tracks and I-80.

In early 1992 the City's Redevelopment Agency initiated a process to redevelop the area near the entrance to Davis. In late 1992 and early 1993, the City Council broadened the study to include the entire 165 acre area and appointed a 27-member Advisory Committee to prepare a specific plan. The Committee and various subcommittees met 20 times from 1993 through 1995 producing two study reports and, ultimately arriving at a consensus plan for the area. City staff met with consultant assistance turned the consensus plan into this specific plan and accompanying EIR.

The purpose of the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan is to provide the goals, policies, design guidelines, and zoning; mechanism necessary to realize the vision created by the Advisory Committee. The specific plan provides guidance for what uses will occur on vacant property, as well as reuse and revitalization of improved parcels and various public improvements. The Specific Plan is intended to be sustainable with or without the Richards Corridor Improvements.

B. THE PLAN

The plan is divided into district sub-areas: East Olive Drive, West Olive Drive, Aggie Village, and the Southern Pacific Depot. Each sub-area has distinct characteristics and each entailed a slightly different planning process. The specific plan knits together the neighborhood plan developed for East Olive Drive with the University-sponsored plan for Aggie Village, modified through the consensus-process.

Figure 1 is all illustrative map showing the proposed land uses, roadways, buildings, open space and bicycle/pedestrian connection as the area would look at buildout. Table 1 lists the existing and proposed uses by sub-area.

The vision for both the East and West Olive Drive areas is to maintain and enhance their existing unique character and mix of needed uses. Along West Olive Drive, service commercial, restaurant, motel and similar uses would continue with roadway and landscape improvements to upgrade the visual entrance to City and the entrance to Nishi. Development of Nishi may lead to increased land values along West Olive Drive and redevelopment and beautification over time.

The vision for East Olive Drive, crafted by residents and merchants of that neighborhood, is to maintain the fine-grained mix of uses and small-scale character of this historic area, while allowing vacant and underutilized parcels to build-out. Residential uses would be added to blend in with existing cottages and multi-family uses. The 8-acre, vacant Youmans; site would allow for a mix of uses including some retail, office, institutional and residential. The design, focuses more intensive uses against the freeway frontage for sound protection and lower scale uses with landscaping on the Olive Drive side. A total of 215 new residential units and 16,200 square feet of commercial and office uses can be added. Public improvements are also envisioned in the area including a pedestrian link to the depot, traffic calming measures and a public open space.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
<th>Add./New Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Parking Req'd.</th>
<th>Acres Req'd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Olive Drive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single-Family</td>
<td>154 units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154 units</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-Family</td>
<td>165 units</td>
<td>296 units</td>
<td>461 units</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>15,062</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,062</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,966</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>88,619</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>93,282</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youmans Property, neighborhood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Olive Drive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>93,029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93,029</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (31 rooms)</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5 Acre</td>
<td>.5 Acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggie Village</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Child. Lab &amp; Parking Lot</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single-Family/Duplex/Studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54 units</td>
<td>54 units</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000/20,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>9.25 Acres</td>
<td>(8.5 Acres)</td>
<td>.75 Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SP Depot</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>75-150 added</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch Tower</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhound</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
East Olive Drive single-family unit count includes 98 mobile homes.
East Olive Drive multi-family unit count includes 8 beds in a boarding house.
New uses in East Olive Drive include 130 multifamily units on Lincoln40 property & 166 mf units on Youmans property.
Callori properties are predominantly now part of Lincoln40, excluding the two corner properties at the corner of Hickory Lane and Olive Drive.
N.A. - Not Applicable. T.B.D. - To Be Determined.
The Southern Pacific Depot is envisioned as a public parking area to serve the Core and the train station; substantial landscaping and beautification are intended to make the area more a part of the Core and more attractive for use.

The University's Aggie Village project along First Street is envisioned as a part of the Core and a way to link the City with both the University and the arboretum. Aggie Village includes a 50,000 square foot retail and office project at the corner of Richards and First meant as an anchor for the Core retail district. By placing buildings on the street with parking behind and adhering to design parameters, this use will be a gateway to downtown business. The center of Aggie Village is a faculty/staff housing project made up of 37 units (detached and duplex) and 17 "grad" flats or second units accessed via pedestrian alleys. This unique design reflects the scale, quality, grid pattern and lay-out of the adjoining University Avenue neighborhood; ample landscaping and open spaces and the physical connection to the arboretum. Further knit this development into the fabric of the Core. The west end of Aggie Village remains in University-related uses.

Another significant part of the overall Gateway vision is the enhanced circulation connections between the University and City, between Olive Drive and the Core and within the study area itself. Bikeways along the creek, connections to the Core within East Olive Drive and at First Street, a link to the arboretum at D Street and an improved Richards corridor are all central to the plan. Within the Nishi property, a perimeter bikeway and central pedestrian spine link the various uses and connect at one end to the University and the other end to the Richards corridor and the Core.

For each sub-area, there are a series of detailed design guidelines providing requirements for site lay-out, landscaping, architecture and parking areas. Designs are also established for new roadways, pedestrian linkages and open space areas.

Additionally, the specific plan provides a detailed financing strategy to fund the $17.8 million of public improvements in the area. Some of these are long-term, City-wide improvements such as the Richards Boulevard corridor expansion.

Funding sources include a mix of developer contributions, redevelopment, the University, the City's Major Projects Financing Plan and other sources. The above mentioned costs do not include public improvements and other costs associated with Aggie Village.

Depot project proposes building a parking lot within the triangle formed by the railroad tracks. The Gateway/Olive Drive specific plan and the SP Depot plans call for providing an East Olive Drive Overcrossing project for pedestrians/bikes to provide direct access for east Olive Drive residents to the Core area.

Typical East Olive Drive Bungalow
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A. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan is to provide the goals, policies, design guidelines, and zoning mechanism necessary to realize the vision created by the Gateway/Olive Drive Advisory Committee. The specific plan will provide guidance for what uses will occur on vacant property, as well as reuse and revitalization of improved parcels. The specific plan establishes: land use, open space and conservation policies, urban design, circulation including bicycle and pedestrian, parking, and infrastructure policies; development standards; design guidelines; and, a program to implement and finance the Plan. The specific plan, when adopted, will supersede the existing general plan designations and zoning for the study area.

B. PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Davis is located eleven miles west of the City of Sacramento, in Yolo County, California (see Figure 2). The area known as the Gateway/Olive Drive contains approximately 165 acres, and is bounded by the University's Aggie Village site, Core Area retail, and old east Davis residential area on the north (see Figure 3). West of the area is the University of California at Davis (UCD), including administrative and educational buildings. South and cast of the area is Interstate 80. The project area also includes the City's multi-modal transportation center known as the Southern Pacific Depot (SP Depot).

C. SUB-AREAS

The study area is divided into four sub-areas: East Olive Drive, West Olive Drive, Aggie Village, and Southern Pacific Depot. Each sub-area has distinct characteristics and issues and each entailed a slightly different planning process. This specific plan knits together the neighborhood plan developed for East Olive Drive with the University-sponsored plan for Aggie Village, the city-prepared plan for the Depot, as modified through the consensus process.

The Southern Pacific Depot is characterized by the existing AMTRAK train station and surrounding platforms and tracks and the "triangle", a partly vacant property between the various tracks. Remnant vegetation and several remnant buildings are on-site. The City has prepared a master plan for this site and is in the process of acquiring the land for various public uses.

The Aggie Village property consists of 12 acres owned by the University. The western third is currently occupied by various university-related uses, most notably the Child and Family Study Center and surrounding outdoor space. The eastern two-thirds of the property is currently zoned for residential and retail. The residential portion of Aggie Village is currently under construction with a variety of tree species, a row of streets trees (olives and palms). An unimproved section of the University arboretum runs along the south border of the property; the plan for this property calls for improvements to the Arboretum and the riparian corridor.

The West Olive Drive area is currently developed into a mix of light industrial, office, commercial and commercial recreation uses. The parcelization pattern is somewhat awkward as is the current circulation and parking arrangements. However, it is mostly built-out with room for revitalization, expansion and improvement of public spaces.

The East Olive Drive area is a historic part of the City with a unique identity and a variety of existing uses including single-family and newer multi-family residential, mobile homes, office and business uses, several major vacant parcels (such as the 8-acre "Youmans" site) and highway service commercial uses. Olive Drive is the route for a part of the historic Lincoln Highway through the Sub-Area. The remnant "motor courts" on the north side of the street provide a unique land use pattern adjacent to the Core Area.
D. THE PLANNING PROCESS

Planning in Davis is characterized by extremely active public participation, and the Gateway process was certainly no exception. Table 2 on the following page summarizes the chronology of this specific plan and the involvement process.

In April of 1992, the City of Davis Redevelopment Agency released a development offering package to interested parties concerning preparation of ideas and plans for "Gateway Center." The agency received several proposals offering various levels of development within the general study area. Due to citizen concern, particularly from the East Olive Drive area, and Council recognition that citizen input on the planning of the City's "front door" was essential, the Agency did not act on the proposals. Instead, City Council agreed to prepare a specific plan for the area with a broadly representative citizens' Committee to advise the Planning Commission and Council.

One proposal put forth by the Arboretum Partners, a local consortium of Davis developers and residents, remained as a point of departure for the Gateway area. The Arboretum Partners ultimately agreed to provide the up-front costs to complete a specific plan, and EIR for the study area. At the same time, the East Olive Drive Neighborhood Association developed a master plan for their community based on extensive neighborhood involvement and presented the plan to the City in November 1992. The University also began to develop plans for their Aggie Village property, as did the City on the Depot property. Thus, the stage was set for a planning process to knit together the plans of several groups into a cohesive proposal.

Through an extensive process which included citizens, staff, the Planning Commission, and Council members, the City selected the firm of EDAW and a team of technical experts to prepare a specific plan and EIR, and assist in advising the Committee during the workshop process.

To assure that full community participation was an integral part of planning for the Gateway, the City Council appointed a citizen Advisory Committee made up of 27 key representatives from the business and residential community, University, landowners, County, and other impacted agencies. The Committee selected two co-chairs whose responsibilities include assisting the City and consultants in defining the agenda of each meeting, and also assisting the staff and consultants in helping the Committee discuss key issues and reach a consensus or majority opinion. Committee meetings were well attended by other members of the public who participated in the discussions. As Table 2 indicates, the Committee began meeting in March 1993. The first phase was spent familiarizing participants with the area in the field and in meetings, brainstorming, options, assessing opportunities and constraints of the area, and exploring preliminary alternatives.

The first phase was completed in July 1993, resulting in a summary report, but little consensus. Periodic status reports were prepared for the Planning Commission and Council.
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### GATEWAY OLIVE DRIVE SPECIFIC PLAN
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1992</td>
<td>Redevelopment Agency begins looking at Gateway Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1992</td>
<td>City Council initiates specific plan process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1993</td>
<td>City Council selects 27-member Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1993</td>
<td>City hires EDAW and Sub-consultants to assist City staff and committee in planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-July 1993</td>
<td>Phase I: Advisory Committee meets six times;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aggie Village Plan Presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• East Olive Drive Neighborhood Plan Presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SP Depot Plan Presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arboretum Partners Alternatives Presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phase I Summary Paper Presented to Long Range Planning Commission and City Council for information only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1993-December 1994</td>
<td>Phase II: Advisory committee meets seven times Consensus Plan Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-October 1994</td>
<td>Sub-Committee #1: &quot;Design&quot; - Two meetings and will meet again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-October 1994</td>
<td>Sub-Committee #2: &quot;Remainder&quot; of Area - One meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1994</td>
<td>Sub-Committee #3: &quot;Policy Issues - Unresolved&quot; - Two meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1994</td>
<td>Phase II Summary Paper Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-February 1995</td>
<td>Phase II Paper Presented to Long Range Planning Commission and City Council for information only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-July 1995</td>
<td>Several delays occurred in funding the final phase, contracting with the consultant and in waiting for information on the USDA proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-November 1995</td>
<td>Consultant and staff actively working on Plan and EIR Design Sub-Committee and full Committee review meetings to be held to review details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1995</td>
<td>Phase III: Draft specific plan and EIR prepared for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1996</td>
<td>Phase IV: Adoption Hearings for specific plan and EIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second phase began in October 1993 and lasted through December 1994. This phase included seven meetings of the full Committee and five meetings of ad hoc Sub-Committees selected to address detailed design, Sub-Areas and policy issues which had not received sufficient previous attention. The bulk of phase II was spent debating a series of alternatives largely focused on the Nishi property. These are briefly summarized in a subsequent section.

The plans for East Olive Drive, Aggie Village and the Depot were readily accepted early in the process and integrated into what became known as the Consensus Plan. Phase II resulted in a summary report presented to the Planning Commission and Council in early 1995.

The Consensus Plan has been edited, supplemented and clarified by city staff and the consultants into this formal specific plan document. This draft specific plan and accompanying EIR will be circulated for Committee public comments. In addition, there will be at least one public meeting to discuss the Draft specific plan. The Draft specific plan will be finalized and presented to the Planning Commission at a public hearing concurrently with the Draft Environmental Impact Report, which analyzed the significant environmental impacts of the specific plan. The Planning Commission will also be presented with the entitlements necessary to make all parcels in the specific plan area consistent with the plan. The Planning Commission’s recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council for final action after an additional public hearing.

E. SCOPE AND INTENT OF A SPECIFIC PLAN

By California state law (Gov. Code 65450) a specific plan shall include a text and diagram or diagrams which specify all of the following in detail:

(1) The distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land, including open space, within the area covered by the plan.

(2) The proposed distribution, location, extent and intensity of major components of public and private transportation, sewage, water, drainage, solid waste disposal, energy, and other essential facilities proposed to be located within the area covered by the plan and needed to support the land uses described in the plan.

(3) Standards and criteria by which development will proceed, and standards for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, where applicable.

(4) A program of implementation measures including regulation, programs, public works projects, and financing measures necessary to carry out paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

A specific plan may address other issues as necessary to support the implementation of the plan. A specific plan must also include a section addressing the relationship of the specific plan to the General Plan.

F. HOW TO USE THE SPECIFIC PLAN

The Gateway/Olive Drive specific plan provides information at several different levels. The first level includes broad goals and policies and designation of specific land uses on a parcel by parcel basis. The second level of the plan is the zoning. The zoning provides for permitted and conditional uses. These uses are consistent with the specific plan land use map. The zoning ties together the design guidelines and goals/visions for the plan. Heights, bulks and setbacks are established to ensure that both the land uses and design guidelines will come together to accomplish a development that enhances the area and serves as a long term amenity to the City of Davis. The third level is the design guidelines. The design guidelines provide specific direction about how new development will occur and how remodels should be designed. The design guidelines have been prepared to ensure that the physical vision of the Committee will be achieved.

Chapter III provides background information about the study area. Chapter IV provides the basic goals, policies, land uses and zoning; for the study area, while Chapter V provides the design guidelines. Chapter VI provides mechanisms for implementation and financing of the plan.
Throughout the document overall project goals are shown in italics.
CHAPTER III. BACKGROUND
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A. RELATIONSHIP OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN TO EXISTING PLANS

General Plan Policies

The Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan is generally consistent with the existing Davis General Plan and complements its policies. Several written policies in the General Plan and the land use map will need to be modified to reflect this specific plan upon adoption. Selected General Plan policies which are particularly relevant to the specific plan are discussed as follows.

Land Use Element (Section 2.1)

A. Maintain Davis as a small, University-oriented city surrounded by farmland, greenbelt, and natural habitats and reserves.

B. Provide for growth to meet internal needs of households whose work or study activities are to have been focused in Davis, and to address regional fair-share housing needs.

The specific plan reinforces the City-University relationship and provides jobs and housing opportunities appropriate for Davis residents and students.

I. Prepare and adopt specific plans or overall development plans (master plans) for each of the new development areas prior to subdivision approvals...

The specific plan responds to this policy.

Land Use Element (Section 2.2)

C. Express the interdependence of Davis and UCD in the design of the city and of the campus.

The specific plan's land use and design guidelines for Aggie Village are designed to link UCD and the City.

C. Retain the Core Area as a multi-function downtown serving as the city's social/cultural center, primary retail business and professional and administrative office district, in manner that enhances pedestrian activity.

The specific plan reinforces this with policy language and land uses: job-generation near the Core; housing near the Core and retail in the Core (Aggie Village).

D. Avoid uniform design standards and residential densities that are either uniform or uniformly mixed.

The Plan provides a variety of housing types in East Olive and Aggie Village.

J. Limit development adjoining I-80 to large sites and nonresidential uses with generous landscaping. Allow identification signs only facing the freeway.

Land Use Element (Section 2.5)

C. Keep non-medical professional offices in the Core.

This policy will need to be modified to reflect the idea of a downtown "edge" district to supply professional offices and high technology space adjacent to the Core.

Land Use Element (Section 2.7)

A. Encourage University-related research establishments, administrative offices, and manufacturers using non-nuisance processes to locate in Davis.

B. Locate high-standard business parks along freeway.

C. Ensure that business park development accepts responsibility for helping to meet the community's recreational, social, and cultural needs, as well as its traffic-circulation requirements.
New development in the specific plan area will be contributing significantly to Davis' infrastructure as described in the implementation and financing section.

D. Improve Davis' business climate by clarifying and simplifying regulations and processing of development applications so that enterprises considering locating in Davis will know what to expect and can anticipate timely decisions.

The specific plan provides a "one-stop shop" for zoning and design review and avoids many future discretionary actions.

E. Provide locations for small businesses that cannot afford rents necessary to support high-quality, business park environments.

Small office/start-up business opportunities are provided for in East Olive Drive and West Olive Drive.

Land Use Element (Section 2.9)

F. Encourage the University to develop the Aggie Village site on First Street in a manner that will strengthen the Core Area.

The plans for Aggie Village accomplishes this policy.

Conservation Element (Section 6.1)

A. Preserve, enhance, and where feasible, restore natural habitat areas and other natural areas.

The plan for the extension and restoration of the arboretum accomplishes this objective.

Emerging General Plan Update

In 1993, City Council initiated a citizen-based update to the Davis General Plan. This update is still in preliminary draft form and is certainly subject to substantial modification. However, a number of the emerging goals and policies reflect the direction of the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan. In particular, many of the existing General Plan policies strengthening retail and providing housing in the Core and encouraging high quality employment are proposed to remain. In addition, several new policies are of note.

Vision 9: Promote economic vitality by developing a diversity of business enterprises.

Vision 11: Recognize and strengthen the essential synergistic partnership between the City and UC Davis.

Goal ED4: Retain existing businesses and encourage new ones to increase higher paying jobs, create greater job diversification, and create a more balanced economy for all economic segments of the community.

Land Use Policy 25:

Identify 300 to 500 acres for new large business park development and to buffer large users from residential development.

Draft Core Area Specific Plan

The Draft Core Area specific plan will be before the City Council and Planning Commission in spring 1996. It reiterates, adds to and implements the General Plan's fundamental direction to strengthen the Core. The overall goal of the plan is as follows:

To retain and foster those types of uses that allow the Core Area to make a major contribution to the social, cultural and economic life of the City of Davis. In order to achieve this general goal, the land use policies in the Core Area specific plan favor a mix of uses. Currently, office and service functions, such as banks and real estate firms, as well as certain types of retailing (for example, restaurants), are well represented. The stabilization of existing, and the development of new, general retailing and housing required special attention. The retention of a residential population base in the Core
Area is crucial to the success of the pedestrian environment of the downtown.

The two specific plans are consistent in the desire to maintain the Core Area as the primary retail core of the City. Both plans recognize the importance of integrating, housing into the land use patterns of the area, and both plans contain numerous ways to link the Core and Gateway with non-vehicular circulation: bikeways, pedestrian crossings, visual or signage connections.

The Draft Core Area Specific Plan also contains specific land use policies regarding the relationship between various sub-areas.

Policy 2.6 states: Ultimately, the Core Area should be anchored by relatively large developments, that are of an appropriate scale and character, at Fifth and G Streets, the area commonly known as Aggie Villa (i.e., Aggie Village), and at Third Street rear the Central Park expansion.

Implementation measure 7(C) states. Care shall be taken in developing the Aggie Village and the Fifth and G Street sites…

Aggie Village provides a retail/office anchor to the Core retail area on the east end of the property transitioning to University use on the west end. Aggie Village has been carefully designed to blend in with the University Avenue neighborhood. Bicycle and pedestrian connections are made throughout including bringing the Core Area directly in contact with an improved University arboretum.

Economic Development Strategy

In June of 1995, the City adopted an ": economic Development Strategic Plan. " Many of the primary goals and objectives in the strategy are embodied by the land uses proposed in the specific plan, particularly the Nishi property development. Examples include the overall goals of the Economic Development Plan:

Expand the economic base of the community by attracting and retaining commercial and industrial enterprises that contribute to the city’s tax base and provide jobs appropriate for the community.

Several specific economic goals will be forwarded by implementation of the specific plan:

Goal 1: Actively attract technology and knowledge-based industries by focusing on the strengths of and proximity to UC Davis.

Goal 2: Ensure that land is available in appropriate zones with preliminary environmental review completed in conjunction with streamlined permit processing for commercial and industrial uses.

In addition, the Economic Development Strategy directly endorses development of Aggie Village:

- Work collaboratively with UC Davis to facilitate the development of the Aggie Village residential and commercial site.

- Assist in the development of Gateway.

B. STUDY AREA OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

The existing conditions of the area offer both opportunities and constraints for future development and conservation. Land use, drainages, views, biological resources, infrastructure and various other existing conditions in the area influence potential buildout of the specific plan. The following description is a brief summary of the significant opportunities and constraints which were analyzed during the planning process and helped inform and create the plan. More detailed resource analyses are contained in the Phase I and II summary reports prepared earlier in the process and presented to the Committee. The accompanying EIR also contains detailed existing conditions for each resource topic. Figure 4 shows many of these features.
Opportunities:

1. **Location.** The project area's location provides convenient access to the downtown University, and the freeway.

2. **Bike and Pedestrian Access.** The location of the project and the planned circulation improvements provide opportunities for bike and pedestrian facilities that will connect the University, the Core Area, the specific plan area, and south Davis (Figure 5). Bicycle/pedestrian undercrossings (currently proposed as an overcrossing in 2018) have been proposed to traverse the railroad tracks at two locations on the Nishi property, and at one location at the end of former Hickory Lane (now proposed as an overcrossing). Additionally, a bicycle/pedestrian path will be built by the city to connect South Davis with the Nishi property including an undercrossing of I-80. These bike/pedestrian paths will facilitate non-motorized transportation between the project and the surrounding areas, thereby reducing impacts on air quality and traffic.

3. **Visual Enhancement.** Because of the substantial I-80 frontage and visibility, and the fact that Davis' main entrance at Richards Boulevard divides the study area, visual issues and opportunities for enhancement are critical. This is the physical and symbolic gateway to Davis. Infill of vacant parcels and improvement of older residential and commercial structures can make the approach to the Richards Boulevard undercrossing more aesthetic. Such improvements would also make the specific plan area a more desirable location for residential and commercial/retail uses.

4. **Light Rail Connections.** Proximity to the railroad tracks provides a potential opportunity for access to a future light rail station at either the SP Depot or adjacent to the University's Alumni/Visitor Center. Buildout of the specific plan area would support either of the station locations, since new and renovated high density residential and retail/commercial uses would be within walking distance of the station. Conversely, a rail station could add to the success of businesses in the specific plan area, as well as the University and downtown. The SP Depot is currently a multimodal station, and there are plans to expand the site, including a

bicycle/pedestrian bike overcrossing connecting East Olive Drive with the Depot.
The tentative map for the Nishi property shall indicate the light rail easement.

5. Retail and Job-Generating Opportunities. Much of the specific plan area provides an opportunity for new services for local and citywide residents, employees of the University and downtown businesses, and visitors to Davis. Furthermore, the new retail and light industrial, high technology business uses will generate tax and revenue for the city.

6. Residential Opportunities. The specific plan will includes areas suitable for new residential use close to the Core Area and the University. This will provide conveniently located housing for Students, University employees, and other potential multi-familial housing residents. Such housing can reduce University student and employee automobile traffic since it would be within walking or cycling distance of the campus and downtown.

7. Historical Resource Preservation. Several buildings and site areas have potential historical significance. Though not all historical resources have been fully characterized, the cottages in Slatter’s Court and the two buildings at the entrance to the East Olive Drive area have substantial historical value. In addition, features contributing to the historical significance of East Olive Drive, such as trees and Lincoln Highway markers, should be preserved and might become part of an historical district. The SP Depot and switch tower are on the National Register of Historic Structures. The main farm house on the Nishi property qualifies for the National Register.

SP Depot
8. Arboretum Expansion. The Nishi property contains a remnant channel of Putah Creek which has potential to be enhanced into an ecologically-productive riparian corridor. Similarly, the arboretum area behind Aggie Village can be enhanced with native vegetation pedestrian/bicycle improvements. Aggie Village also presents the opportunity to connect the Core to the arboretum at "D" Street and "B" Street. These enhancements can have ecological, visual and recreational value. Putah Creek on the Nishi property and the area behind Aggie Village will be enhanced to connect with the existing UCD arboretum along Putah Creek. The extension of the UCD arboretum behind the Aggie Village and in the Nishi property will be done in consultation with the Arboretum; UCD.

Constraints:

1. Railroad Tracks. Increased use and activity in the area requires safe crossings of the railroad tracks along the north boundary of the specific plan area. Construction of tunnels will be costly and will cause train schedules to be interrupted during construction. Having to use tunnels also limits the location, size, and alignment of paths since there are engineering and cost constraints associated with such undercrossings.

2. Freeway and Train Noise Impacts. The freeway creates a constant roadway noise impact, while trains traveling through the area create intermittent noise impacts. Separately or combined, these transit facilities contribute to a noise level that is greater than most other areas in the city. Noise averages between 70-75 dBA (day/night average sound level). These various sources of noise will have the greatest impact on the residential uses in the specific plan area. The EIR for the project examines the impacts of noise on the plan area and indicates required mitigation measures.

3. Existing Roadway Network and Traffic Issues. Figure 6 shows the key roadways in the study area. Richards Boulevard is a north-south arterial roadway which connects north and south Davis. It crosses under the Southern Pacific railroad tracks in a covered two-lane undercrossing. Richards Boulevard has one travel lane in each direction without parking, bicycle lanes or shoulders. Along the western side of Richards Boulevard between First Street and Olive Drive a bicycle path is provided. Bicycle traffic crosses under the railroad in a separate tunnel adjacent to and slightly higher than the two lane vehicular roadway. Richards Boulevard is four lanes south of Olive Drive and crosses over I-80 to serve South Davis. On the overcrossing, two southbound lanes and two northbound lanes are provided.

Caltrans recently widened the freeway overcrossing and reconfigured the eastbound I-80 ramps on the southside of the Richards Boulevard interchange. The ramps on the northside of I-80 were not altered. The eastbound off-ramp was realigned to meet Richards Boulevard at a right angle. The overcrossing can accommodate four travel lanes, bicycle lanes and turn lanes.

East Olive Drive is a two lane residential street connecting the East Olive area with the other portions of Davis at Richards Boulevard. The East Olive Drive/Richards Boulevard intersection is signalized and located between the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks and I-80.

East Olive Drive parallels I-80 towards Sacramento. A westbound off-ramp from I-80 is located at the eastern terminus of East Olive Drive. West Olive Drive is a two lane roadway serving primarily commercial land uses to the west of Richards Boulevard. West Olive Drive intersects Richards Boulevard at the same location as East Olive Drive and is controlled by the same signal.
First Street is an east-west two lane arterial with parking on the north side and center left turn lanes at selected locations between E Street and B Street. The Richards Boulevard/First Street/E Street intersection is signalized. Stop sign control on the side streets with no controls on First Street is provided at C and D Streets.

**Planned Area Roadway Improvements:** A number of transportation improvements have been identified in the General Plan for the roadways and intersections near the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Area. Table 3 indicates relevant planned improvements as stated in the General Plan. The ‘4’ for Richards Boulevard, B Street, and First Street indicates turn pockets or intersection widening without adding through travel lanes on the majority of the street.

**Roadway Levels of Service and Volumes:** The LOS standard for the City of Davis is "D" for existing facilities and "C" for new facilities. The General Plan "rejects road widening in of excess of four lanes, irrespective of resultant level of service." The quality of life and small town character are given priority over the LOS standard. The average daily traffic (ADT) volumes for the major streets in the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan area are shown in Table 4. Most roadways operate at level of service (LOS) C or better. The exceptions are:

- Richards Boulevard between First Street and the westbound I-80 freeway ramps which operates at LOS "F".
- First Street between C and A Streets operates at LOS "D".
- B Street from First Street to Second Street operates at LOS "D".
- E Street north of First Street operates at LOS "D".

**Existing Peak Hour Levels of Service:** The peak hour levels of service (LOS) were calculated for Richards Boulevard at the eastbound ramps from I-80, Richards at East Olive Drive and First Street and First Street at B, C and D Streets. During the PM peak hour, the LOS is slightly worse than during the AM peak hour. First Street at Richards Boulevard operates at LOS "F" in the AM and PM hours respectively. First and B, C and D Streets operate at LOS "C" in the AM and PM peak hour. The intersection of Richards Boulevard and the eastbound I-80 ramps operates at level of service "B" in the AM and PM peak hours. Traffic and circulation will remain a constraint to full buildout of the specific plan until improvements are made.

4. **Toxic Contamination Sites.** There are three sites within the specific plan area that are being monitored for contamination. One is located at the northeast corner of the plan area known as the Van Wert site. Another site is located at the southwest corner of Olive Drive and Richards Boulevard (Caffino). The third is the SP Depot site. It appears that these sites do not have significant contamination, and therefore, construction would be allowed (there is already a structure on the southwest corner of Olive and Richards). However, any new buildings on these sites would not be able to obstruct the wells which are being used for clean-up and monitoring or other clean-up operations.

5. **Wildlife Habitat.** Vacant lands within the specific plan area provide potential habitat for sensitive species such as Swainson's hawks, burrowing owls, and valley elderberry longhorn beetles. Most of this potential habitat is located on the Nishi property. Although much of this property is currently being farmed, there still exists adequate foraging opportunities for rodents which are prey for the hawks and owls. The creek bed also provides important riparian habitat (nesting, cover, and water), as well as elderberry plants that provide cover and food for the longhorn beetle. Development of the Nishi property would reduce the amount of potential habitat for these sensitive species. Analysis of the impacts resulting from the project and mitigation built into the plan are discussed in the EIR.

6. **Electromagnetic Field (EMF).** There are high-voltage overhead power lines along the railroad tracks. Recent studies suggest that the EMF created by these lines might have human health impacts. Based on the location of the power lines and the potential for human exposure, plans contains set-backs for buildings from the power lines. A separate EMF analysis...
TABLE 3
Planned Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>General Plan Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. F Street</td>
<td>Seventh to Third Streets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Richards Boulevard</td>
<td>I-80 EB ramp to First Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. B Street</td>
<td>First to Fifth Streets</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. First Street</td>
<td>B Street to E Street</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>B Street to L Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4
1992 Average Daily Traffic on Selected Roadway Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic Volume (ADT)</th>
<th>Daily Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Street (B Street to E Street)</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>LOS &quot;D&quot; (volume to capacity ratio= 0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Boulevard (E Street to East Olive Drive)</td>
<td>21,900</td>
<td>LOS &quot;F&quot; (volume to Olive Drive) capacity ratio=1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Boulevard (East Olive Drive to I-80 eastbound ramps)</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>LOS &quot;F&quot; (volume to capacity ratio=1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street (First Street to Fifth Street)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>LOS &quot;C&quot; (volume to capacity ratio=0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Street (B Street to F Street)</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>LOS &quot;A&quot; (volume to capacity ratio=0.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was conducted as a component of the EIR.

7. Underground Gas Lines. There are PG&E and Southern Pacific Railroad gas lines located on the Nishi property that could be a constraint to development. The issue is with the depth of the lines and whether the location of the infrastructure improvement would create a conflict. Easements over these lines will limit any potential for conflict with building locations.

8. Archaeological Resources. A literature and field reconnaissance was undertaken by Far Western Associates to look for evidence of prehistoric cultural resources. The Putah Creek channel was analyzed with particular emphasis on observation of the cut slopes within the channel.

A known archaeological site exists at the intersection of A Street and Rice Lane (CA-YOL-1 18), which continues to yield scattered artifacts in exposed locations on campus. The Aggie Village parcel might include some of this site, but work in that area suggests otherwise. Backhoe trenches excavated within the last year failed to generate any cultural evidence, while recent surface observations replicated that pattern. UCD officials conducted the trenching and remain the source of reliable information about that site and about the recent findings on nearby Solano Park.

There should be no impediments to development for the Gateway area at this point in time, although mitigation measures are proposed in the EIR initial study.

C. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED DURING THE PROCESS

Many alternatives were developed and debated during the study process, generally focusing on choices for the Nishi property. The plans for East Olive Drive, Aggie Village and the Southern Pacific Depot were brought forward and generally accepted by the Committee for integration into the plan.

During Phase I, the consultants and staff brought forward five conceptual alternatives to stimulate and focus discussion:
The Core Extension Concept extended the grid of the Core Area into the Nishi site and proposed a mix of land uses similar to the Core in scale and use including retail, housing, office and open space uses. The Garden Concept envisioned the Nishi property as a commercial nursery with accompanying retail, restaurant and cultural uses, as well as open space. The Retail Concept envisioned a mix of large and small-scale retail uses and open space at either end. The Village Concept envisioned an extension of the scale and character of the core on Nishi with a mix of retail, offices, housing and either University-related or cultural uses. The Sports Concept envisioned an intensive sports complex with ice and roller rinks, velodrome, aquatics, outdoor sports demonstration, accompanying retail and restaurant uses and other commercial recreation. These concepts assisted in the discussion, but were never analyzed nor given serious consideration by the Committee or the applicant.

At the conclusion of Phase I, alternatives A and B were advanced. These alternatives indicated minor variations in the plans for Aggie Village, Depot and East and West Olive Drive, but generally focused on the Nishi property. Alternative A concentrated on retail uses for the center of Nishi with restaurants and an expanded arboretum on the east and a small area of hotel, offices and University-related uses on the west. Total square footage was approximately 452,000 with 200,000 in retail. Alternative B excluded all retail uses and replaced them with light industrial/office uses and a housing area buffered from surrounding uses. Total square footage was 480,000. Ultimately, neither the Committee nor the applicant was in favor of either alternative. This led to consideration of several additional alternatives at the start of Phase II. During this time, several options were advanced by East Olive Drive property owners as variations on the neighborhood plan; some of these changes were incorporated into the ultimate Consensus plan.

Alternative C was developed by a citizen’s group in response to A and B. It called for a city commitment to maintaining and revitalizing downtown as the retail hub of the city and adding substantial square footage of retail space to the downtown. Plan C designated Nishi as an "institute and conference center for agricultural and environmental research." Although there were no physical plans developed, uses included offices, research laboratories, institutes, hotels, conference facilities and related uses that would build on the proximity and relationship to the University and bring in jobs.

In July 1994, Arboretum Partners withdrew their interest in continuing with a major retail component at Nishi and brought forward alternative U. The primary element of this plan was a University-related office and technology campus along a central spine consisting of large-scale offices, laboratories, educational facilities and institutes and support uses. Various other areas were included such as arboretum expansion, restaurants, a hotel, an area for small offices and start-up businesses and housing for visiting scholars and students.

Alternative D was prepared at approximately the same time by staff and consultants. The concept was a relatively dense “edge” district to the downtown including offices and University-related facilities, restaurants, hotel and conference center, neighborhood retail, some housing and large areas of open space. The Committee decided to utilize Plan U as a starting point and draw from the features of Plans D and C to arrive at a final Consensus Plan. The so-called Consensus Plan was developed and became the basis for the land use, policy and design components of the specific plan. The Consensus plan is described in detail throughout this document. The Committee also agreed to maintain Plan D throughout the EIR as an alternative to explore issues related to design, parking and open space.

Note: Per the adoption of the May, 2001 General Plan update and the March 13, 2002 City Council Resolution # 02 - 41, the Nishi property has been removed from the Specific Plan Area and converted to Agricultural Designation in the General Plan.
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CHAPTER IV. GATEWAY/OLIVE DRIVE SPECIFIC PLAN

This chapter forms the heart of the specific plan and includes the major land use and zoning requirements and regulations. It will be used along with the design guidelines to evaluate future development proposals and to serve as the guiding vision for the area.

The following specific plan goals reflect the discussions and decisions of the Advisory Committee.

A. SPECIFIC PLAN GOALS

Overall Goal:

(1) Develop a specific plan that effectively and sensitively addresses vehicles, pedestrian/bicycle circulation, aesthetics, biotics, historical, design and land use characteristics of the Gateway/Olive Drive area into the future.

Land Use:

(2) Develop a land use plan which addresses the character of the area and the needs of Davis and recognizes the proximity to the University and Core Area. It should:

   a. Consider the present and future needs of the students of the University.
   b. Enhance the vitality that currently exists within the University, Core Area and surrounding neighborhoods.
   c. Create a dynamic plan that meets the needs of a diverse population and allows for opportunities to live, work, shop, and recreate.

Circulation:

(3) Develop a balanced traffic circulation system which also addresses emergency vehicle access.

(4) Develop pedestrian/bicycle linkages to connect the specific plan area to the rest of Davis.

Resources:

(5) Develop a plan which preserves the historic and biotic qualities of the public area, while:

   a. Respecting and promoting the historical character and ambiance of the East Olive Drive neighborhood.
   b. Preserving historic and cultural resources, including natural landforms, and integrating these into the development of the specific plan.

Public Services and Infrastructure:

(6) Provide adequate services and infrastructure to serve the needs of the plan area into the future.

Design:

(7) Develop design guidelines which address the aesthetics and character of each subarea within the project area.

B. VISION FOR THE SPECIFIC PLAN

The Gateway Olive Drive Plan is really a knitting together of several distinct, but complementary visions for each of the sub-areas. Figure 7 provides an illustrative view of the study area as it might look at build-out. Table 1 indicates the assumed existing and proposed land use accounting for the plan.

The vision for both the East and West Olive Drive areas is to maintain and enhance their existing unique character and mix of needed uses. Along West Olive Drive, service commercial, restaurant, motel and similar uses would continue with roadway and landscape improvements to upgrade the entrance to the City and the entrance to Nishi. Development of Nishi may lead to increased values along West Olive Drive and redevelopment and beautification over time.
Table 5
Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan
Existing and Proposed Land Use Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
<th>Add./New Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Parking Req'd.</th>
<th>Acres Req'd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Olive Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single-Family</td>
<td>154 units</td>
<td>0 units</td>
<td>203 units</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-Family</td>
<td>165 units</td>
<td>296 units</td>
<td>461 units</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>15,062</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,062</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
<td>1,966.</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,966</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>88,619</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>93,282</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youmans Property,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Olive Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>93,029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93,029</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (31 rooms)</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5 Acre</td>
<td>0.5 Acre</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggie Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Child. Lab &amp; Parking Lot 10</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single-Family/Duplex/Studio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54 units</td>
<td>54 units</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000/20,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>9.25 Acres</td>
<td>(8.5 Acres)</td>
<td>0.75 Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishi Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Office/institutes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (150 rooms)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>T.B.D.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Offices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>T.B.D.</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-Existing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Nursery &amp; Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Station and Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>T.B.D.</td>
<td>T.B.D.</td>
<td>T.B.D.</td>
<td>T.B.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (Public Uses)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.3 Acres</td>
<td>15.3 Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Depot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>75-150 added</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch Tower</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhound</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
East Olive Drive single-family unit count includes 98 mobile homes.
East Olive Drive multi-family unit count includes 8 beds in a boarding house.
New uses in East Olive Drive include 130 multifamily units on Lincoln40 property & 166 mf units on Youmans property.
N.A.-Not Applicable. T.B.D.-To Be Determined.
The vision for East Olive Drive, crafted by residents and merchants of that neighborhood, is to maintain the fine-grained mix of uses and small-scale character of this historic area, while allowing vacant and underutilized parcels to build-out. Residential uses would be added to blend in with existing cottages and multi-family uses. The 8-acre, vacant Youmans site would allow for a mix of uses including some retail, office, institutional and potentially residential. The design focuses more intensive uses against the freeway frontage for sound protection and lower scale uses with landscaping on the Olive Drive side. Public improvements are also envisioned in the area including a pedestrian link to the depot, traffic calming measures and a public open space.

The Southern Pacific Depot is envisioned as a public parking area to serve the Core and the train station; substantial landscaping and beautification are intended to make the area more a part of the Core.

The University’s Aggie Village project along First Street is envisioned as a part of the Core and a way to link the City with both University and the arboretum. Aggie Village includes a 3.5 acre retail and office or retail only project at the corner of Richards and First meant as an anchor for the Core retail district. By placing buildings on the street with parking behind and adhering to design parameters, this use will be a gateway to downtown business. The center of Aggie Village is a faculty/staff housing project made up of 37 units (detached and duplex) and 17 "grad" flats or second units accessed via pedestrian alleys. This unique design reflects the scale, quality, grid pattern and lay-out of the adjoining University Avenue neighborhood; ample landscaping and open spaces and the physical connection to the arboretum further knit this development into the fabric of the Core. The west end of Aggie Village remains in University-related uses.

Another significant part of the overall Gateway vision is the enhanced circulation connections it will allow between the University and City, between Olive Drive and the Core and within the study area itself. Bikeways along the creek, connections to the Core at the former Hickory Lane and First Street, a link to the arboretum at D Street and an improved Richards corridor are all central to the plan.

The Plan assumes buildout and success of the SP Depot Project and Aggie Village Projects, which will create quality developments with physical connections to Olive Drive. These two projects will provide the linkages that move pedestrians back and forth between the Core area and University. The residents of the plan area will use these connections to walk or bike to the Core area for recreational and retail needs.

C. LAND USES AND ZONING

The following land use regulations serve as the general plan, specific plan and zoning for the properties within the plan area. Figure 8 is the Land Use and Zoning Plan for the area. A description of the key land use issues and expectations proceed the description of the land uses and zoning regulations for each sub-area. Zoning regulations which are more aesthetic in nature are provided in the design guidelines. Certain detailed site design issues such as driveway widths or locations are not included here. The applicable City zoning code for the most similar district shall apply.

(2) East Olive Drive Subarea

The guiding policy for the East Olive Drive subarea is:

Any improvement or development within the existing neighborhood of East Olive Drive must be compatible with the unique qualities of this neighborhood.

The allowed land uses on vacant and in-fill sites, zoning regulations and design guidelines in this plan are intended to implement this guiding policy. New development in the area will focus on preserving and renovating the existing housing and structures in the area. The combination of land uses for the subarea recognizes the benefit of the low-income housing in the area and encourages its preservation.

The volume and speed of vehicle traffic on East Olive Drive continues to be a concern of
(2) East Olive Drive Subarea

residents. This issue is discussed in the vehicle circulation section of this report. Any land use reviewed by the Planning Commission for consistency with the permitted and conditional uses should take into consideration the vehicle trips generated by the use and its impact on adjacent uses. A bicycle and pedestrian undercrossing and open space area is proposed at the former Hickory Lane (now an overcrossing and realigned), providing a connection to the Southern Pacific Depot. Cork oak and Olive trees will be preserved throughout the subarea. The subarea surrounds a portion of the Old Lincoln Highway, and contains some of the last remnants of original architecture, which will be preserved and highlighted.

In summary, the specific plan allows new in-fill development on the following vacant parcels:

Youmans:
Up to 166 Multi-family units and 3,500 square feet of office, personal services, cafe, and neighborhood serving retail uses. The scale of new development on the site shall be human scale and urban in nature. Consideration of traffic calming and pedestrian circulation in the vicinity of the former Hickory Lane should be a requirement of any proposal.

Note: This property is located within the RMD Zone. This section supercedes RMD limitations.

Lincoln40:
Up to 130 multifamily units. Adherence to the design guidelines should be required for any successful development on this property.

Dowling:
1020 Olive Drive, up to 4,000 square feet of service commercial adjacent to the Shell station. The site has been approved for a restaurant but is currently unbuilt.

COMMERCIAL SERVICE C-S

The purpose of this district is to provide suitable areas for uses which primarily serve the motorist or which rely to a smaller degree on pedestrian traffic or trade. The Gateway area has historically been the hub of commercial services for the community of Davis. The purpose of the district is to continue supporting these uses. Uses typically include automotive sales and service, lumber yards, nurseries, storage, equipment rental, repair services, wholesale businesses. Convenience retail stores, limited professional/administrative or veterinary offices, motels and restaurants having access from a road serving the freeway. The maximum floor area ratio shall be 40 percent.

Permitted Uses:
(a) Auto and farm equipment sales and bicycle and motorcycle sales and service.
(b) Wholesale establishments, supply services, distribution, and vending, equipment rental, nursery and garden supply.

Resolution No. 18-041
Exhibit B
(c) Retail shops such as for antiques, bake goods and catering, furniture, butcher, fish, produce or food market, lumber and building material sales and service.

(d) Service establishments such as print, cabinet, glass or sign shops; exterminator-tor or water softening services, barber or beauty salons, cleaners or laundromats.

(e) Offices for professional and administrative uses, veterinarians, contractors.

(f) Similar types of uses as identified by the Planning Commission to be of the same general character as those above.

**Conditional Uses:**
The following conditional uses may be permitted:

(a) Public and quasi-public, including public utility, uses and institutions.

(b) Auto service stations.

(c) Restaurants.

(d) Boat and trailer sales.

(e) New and used car lots.

(f) Motel

(g) Similar types of uses, as identified by Planning Commission to be the same general character as those noted above.

**Set-Back and Buffer Requirements:**
The following yard requirements shall be met:

(a) Front yard. None, unless required as part of the design review process.

(b) Side and rear yards. None, except when abutting a residential district, then not less than ten feet.

(c) Landscaping shall be required to screen railroad tracks, parking, loading or maintenance areas as provided for in design review.

(d) Solid masonry walls shall be required service, repair shops, auto upholstery, between commercial service uses and residential uses.

**RESIDENTIAL**
The purpose of this district is to provide residential land uses in the East Olive Drive area, which will complement existing residential land uses and will offer additional housing choices in the vicinity. With exception of Youmans and Lincoln40, residential developments are expected to emulate the cot-
tage/bungalow style of development, where smaller scale structures are placed in close proximity to each other opening out on to a common pedestrian walk. The intent of the district is to enhance the continued functioning of East Olive Drive as an area where travel trailers, mobile homes, and other small housing units are available as housing choices to Davis residents while encouraging development of neighborhood recreational or park/open space areas.

Three densities are allowed as shown on the map:

**Medium Density.** Single-family or multi-family residential development with densities from 4.2 to 10.0 units per net acre.

Note:

**High Density.** Includes apartment, condominium, town house, 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.

Allowed uses and site requirements are the same for the three residential densities.

**Residential Medium High Density – Lincoln40.** Uses same as High Density.

Density -- 14.00 to 24.99 units per gross acre; 13.45 - 23.99 units per net acre without density bonus

**Permitted Uses:**

(a) Single family dwellings.
(b) Duplex or two family dwellings.
(c) Living groups.
(d) Multi-family units.
(e) Mobile homes, trailers, travel trailers.
(f) Cabins without interior bathrooms in conjunction with separate buildings with maintained bathrooms.
(g) Agriculture, except the raising of animals or fowl for commercial purposes, or the sale of any products at retail on the premises.

**Conditional Use:**

(a) Public and quasi-public buildings and uses of a recreational, educational,
cultural or public service type, including public utility, but not including corporation yards, warehouses and similar uses.

(b) Churches and other religious or eleemosynary institutions.

The following accessory uses shall be permitted:

* Rooming and boarding of not more than five persons.
* Home occupations.
* Swimming pools.
* Signs, subject to standard zoning regulations.
* Studio, arts and crafts workshops. Other accessory uses and accessory buildings customarily appurtenant to a permitted use.
* Nursery schools and day care centers.

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, except for the Lincoln 40 that property shall not exceed sixty (60) 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.

EAST OLIVE MULTIPLE USE

The purpose of the East Olive Multiple use district is to encourage specific mixed use developments which form a cohesive link between existing and new development. The district is intended to be developed by creatively combining residential land uses with supporting retail, and office and business uses. When the zoning is combined with the design guidelines, the vision for the district is predominantly an updated version of the 1940-1950's concept of cottage/bungalow siting which successfully incorporates residential and non-residential land uses needed by both the residents and the community. Development of the Youman's property shall respect the existing cottage and heritage tree character of Olive Drive while creating a more urban pedestrian-oriented village style development on this property.

The Youmans property should be treated as one project predominantly consisting of multi-family with a small amount of neighborhood serving commercial uses.

Permitted Uses:

"Youmans ” Property - Parcel A
A. Multi-family not to exceed 15 du/acre (exclusive of density bonus.)
B. 3,500 square feet of office, personal services, cafe, or neighborhood-serving retail uses (sale of alcohol shall only be permitted within a sit down service cafe and be ancillary to food sales).
C. Live-work (residential in combination with one of the above listed permitted commercial uses in the same leasable space).

"Youmans ” Property - Parcel B (Affordable Housing)
A. Multi-family or co-op housing not to exceed 20 du/acre.

Remaining Hickory Lane Properties
Mix of uses on each parcel containing a combination of any two or more of the plan following:
(a) Multi-family
(b) Restaurants.
(c) Professional and administrative offices.
(d) Retail uses.

Conditional Uses:
(a) Athletic Clubs.
(b) Other uses as determined by the Planning Commission to be of the same general character as those listed above.
(c) Projects which do not provide a balanced mix of uses shall obtain a conditional use permit from the Planning Commission to insure that the use is compatible with the East Olive Drive neighborhood.

For design criteria including setbacks and building heights please refer to Chapter V - DESIGN GUIDELINES.

(3) West Olive Drive Subarea

The general and specific plan land use for this area is commercial service. The land use and zoning will be treated the same as commercial service in the East Olive Drive Subarea.

The West Olive Drive area is currently characterized by a motel and restaurants and commercial service uses. This portion of the plan assumes a widened Richards Boulevard undercrossing of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks. The intent of the land use and design guidelines for this portion of the project is to upgrade the image of the area and provide an enhanced entry experience while entering central Davis from 1-80.

(4) Aggie Village

As part of the City approved annexation for the Aggie Village development, the City amended the General Plan to designate the site as Street, residential medium density and retail with to the office. The subarea was also prezoned to a planned development for the residential portion of the project. All residential zoning requirements have been previously established and are not modified or incorporated herein. The only enforcement authority the specific plan will have over the Aggie Village is the design guidelines on the retail portion of the project. The zoning, General Plan and setbacks are as previously approved.

The University of California owns the land south of First Street, north of Putah Creek and the arboretum, from A Street to Richards Boulevard. Representatives of the University have participated in the Committee meetings, and presented a plan for their property which the Committee has accepted and supported. The Aggie Village project has been approved by the University Board of Regents and has already undergone CEQA review. It is included in the Gateway EIR for cumulative impact and environmental setting purposes only.

Aggie Village is separated into three distinct land uses from west to east. The early childhood laboratory and parking lot 10 are existing uses on the western 4 acres of the site. The subarea remains largely unchanged. The second subarea is currently vacant. Proposed uses include an open space corridor connecting Putah Creek to B Street (.75 acres), 37 houses plus 17 "grad flats" residential units on 5 acres between B and D streets. The third subarea is also vacant. Proposed uses include a retail/office development between D Street and
Richards Boulevard on 3.5 acres. The University has stated that the land use program for the commercial site could be either: 30,000 square feet of retail and 20,000 square feet of office or, 50,000 square feet of retail. No building structure shall exceed thirty-five feet in height.

The proposed housing units include both duplexes, and single family detached units with garage units behind. The duplexes will face the larger residences on the north side of First Street and the single family units will be located to the rear of those units with access to the arboretum and pedestrian/bicycle trails.

The overall site layout and extension of grid circulation (including street and pedestrian/bikeway) reflect the Core area, as does the fine grain of open spaces and built areas. The architecture and scale of the residential neighborhood are an extension of the University Avenue neighborhood. The retail/office area is designed to fit in with Core retail and enhance the pedestrian-oriented street frontage. The design guidelines reflect these intentions.

(5) Southern Pacific (SP) Depot

The Southern Pacific Depot will reflect a public designation for the general plan/specific plan and zoning.

The SP Depot is located north of the east-west railroad tracks. The railroad tracks create a parcel that is triangular in shape and generally vacant except for the depot and switch tower buildings. The vacant area of the site is proposed to be improved with a parking lot and numerous pedestrian/bike amenities. In 1994, the City Council approved the recommendation of the SP Depot report. The Council approval was accepted by the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Committee and is incorporated into the plan. The SP Depot permitted uses are public and quasi-public and it is anticipated that the project will consist of the following components and actions:

* Acquire the "Y" and the "Sliver" of the property.
* Relocate drop-off circle and "Solar Intersections" sculpture.
* Automobile access to the "Y" at Second Street.
* Improve the pedestrian connection of the station to the City.
* Channeled pedestrian and bicycle track-crossing at Second and H Street.
* Continue and expand bus service at H Street.
* Preserve existing trees and bushes, where possible.
* Preserve and enhance existing parking for businesses.
* Provide 75 to 150 parking spaces for the Depot or more if parking decks are ever added.
* Expanded bicycle parking.
* Preserve the historic integrity of the Depot and Switch Tower.

There are no proposed conditional uses or particular physical design requirements for the district. The general layout, uses and design from the SP Depot Report form the basic policies for this sub-area.

D. TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

This section provides the policies regarding the movement of people and goods via various modes of transport. Implementation of the specific plan does not require major modification to existing roadways. However, minor modifications will improve the area for all users, and substantial improvements are needed to serve the Nishi property. The cumulative total of all traffic and circulation improvements is the primary link which ties together the area with the Core Area, south Davis and the University. Especially important to any vehicular circulation
improvements are the numerous bicycle and pedestrian connections provided by this Specific Plan. Figure 9 provides an overview of existing and proposed improvement. Note that the westerly undercrossing of the Southern Pacific tracks on the Nishi property shall not be used for vehicle access other than emergency vehicles.

Vehicle Circulation
(1) West Olive Drive shall be extended to accommodate vehicle trips generated by the Nishi property.

Richards Boulevard
The Davis General Plan calls for widening and capacity and safety improvements to the Richards Boulevard corridor and underpass. The improvements are necessary for the roadway to operate at acceptable levels of service. Figure 10 is an artist's rendition of a widened Richards Boulevard.

(2) Richards Boulevard shall be improved to accommodate vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle traffic consistent with the Davis General Plan and the ultimate final design determined through the Richards Corridor EIR process.

(3) All improvements to the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive shall recognize the importance of the intersection as a gateway to Davis. Use of paver materials and extensive use of landscaping shall be a high priority.

Safety Issues
The speed at which vehicles enter East Olive Drive after exiting I-80 has long been a concern of residents in the area. The options available for addressing the concern are use of various traffic calming measures or closure of the off ramp. The Advisory Committee decided to leave the off-ramp open at this time, implement appropriate traffic calming measures and monitor the traffic for a period of time to re-evaluate the need for closure.

(4) City staff and Safety Advisory Commission shall identify applicable traffic calming reduce measures to slow traffic exiting I-80.

(5) As part of the review of any development in the plan area, the effects of trip generation shall be reviewed, and if warranted due to adverse impacts on traffic, shall be conditioned to provide traffic calming measures as part of site improvements. After 5 years the city shall reevaluate the need for closing the I-80/Olive Drive exit.

(6) The Olive Drive corridor needs to be reviewed immediately and traffic calming implemented.

Examples of traffic calming.

Emergency Vehicle Access
Due to the physical barriers of the SP tracks and I-80, ensuring that acceptable emergency vehicle access has been provided is a high priority. City policy has been that all large projects have more than one emergency vehicle access.

Construction Traffic
The Transportation and Circulation Element of the General Plan requires that construction traffic routes be identified in the project approvals. The intent of this requirement is to reduce impacts to residential areas.

(7) All construction traffic should use designated truck routes and the freeway, to the extent feasible.

(8) With the exception of construction activities in East Olive Drive, no construction vehicles shall be exiting I-80 at the East Olive Drive exit.
Figure 10
All project approvals shall include a construction vehicle routing map to be approved by the City Public Works Department.

Local and Regional Transit

Yolo County Transit (Yolobus) currently provides regional service between Sacramento, Woodland, and Davis. Yolobus express lines 43, 44, and 231 primarily serve commute travel to Sacramento from the downtown area. Lines 42, 242, 243, and 244 provide intercity non-express service from Davis to Sacramento and Woodland. Intercity buses run throughout the day.

Yolobus currently serves an estimated 100,000 riders from Davis each year, which is about 15 percent of the total ridership on the entire system. Unitrans currently provides local service in Davis with eleven bus routes that cover the city starting and terminating at the university campus.

Monthly ridership fluctuates depending upon the time of year. Ridership tends to peak during the winter months. Last February ridership was estimated at 202,048 riders. In May, ridership dropped to 166,637 riders. During the summer months the patronage drops significantly.

Amtrak provides service along the Capitol Route which stops in Davis at the SP Depot located at the end of Second Street. Ten trains stop in Davis daily. The Capitol trains run between Sacramento and San Jose. Two long distance trains also stop in Davis. The Coast Starlight provides service along the Pacific Coast from Los Angeles to Seattle. The California Zephyr is a transcontinental train between Oakland and Chicago. The proposed Nishi development adds substantial need for transit services, while the other parts of the specific plan do not. The following policies apply.

(9) Maintain current Yolobus and Unitrans routes with stops on First Street.

(10) The SP Depot shall continue to have land set aside and available for a potential light rail station.

Key Pedestrian/Bicycle Connections

A major bike/pedestrian corridor is planned to connect the east end of the UCD arboretum behind Aggie Village and under the railroad tracks across the east side of the Nishi property and crossing I-80 at Putah Creek to connect to West Chiles Road in South Davis.

Adequate lighting and safety issues will significantly affect the outcome of this project.

The pedestrian/bicycle connections proposed by the specific plan are a key feature of the plan. This is due in part to the close proximity of the Core, University and South Davis. Major connections will be made that improve both commuter and recreational opportunities for pedestrians and bicyclists. The major connections are highlighted along with other proposed connections for the specific plan area on Figure 9.

(12) The following pedestrian/bicycle linkages connecting the specific plan to the rest of Davis are included as part of the plan:

* Aggie Village to the SP Depot.
* East Olive Drive to the SP Depot via East Olive / Train Depot Crossing (New name per Public Works Department).
* Undercrossing of I-80 at Putah Creek with a possible extension under the West Olive Drive extension.

E. SIGNIFICANT BIOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The specific plan contains a number of resources which are proposed to be retained and enhanced. The East Olive Drive subarea contains a portion of the Old Lincoln Highway which provides a link to the past. Numerous significant trees and shrubs can be found in the specific plan area, which provide aesthetic and biological value. The abandoned Putah Creek channel still contains much of the native vegetation and character from its days as an active channel. Other resources in the subarea include, Nishi pond, hawk habitat, proximity to UCD arboretum, and pockets of open space.

Biological and Water Resources
The specific plan area is bisected by a remnant channel of Putah Creek. The water in the creek was diverted many years ago. Today, the creek channel is mostly dry, but retains some of the original riparian character of the historical channel. The 3.5 acres of land adjacent to the creek channel will be dedicated to the City.

(1) The remnant channel shall be improved to provide habitat area that enhances the historical character of the creek.

(2) As part of this improvement, riparian vegetation will be planted on both sides of the channel to provide aesthetic and habitat value.

In between the railroad tracks and the freeway there are currently two pathway alignments under consideration for connecting south Davis to the arboretum. The first will directly impact the creek area by following the channel. The second alignment would be routed out of the creek area into the developed portion of the Nishi project. As part of the Council action in adopting the specific plan, a final decision will need to be made as to which alignment will be used. The specific plan assumes the upper pathway which is more direct and causes less disturbance.

(3) The primary bike path connecting south Davis to the arboretum shall be connected to the pedestrian spine in the vicinity of old farm house.

(4) A secondary, smaller pedestrian path may be constructed along the creek edge alignment, minimizing disturbance to vegetation.

Opportunities exist to observe various wildlife species including hawks within the area and provide ground cover for other species.

(5) The City shall work with a qualified biologist and landscape designer to develop an urban habitat area that could serve as an educational amenity to the Core Area and specific plan area along the remnant channel.

Swainson's Hawks

Swainson's hawks have been known to nest and forage in the specific plan area. More specifically, a known historic hawk nest is located in the Putah Creek Channel area. The nest has not been active since 1991, but is not considered abandoned until use has discontinued for five years. Other active hawk nests exist within a mile of the project site. The crops grown on the Nishi property provide minimal hawk foraging value.

Any future improvements in the creek vicinity shall minimize disturbance and intrusion to the tree lined creek area. The City and developer shall work with the California Department of Fish and Game or biologist in choosing native landscaping for the creek area that provides nesting and foraging opportunities for hawks.

(6) Additional mitigations for loss of habitat and construction disturbance for the developed areas will follow the requirements set forth in the EIR.

Arboretum

Located on the north side of the SP tracks and following the Putah Creek channel is the University arboretum. The arboretum is a collection of plants and trees arranged to represent the species typical of various climatic regions of the world. The area contains an extensive bicycle and pedestrian system along the southerly portion of the main UCD campus. The development of the Putah Creek area behind Aggie Village and the Nishi property will be done to complement the existing UCD arboretum. The City of Davis will work with Arboretum/UC Davis when developing plans.

(7) Pathways onto the Nishi property shall be designed and planted to be a natural extension of the arboretum.

Trees

The specific plan area contains some of the largest and oldest trees in the city of Davis. East Olive Drive is bordered by cork oak and olive trees which shade the street and provide much of the ambiance of the area. The trees provide a valuable resource which should be retained for the area.

(8) All significant trees shall be preserved and protected. Significant trees are those that have been identified as rare, or extraordinary or significant specimens in the biological analysis.
(9) Prior to recordation of any final map, a tree protection plan shall be submitted addressing all significant and healthy trees for review and Department.

(10) To ensure that the East Olive Drive character is maintained, new trees shall be planted to fill in gaps in the streetscape for future generations to enjoy. New development in the East Olive Drive Area shall be responsible for the costs of this planting, augmented where feasible by the City or Tree Davis planting.

In addition to the trees, there are several clusters of elderberry bushes which serve as potential habitat for the elderberry long horn beetle. Although there are no beetles on the site, the habitat is protected by federal law.

(11) Subject to the approval of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, a take permit shall be obtained for all impacts to elderberry bushes. The take permit shall consider placing replacement bushes in the creek area.

**Open Space**

There are small pockets of vacant land in the East Olive Drive area, which serve as the only open area for residents. Due to the density of residential development in the area, these pockets form a valuable resource for preserving and enhancing the residential land uses in the area.

(12) New and remodeled residential developments shall utilize the flexible setbacks provided by the specific plan to create useable open space areas within residential projects.

**Historic Resources**

The City of Davis Historic Resources Management Commission has had on-going discussions regarding the possible designation of East Olive Drive as a historic resource. East Olive Drive is a remnant of the Old Lincoln Highway (US 40). The only designated historic structures within the plan area are the SP Depot and Switch Tower. The Slatter's Court complex was inventoried as a historic resource. The main farmhouse on the Nishi Property qualifies for the National Register, but currently has no historic designation at the local level. A copy of the assessment for the main farmhouse is available in the Community Development Department.

(14) Preservation of the older, historical character and structures of the East Olive Drive area is required. With the exception of the Youmans and Lincoln40 properties, new construction is required to emulate the architectural elements of the era as provided for in the design guidelines of this plan. New construction on the Youmans and Lincoln40 properties may differ from this character but must be human scale, pedestrian oriented, and compatible with the existing building and natural environment of the area.

(15) Reuse of the main farmhouse on the Nishi property is required consistent with the design guidelines (Chapter V).

**F. PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

Public services and infrastructure address water, sanitary sewer, drainage and utilities. Except for the proposed Nishi development, the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Area is currently served by all major utilities. Implementation of the specific plan in all areas but Nishi will not result in the need for any capacity improvement or other modifications to the existing utilities. Appendix A shows the locations of the existing facilities, which will adequately serve East and West Olive Drive, SP Depot and Aggie Village.

**Utilities**

Gas and electric service is currently provided by PG&E. Phone service is provided by Pac Bell and covers the entire plan area. Service currently exists in all subareas.

(1) All transformers shall be placed at locations which are not visible to the public or can adequately be screened by landscaping. If the transformers cannot be adequately screened they shall be placed underground.

The specific plan proposes that all new services within the plan area be capable of handling fiber
optics cable. If new trenches are opened in the East Olive Drive portion of the project, a sleeve should be provided to accommodate future fiber optic cable. New residential or hotel projects should be encouraged to provide computer networking capabilities. Direct connections to the University and Internet can lead to greater efficiency and a reduction in the number of vehicle trips.

(2) All infrastructure improvements in the plan area shall be designed to accommodate future technology such as fiber optics and computer networking capabilities.
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CHAPTER V. DESIGN GUIDELINES

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains design guidelines which apply to all new construction and renovation within the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Area. Design guidelines are intended to guide developers towards design solutions which:

- reinforce district character;
- ensure that adjacent developments are complementary with one another; and
- enhance the character of the place.

The Design Review Process is an administrative process to review the site plan signage and elevations of a project. Adjacent property owners are notified of the intended action and provided an opportunity for input.

This chapter is divided into two sections: general design guidelines and district design guidelines. The general design guidelines section includes guidelines which apply to the entire specific plan area. Development in all six districts must comply with these general guidelines.

The district design guidelines section describes six "districts" within the Gateway Olive Drive Specific Plan Area: East Olive Drive, West Olive Drive, Aggie Village, the Southern Pacific Depot and the Richards Boulevard/Olive Drive Intersection Area.

B. GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

Freeway Edge Landscaping

- All freeway edges shall be landscaped. Along the East Olive Drive frontage, this shall be in the form of landscaping and walls.

- The City shall work with Caltrans to provide landscaping adjacent to the freeway, consistent with the landscape patterns on the adjacent properties.

Parking Lots

- Parking lot entrances shall be well defined and easily recognizable to motorists.

- Parking lot layouts shall include paths to accommodate pedestrians; these paths are to be readily distinguishable and adequately lit for use after dark.

- Parking lots shall be located behind or between the buildings rather than between the building and the street. Where parking lots must be located adjacent to a public or private street, a 15-foot wide, bermed landscaped buffer shall be provided between the street, pedestrian spine and the parking lot to screen the parking from view of the roadway. (See diagram below).

- Parking lot islands between bays of parking shall be at least 6 feet from the outer edge of the bay to provide adequate space for tree trunks, hedges or parking lot light standards to be placed in the middle of the island.

- As appendages to or at the ends of planting islands, planting fingers can be used to provide additional planting area for trees and ground cover.
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• Vehicles shall be allowed to overhang into landscaped islands. The use of extended curbs or wheel-stops are prohibited.

• Parking lot landscaping shall be planted so as to provide a minimum of 50 percent shade at noon in 15 years.

• Trees in parking bays and surrounding parking lots shall be spaced the distance in feet which is equal to two-thirds of the tree's canopy in 15 years. For example, trees with an expected 15-year canopy of 45-feet should be planted 30 feet on center (compare with diagram below).

• Parking lot landscaping shall be planted in the "orchard style" to provide a shaded parking lot. (See photo and diagram at right).

• Plants shall be used in most landscaped areas; gravel, bark, rock or mulch is not adequate by itself as ground cover, with the exception of areas adjacent to buildings as required for window cleaning and maintenance. Similarly bicycle parking areas may use decomposed granite as a base material like the parking areas on the UCD campus. Further, where such areas are located adjacent to a pedestrian spine transition areas shall be designed to keep the material off the spine.

• Grading and berming shall be used to screen parking lots from the street and sidewalk areas, where appropriate.

• The use of native plants and other water conserving plants are strongly encouraged.

• All planted areas shall be automatically irrigated, drip and other water-conserving methods as required by the City's Water Conservation Ordinance.
Bicycle Paths

- Bollards shall be installed at all bicycle path/street intersections to alert the pedestrian or cyclist and discourage vehicular access. Bollards shall be removable to permit emergency access.
- Bicycle paths shall be constructed to City's standards.
- Landscaping shall be designed and maintained to ensure good visibility at intersections and prevent obstruction of paths.

Underpasses

- Native, drought-tolerant landscaping shall be planted in the vicinity of Putah Creek.
- Grade separations not near Putah Creek shall be terraced and landscaped.

Street Furniture

- Outdoor furniture shall be durable, visually attractive, and maintained at high quality.
- Street furniture shall be included in all commercial developments and include: at a minimum, benches, bike racks and drinking fountains. The inclusion of public art in commercial development projects is encouraged.
- Street furniture should be similar in scale, form, material, color, surface and detail to create a uniform theme within each district. For instance street furniture in the East Olive drive subarea would project the historical character of the area.

Lighting

- Lighting should be consistent with city lighting standards.
- Lighting should be placed where it can best aid in illuminating activity areas.
- Lighting shall be positioned to enhance the safety of vehicular and pedestrian flows at key points along the roadway. Light should be concentrated at intersections and pedestrian crosswalks.
- Pedestrian walkways, plazas and other activity points shall be illuminated.
- Light standards shall be scaled in size to match the size of areas to be lit. (See diagram below).

- Area lighting shall be directed predominantly downward and should be placed to prevent glare or excessive spray of light onto neighboring sites.
- Accent illumination should be provided at key locations such as building entries and driveway entries. Uplighting should be used as an accent only.
- Limited uses of lighting or highlighting of building facades is permitted, but should be subtle.

Signage

- Signage within the specific plan is intended to aid drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians in the area. The plan calls for low key signs which are generally not oriented to the freeway.
- All signage shall conform with Chapter 40: Zoning of the Davis Municipal Code.
• Planning Director or designee shall review the design and placement of signs and outdoor advertising as part of design review.

• Signage shall enhance the architectural character of the building.

• The light from any illuminated sign shall be shaded, shielded or directed so that the light intensity or brightness shall not be objectionable to surrounding areas. No sign shall have blinking, flashing or fluttering lights or other illuminating device which has a changing light intensity, brightness or color except for time of day and temperature signs.

• All signage shall be placed flat against the building and incorporated into the building's architecture.

• Low monument signs shall be allowed if oriented to the pedestrian and driver. Such signs shall be in scale with the building and lot. Pole signs are not allowed.

Screening

• All exterior services and utilities such as trash dumpsters, transformers, meters and loading bays shall be screened from public or private streets or walkways. (See diagram below).

Fences and enclosures used to screen these elements shall be compatible with the architecture of the building and should use complementary materials.

Loading/Shipping

Truck loading docks shall be designed as an integral part of the development and be screened from any public right-of-way, open space and residential development.

Retention/Detention Basins

• Basins shall be designed with natural landscaping for wildlife habitat purposes, similar to the existing Aspen or Northstar ponds.

• Passive recreation areas which allow for viewing of retention basins shall be provided.

Culverts

• Culverts shall incorporate native, drought-olerant landscaping to provide screening and a more natural appearance.

C. DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES

Character Types

Two character types are proposed for the Gateway/Olive Drive area – Downtown Character and Cottage Character. The architecture, landscape and streetscapes of each district are intended to reflect one of these character types. Figure 13 illustrates the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Area and the character each district and streetscape is proposed to reflect.

Downtown Core Character

The Downtown Core Character draws upon many of the elements found in downtown Davis: a formal and urban character; a small-scale pedestrian orientation; and a mix of commercial and residential activities. The landscape is characterized by shaded tree-lined streets, landscaped yards and street furniture. Figure 15 illustrates the intended overall, landscape and...
architectural themes associated with the Downtown Core Character. Districts to be developed in keeping with the Downtown Core Character are West Olive Drive, Aggie Village, the SP Depot and the Nishi Property North.

**Cottage Character**

The Cottage Character draws upon elements found along the Old Lincoln Highway (Highway 40). The Old Lincoln Highway connected the east coast, Ocean City, Maryland, with the west coast, San Francisco, California, and was developed in the 1940's to accommodate the growing interest in the automobile travel.

In northern California, buildings along the Lincoln Highway were developed to meet the needs of travelers and included bungalows and small residential courts for overnight stays, and gas stations for fueling. The buildings were freestanding, small-scale, wooden structures. Architectural elements included large porches and overhangs. Large shade trees lined the Lincoln Highway providing shade and visually enhancing the experience of the traveler. The building sites were landscaped with informal groupings of shade trees. Figure 16 illustrates the intended overall, landscape and architectural character associated with the Cottage character. The East Olive Drive district is to be developed in keeping with the Cottage Character.

Development on the Lincoln40 property will incorporate some elements of Lincoln Highway. The primary building is envisioned as a contemporary, five-story pavilions incorporating elements from traditional highway and railroad structures. The building, which may include materials such as brick veneer, metal roof lines and plaster, are set back, away from Olive Drive following the curve of the adjacent railroad, creating a backdrop to the community outdoor and amenity spaces. On-site parking will serve as a buffer between the railroad and the residential building. The building will step down in height and scale along the Olive Drive (formerly known as Lincoln Highway), with active, ground-floor amenity spaces facing the street and with residential units above providing additional eyes toward the public sidewalk. This configuration will minimize the building footprint and maximize active open space.
Overall Character

- Buildings Set in the Landscape
- Landscape Character Knits Diverse Building Styles Together
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Orientation

Landscape Character

- Shade
- Informal, mature landscape
- Vehicles at periphery, separated from pedestrians and bicycles

Architectural Character

- Formal building entries differentiated architecturally from rest of building
- Enter building from pedestrian arteries
- Windows punched in facade rather than ribbons of glass
- Two to four story building height
- Flat or pitched roofs
- Neutral colors
- Stucco or wood siding

University Character
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Figure 14
Overall Character
- Formal, Urban Character
- Mix of Uses - Commercial and Residential
- Small Scale Pedestrian Orientation

Landscape Character
- Landscaped Sidewalks - street trees and planters
- Pedestrian Amenities - street furniture, outdoor seating
- Vehicular Presence - on-street parking

Architectural Character
- Two-story building height
- Flat or pitched roofs
- Larger ground floor windows
- Smaller upper floor windows
- Commercial area has continuous facade with constant setbacks
- Enter building from the street
- Neutral colored facade/accent colors
- Predominantly stucco

DOWNTOWN CORE CHARACTER

GATEWAY OLIVE DRIVE SPECIFIC PLAN
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EDAW, INC.
Overall Character

- Reflects the character of the Old Lincoln Highway
- Rural character
- Small-scale
- Bungalow style architecture

Landscape Character

- Roads lined with heritage trees
- Informal groupings of large shade trees around buildings
- No curbs or sidewalks

Architectural Character

- Small-scale wooden buildings
- Pitched, gambrel or hipped roofline
- Architectural elements include porches, overhangs, awnings, detailed railings and wooden columns
- Neutral colors with accent colors on wood trim
- Sash or multi-paned windows

Cottage Character
Chapter V. Design Guidelines

(1) East Olive Drive Neighborhood

The East Olive Drive neighborhood is characterized by the enormous cork oaks which line the street, providing shade and a sense of history for the neighborhood. The area north of East Olive Drive is predominantly single-story, wooden, residential bungalows with pitched roofs, overhanging eaves and sash or multi-paned windows. The area is shaded by a variety of tree types in informal groupings.

With the exception of the Youmans and Lincoln40 properties, new development in the East Olive Drive Neighborhood is intended to reflect the Cottage Character (see Figure 16) with small-scale, freestanding wooden structures, large porches and deep overhangs, as well as an informal landscape of shade trees. Development on the Youmans and Lincoln40 properties shall respect the existing Cottage Character fabric of the Old Lincoln Highway while enhancing the pedestrian scale ambiance of the neighborhood. Historic single family cottages would be retained and enhancement would be encouraged. Existing vacant and underutilized land is intended to be converted to mixed use with generally residential and neighborhood serving commercial uses.

Design guidelines for the East Olive Drive Neighborhood are as follows with separate guidelines for the Youmans and Lincoln40 properties delineated where appropriate:

Building Materials

Building materials shall be predominantly wood with lap siding.

(Youmans Property)
Building materials and color should help establish a human scale and provide visual interest. Use the high quality materials on exposed exterior surfaces such as brick, metal, surfaces.

(Lincoln40)
Building materials and color should help establish a human scale and provide visual interest. Use of materials on exposed exterior surfaces such as brick veneer, metal, plaster, or siding are encouraged.

Roofline

Rooflines shall be predominantly pitched, nipped or gambrelled, to reflect the character of the buildings constructed along the Old Lincoln Highway. (See diagram below). Flat roofs should be limited to commercial and mixed use buildings only.

Roof mounted mechanical equipment is prohibited in the East Olive Drive subarea except for commercial and mixed use buildings. Restaurants will be permitted roof mounted exhaust hoods on the condition that they are completely screened from public view and meet the architectural design criteria.
Rooflines shall be predominantly pitched, nipped, or gambreled, to reflect the character of the buildings constructed along the Old Lincoln Highway. Flat roofs (above three stories) are allowed provided they encompass not more than 50% of the roof type per structure. Any roof mounted mechanical equipment must be completely screened from public view and meet the architectural design criteria.
Facade Design

New buildings shall utilize characteristics of the bungalows, gas stations and cottages that characterized the Old Lincoln Highway. Traditional windows are required for all buildings using traditional architectural style.

Facade details could include some of all of the following elements: porches, overhangs, awnings, wooden windows and trim, railing details, and multi-paned or sash windows. (see diagram below).

(Lincoln40)

New buildings should be delineated both vertically and horizontally to respect the traditional building scale and convey a human scale.

Facade details could include some or all of the following elements: porches, stoops, overhangs, awnings, wooden windows and trim, railing details, and multi-paned or sash windows.

(Youmans Property)

New buildings should be delineated both vertically and horizontally to respect the traditional building scale and convey a human scale.

Facade details could include some or all of the following elements: porches, stoops, overhangs, awnings, wooden windows and trim, railing details, and multi-paned or sash windows. (See diagram below).
Building Entries

Building entries shall incorporate elements of the historical Lincoln Highway including deep overhangs and front porches.

(Youmans Property)

Residential building entries shall incorporate elements of the historical Lincoln Highway buildings including deep overhang's and front porches. Primary entrances to commercial and residential buildings should be clearly identified and oriented toward the street and/or pedestrian way.

(Lincoln40)

Primary entrances should be clearly identified and oriented toward the street or a pedestrian way.

Building Siting

Commercial buildings shall be oriented to the street with parking behind the structures. Residential projects shall reflect the hotel/bungalow siting pattern.

(Youmans Property)

Both residential and commercial buildings shall be oriented to the street or private roadway with parking behind the structures.

(Lincoln40)

Buildings shall be oriented to the street or private roadway with parking behind or to the side of the structures.

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.
Building heights may increase to a maximum of 3 stories and 35 feet adjacent to the freeway.

(Youmans Property)
All buildings or portions thereof fronting onto East Olive Drive shall emphasize the single story building heights traditional to Olive Drive through the use of a variety of features such as; porches, trellises, stoops and enhanced exterior building material detailing.

Building heights may be a maximum of 3 stories and 36 feet

(Lincoln40)
Building heights may be a maximum of sixty (60) foot and/or five (5) stories.

Pedestrian Amenities

Lighting in the East Olive Drive neighborhood shall reflect the character and history of the neighborhood and be unified throughout the district. Lighting fixtures shall be traditional in nature incorporating flared vases and acorn fixtures or other traditionally appropriate light fixture.

Site Landscaping

Building and parking setbacks shall be landscaped with native, drought-tolerant plant materials.

Streetscape Guidelines

The overall character of East Olive Drive is informal and rural.

East Olive Drive shall have two vehicle lanes, two bicycle lanes, paved sidewalks, and a planter strip, which serves as a planting area for heritage trees. On street parking is appropriate where sufficient right-of-way exists.

Mature heritage trees shall be retained and added to, wherever possible. The turnaround at the east end of East Olive Drive shall be enhanced with landscaping and other site amenities.

(2) West Olive Drive

The West Olive Drive District serves as the entrance to the Nishi Property. Uses planned for this area include highway service commercial, office, and open space. Development in this area is intended to reflect the Downtown Core Character (see Figure 15). The landscape character includes shaded tree-lined streets, landscaped yards and street furniture. Design guidelines for the West Olive Drive District are provided below:

Building Materials

Building materials shall be predominantly block or stucco with varying accent materials (metal, glass, tile).

Roofline

Rooflines can be either flat or pitched.

Flat roofs shall incorporate vertical elements such as towers, projecting cornices, parapet walls, false fronts, or other vertical architectural elements to add interest.

Facade Design

Commercial areas shall have a continuous facade with consistent setbacks.

Building facades shall consist of larger ground floor windows topped by smaller upper floor windows or transom/clear story windows. Traditional windows required in buildings using traditional architectural style.
Building Entries

Buildings shall have primary entrance from the street. Formal building entries shall be differentiated architecturally from the rest of building.

Building Height

Buildings shall not exceed two stories in height and 35 feet.

Building Setbacks

Building setbacks shall be the same as those established for the Gateway Commercial Service District.

Parking

Parking shall be on-street or in lots located behind or between the buildings rather than between the building and the street.

Pedestrian Amenities

Pedestrian amenities shall include street furniture, outdoor seating lighting and exterior waiting areas for commercial service/restaurant uses.

Street furniture, outdoor seating and lighting in the West Olive Drive District shall be of a distinct design and be of similar character to that in the Nishi Property.

Site Landscaping

Building and parking setbacks shall be landscaped with native, drought-tolerant plant materials.

Streetscape Guidelines

West Olive Drive is intended to have the character of a downtown street - formal and shady. The figures adjacent and below are representative plan and sections to illustrate the intended street character for West Olive Drive.

Specific guidelines for this streetscape are as follows:

West Olive Drive shall have a 84-foot right-of-way including two 8-foot bicycle lanes, four 11-foot vehicle lanes and two 12-foot sidewalk/planting areas.
Street tree planting shall consist of evenly spaced, deciduous shade trees selected from the City's approved street tree list.

Trees shall be spaced the distance in feet which is equal to two-thirds of the tree's canopy in 15 years. For example, trees with an expected 15-year canopy of 45-feet should be planted 30 feet on center.

(3) Aggie Village

Aggie Village is intended as a mixed-use development incorporating single-family and multi-family housing, ground floor retail with potential office above, academic uses and open space. A plan for this area was prepared by U.C. Davis. The housing component of the area is already approved and under construction. The
following design guidelines apply to the commercial portion only. Development in this district should follow the Downtown Core Character (see Figure 15) and reflect the elements found in downtown Davis: a formal and urban character; a small scale pedestrian orientation; and a mix of commercial and residential activities. The landscape character should include shaded tree-lined streets, landscaped yards and street furniture.

Design guidelines for the Aggie Village office/retail area are provided below and shall be compatible with the residential project currently underway.

### Building Materials

Building materials shall be predominantly wood, brick or stucco with varying accent materials (metal, glass, tile).

### Roofline

Rooflines shall be either flat or pitched. Flat roofs shall incorporate vertical elements such as towers, projecting cornices, crenellated or decorated parapet walls, false fronts, or other vertical architectural elements.

### Facade Design

Commercial areas shall have a continuous facade of attached buildings similar to the core area with consistent setbacks.

Building facades shall consist of larger ground floor windows topped by smaller upper floor windows or transom/clerestory windows.

Retail Commercial buildings should provide varied facades, roof forms, architectural details, and finishes to create an appearance of several smaller projects. Commercial bays should be visually expressed to break down the size of any frontage into smaller and more traditional increments that reflect the scale of the surrounding residential neighborhood and commercial uses in the downtown.

### Building Entries

Buildings shall have a primary entrance from the street with the exception of any commercial bay at the corner of First and D.

Formal building entries shall be differentiated architecturally from the rest of building.

### Building Height

Retail Commercial buildings shall not exceed 35 feet in height, except for tower elements which may be 45 feet in height but may not exceed a footprint of 400 square feet.

### Scale and Architectural Style

The scale and building style shall be complementary to the adjacent Aggie Village residential neighborhood to the west.

### Building Setbacks

In order to create a uniform, active, and pedestrian-oriented street facade along First and D Streets, buildings facing onto these streets shall be built 15 feet or less from the street curb. Certain special conditions may allow portions of the building to setback more than 10 feet.

If indoor seating is provided, buildings may be set back as much as 10 additional feet; at designated plaza areas, building may be set back further.

### Plaza Areas

Pedestrian connections with the surrounding downtown are to be reinforced by an entry plaza.

This plaza shall be designed to permit views into the site and provide usable outdoor space.

The plaza shall be at least 2,500 square feet. At least one building entrance shall be required from the Plaza.

### Roofs

Mechanical equipment shall be screened from streets by using parapets or by extending the roofs from over equipment.
Windows Facing the Plaza and First Street

Windows are required along First and D Streets and adjacent to required plazas and pedestrian paths, with not more than 10 feet of non-window wall space in every 25 feet of frontage. Windows and display cases are encouraged on facades facing on-site parking.

Windows shall be recessed at least two inches from walls.

Windows shall be rest on stem walls that are at least 24 inches tall and may not extend to floor level.

Window frames not to exceed a width of 10 feet.

Parking

Parking shall be in lots located behind the buildings rather than between the building and the street.

Loading and Service Areas

The visual impact of loading areas shall be minimized.

Preferably, loading areas should be from street, plaza and parking areas. Alternatively, loading areas may occur within view of these areas but should not occupy more than 20 feet of frontage and shall be visually buffered with trellises, landscaping and overhangs.

Trash enclosures shall be screened from view with materials of the same palette as materials found in primary buildings. Where possible, trash enclosures shall be incorporated into the form of the building itself.

Pedestrian Amenities

Pedestrian amenities shall include street furniture, outdoor seating, lighting and landscaping.

Pedestrian amenities shall be of a distinct design and be compatible with the design and character of the pedestrian amenities in the Downtown of the Core. Suggestions include wider sidewalks to allow cafes, provision of display windows along pedestrian ways, overhangs to protect the pedestrian from sun and rain.

D Street

D Street links the pedestrian spine on the Nishi Property to First Street and downtown Davis via an underpass beneath the railroad tracks. The character of D Street between First Street and the railroad tracks is that of a downtown Davis street - formal and shady. D Street is not intended for through traffic, and, therefore will not be constructed as a standard street. Specific guidelines for D Street are as follows:

D Street shall provide a continuation of the pedestrian spine and provide for pedestrian and bicycle traffic with landscape or design elements consistent with the pedestrian spine.

The railroad underpass linking D Street and the pedestrian spine shall be designed so its height and width can comfortably accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.

D Street shall be planted with evenly spaced, deciduous shade trees selected from the City's list of approved street trees.

Trees on the west side of D Street shall be spaced the distance in feet which is equal to two-thirds of the tree's canopy in 15 years. For example, trees with an expected 15-year canopy of 45 feet should be planted 30 feet on center.

(4) SP Depot

The SP Depot Planning Study was completed in June 1994 and recommended the addition of 150 parking spaces to the existing train station site.
The station, constructed in 1914, is an historic structure and serves as a transit hub for downtown Davis. The SP Depot was renovated in 1986 and is in excellent condition. No additional development is planned for this site; however, any future changes to this site should be compatible with the Downtown Core Character (see Figure 15) and reflect a formal and urban character; a small scale pedestrian orientation; and a mix of commercial and residential activities. The landscape character should include shaded tree-lined streets, landscaped yards and street furniture. Provide a safe crossing underneath the railroad tracks to connect the SP Depot, downtown Davis and the East Olive Drive neighborhood.

Visually and functionally improve the connection between the SP Depot and downtown Davis.

Expand and enhance bicycle and pedestrian access to and through the station area.

Structures within this area are subject to Historic Resources Management Commission review to ensure compatibility with the historic structures on site. Any new structures are required to reflect the SP Depot structure.

Parking

Parking decks or structures may be added to the SP "triangle" property, provided their scale and design are compatible with the depot and surrounding landscaping and built areas. Design of any structured parking shall reflect a high quality architectural image and evoke the history of the site.

The Richards Boulevard/Olive Drive Gateway

Richards Boulevard is one of the main entries to downtown Davis. Currently a two-lane road which passes under the Southern Pacific tracks. Plans call for the widening of Richards Boulevard to four-lanes with bicycle lanes in either direction and visual enhancement of the underpass. The plan intends for both sides of Richards Boulevard to be developed as highway commercial. The Richards Boulevard flowering corridor shall reflect the formal, urban character of downtown Davis. Detailed studies are currently underway to determine the exact configuration of Richards Boulevard. However, general guidelines for the Richards Boulevard streetscape and the Richards Boulevard/Olive Drive Gateway

Pedestrian Amenities

Pedestrian amenities shall include street furniture, outdoor seating and lighting. Pedestrian amenities shall be of a distinct design and be compatible with the design and character of SP Depot. Amenities shall focus on meeting needs of the depot and other transit users. Adequate waiting areas, drop off and loading areas and bike racks/lockers shall be provided.

Site Landscaping

Buildings and parking setbacks shall be landscaped with native drought tolerant plant materials.
Drive Gateway are as follows:

Street tree planting shall consist of evenly spaced deciduous shade trees.

Landmark trees such as cork or valley oaks or cedars shall be included in streetscape landscaping.

Street trees shall be spaced the distance in feet which is equal to two-thirds of the tree's canopy in 15 years. For example, trees with an expected 15-year canopy of 45-feet shall be planted 30 feet on center.

Parking shall not be permitted on Richards Boulevard.

Special streetlights shall be incorporated into Richards Boulevard which help to emphasize the importance of this entry boulevard.

The City of Davis shall work with Caltrans to landscape the land encircled by tile on and off ramps from Interstate 80. The landscape shall mark and enhance this entry to downtown Davis. Landscaping shall include trees and shrubs with flowering color.

Gateways shall be created on Richards Boulevard south of East Olive Drive and on West Olive Drive at the entrance to the Nishi Property.

Each gateway shall incorporate an identity feature such as columns, walls, fencing; and landscaping. Buildings shall be set back from street to emphasize gateway landscaping.

Landscaping and mounding shall be used to screen parking areas so they are screened from Richards Boulevard.

Accent trees with fall and flowering color and shrubs shall be used as gateway plantings.

All gateway and entry boulevard landscaping shall allow clear views for traffic safety. Enriched paving treatments, such as interlocking brick pavers, can be used to visually denote crosswalks. All signage shall be designed to be observed from below the future tree canopy.
CHAPTER VI. IMPLEMENTATION
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CHAPTER VI. IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter provides the detailed means for building out of the specific plan by private parties. It is divided into two sections: (1) entitlements, and (2) financing. The entitlements section lists the necessary regulatory steps which will have to occur to move from policy into development or redevelopment of parcels and various public improvements. The financing section describes and analyzes the costs to implement the specific plan and the various financing mechanisms which will be used to fund the improvements. This chapter does not analyze the fiscal impacts of the plan, that is, the on-going public costs and revenues to the City and County. That analysis is in a separate document accompanying the staff report.

A. ENTITLEMENTS AND NEXT STEPS

The Gateway Olive Drive Specific Plan is designed to be "self-contained." That is, the general plan land use, the zoning and the design guidelines are all in one place and are meant to be adopted by ordinance. The following is a list which indicates the various required actions by the City and other agencies to adopt the Plan and to establish additional required entitlements.

(1) Environmental Impact Report Certification (by City): This is required before any specific plan approvals can proceed; it will occur along with plan adoption.

(2) Specific Plan Adoption (by City): The City will adopt the Specific Plan for the Gateway/Olive Drive area by ordinance. It includes general plan land use design guidelines. Properties currently outside the city limits will need to be prezoned prior to annexation. The areas currently existing within the city limits will have a new zoning as per the specific plan. This will be done along with EIR certification.

(3) A few sentences in the General Plan text will need to be modified to be consistent with the project. These changes will be done along with specific plan adoption.

(4) Sphere of Influence (by LAFCO and City): The Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission will need to amend the current Sphere of Influence to include the Nishi property in the 10-Year Sphere of Influence. The City will also need to adjust the Sphere of Influence map on City documents. This will occur at the time the Nishi property developers apply for annexation.

(5) Tentative Map and Final Map(s), including subdivision improvement agreement(s) (by City): tentative and final map(s) will be processed to subdivide any properties within the specific plan area coming forward for development.

(6) Design Review (by City): All new developments or major remodels will require design review approval. Other subsequent development proposals are subject to design review based on the criteria established in Chapter V of the specific plan.

B. FINANCING PLAN

This financing plan sets forth a strategy to fund the public and private improvements needed to support the proposed land uses in the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan. The proposed land use plan includes approximately designations, pre-zoning, rezoning and 215 dwelling units and 16,200 square feet of non-residential development, in addition to the existing land uses. The financing plan provides a detailed analysis of the cost to provide necessary infrastructure to serve new development and identifies the probable funding sources. This section is organized into two major issues:
Table 6
Total Costs by Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Facilities</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Davis</td>
<td>Project Specific</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPFP Fee</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA WIDE IMPROVEMENTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd. Undercoressing &amp; Widening</td>
<td>$8,900,000</td>
<td>$8,010,000</td>
<td>$890,000</td>
<td>$1,372,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putah Creek Bike Connections (1)</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$363,260</td>
<td>$1,064,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,762,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under SP RR and I-80 Undercrossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Depot (2)</td>
<td>$1,762,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,762,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Depot Crossing to East Olive Dr.</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Olive Dr. Street Improvements (3)</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COSTS</td>
<td>$17,907,000</td>
<td>$3,863,160</td>
<td>$8,010,000</td>
<td>$1,954,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$1,372,840</td>
<td>$2,567,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) "Other" funding source includes construction tax (26.35%) and Prop. 116 (22.68%)
(2) Project acquisition has been funded by a combination of State funding and a grant is not included in this cost estimate. The remainder of the project is the responsibility of the City and is currently unfunded.
(3) Project is currently unfunded. A portion of the project will be funded by private financing. The remainder will possibly be funded by the MPFP and redevelopment funds.
(4) Assumes below grade crossing. At-grade crossing will be pursued and if approved will cost approximately $300,000 and use similar funding source(s).

Source: NI Engineering and Surveying Co., Inc., the City of Davis Public Works Department, and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. / Prepared by Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.

Amended by City of Davis, 2002.
### Table 7
**Phasing of Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Facility Costs - 1995$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AREA-WIDE IMPROVEMENTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd. Undercrossing &amp; Widening</td>
<td>$8,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putah Creek Bike Connections</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under SP RR and I-80 (Undercrossings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Depot</td>
<td>$1,762,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Depot Crossing to East Olive Drive (at grade)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-OR-</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Depot Crossing to East Olive Drive (below grade)</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Olive Dr. Street Improvements</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,907,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Subtotal for area wide improvements assumes below grade crossing at SP Depot to Olive Drive based on 2002 construction costs.

(2) Phase 1 for the Nishi property assumes development of lots 1 & 2 on the tentative map. Lots 1 and 2 represent approximately 10 acres of development, with 11,400 sq. ft. of restaurant/retail development, 120,000 sq. ft. of large office space, and 90,000 sq. ft. of small office space.

Source: NK Engineering and Surveying Co., Inc. and the City of Davis Public Works Department.

Prepared by Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.

Amended by City of Davis, 2002.
Summary of Infrastructure Costs and Phasing

Development within the specific plan area will require the construction of major public infrastructure. Frontage and in-tract improvement costs are not available at this time for the East Olive Drive, West Olive Drive, and SP Depot subareas. Cost estimates for facilities needed in these subareas will be estimated as development occurs. The Aggie Village subarea improvements will be funded by the University of California at Davis (UCD). Prior to approval of applicable infrastructure projects the City will consult with UCD to review all costs and portions assumed to be paid by UCD, and in particular the bike undercrossing the Southern Pacific tracks.

The facilities costs and descriptions of facilities included are limited to those area-wide facilities of benefit to the entire specific plan.

The cost estimates include approximately $14.4 million for the area-wide improvements, of which $8.9 million is for the Richards undercrossing widening.

All costs are in 1995 dollars and rounded to the nearest $100. The area-wide facilities costs are provided by the City of Davis Public Works Department. A detailed list of facilities costs is contained in Appendix B.

The phasing of development in the specific plan area will vary for the different subareas. The improvements within the specific plan will be constructed in response to development. The timing of development in the East Olive Drive, West Olive Drive, and SP Depot areas is unknown at this time.

Table 8 also shows that approximately $14.4 million of area-wide facilities. Although all of the area-wide facilities are shown in other phases of development, the city's Major Project Financing Plan (MPFP) indicates that the Putah Creek bike connections may be constructed in the year 1997.

Detailed Description of Area-Wide Improvements

The $14.4 million of area-wide improvements includes $8.9 million for the widening of the Richards Boulevard undercrossing. The existing undercrossing is two lanes. The city's General Plan and MPFP shows the undercrossing is to be widened to four lanes.

The Putah Creek bike connections under the SP railroad tracks and I-80 are also included in the area-wide improvements at a cost of $2.8 million. The Putah Creek Parkway Channel (a pedestrian/bike path) currently dead ends in the vicinity of I-80. The improvements will allow the path to continue under I-80, under the newly extended Olive Drive (per the Specific Plan), and under the SP railroad tracks to connect to the existing arboretum at UCD. The improvements to the SP Depot will include a 150 stall parking lot, pedestrian walls, decorative pavement treatment, bus turn out and other improvements. The cost the SP Depot improvements is estimated on a preliminary basis to be $1.8 million.

The area-wide improvements also include construction of a crossing from the SP Depot to East Olive Drive at an approximate cost of $3,500,000 for an at-grade and for a $300,000 below grade crossing. The pedestrian/bike crossing will go from the SP Depot, over/under the SP railroad tracks, and connect in the vicinity of Hickory Lane and East Olive Drive. Paving and improving Hickory Lane (not including the bike crossing) will be funded by adjacent development.

The East Olive Drive improvements will include striping and median improvements used for traffic calming measures. The $145,000 cost estimate for these improvements is preliminary in nature and is based on specific traffic calming measures. The actual cost of the improvements may vary depending on the traffic calming measure selected. The need for the area-wide improvements to Richards Boulevard and the facilities is not directly related to the timing of development in the specific plan area.

The area-wide improvements will be scheduled in the MPFP and will be constructed depending
on the timing of city-wide development and the need for the facilities.

**Financing Strategy**

Table 9 summarizes the potential funding sources for facilities needed to support development within the subareas of the Specific Plan. In general, improvements will be funded by a combination of funding sources, including the Major Projects Financing Plan (MPFP), redevelopment funds, the University of California at Davis, project specific funding. Table 6 shows how a series of funding sources may be used to fund the $17.8 million of area-wide and Nishi subarea improvements.

### Table 9
**Potential Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>City of Davis</th>
<th>Project Specific Funding</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPFP Fee Program</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>UCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Olive Drive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Olive Drive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggie Village</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Depot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area-Wide Facilities:** The area-wide improvements will be funded by City of Davis funding sources, primarily through the MPFP ($363,200) and redevelopment tax increment financing ($8 million). An additional approximately $2 million will be funded by UCD, $140,000 by project specific financing, and $1.4 million by other funding sources. Grant funding for the pedestrian/bike undercrossing may also be pursued. The other funding sources include the City's construction tax and Proposition 116 monies.

A portion of the area-wide improvements, $2.2 million to $5,700,000, is currently unfunded. The estimate includes $1.8 million for the improvements to the SP Depot, $300,000 to $3,500,000 for the SP Depot bike crossing to East Olive Drive, and $5,000 for improvements to East Olive Drive. The majority of these costs are associated with development of the SP Depot, and are therefore the responsibility of the City. These projects which are currently unfunded will possibly be included in the MPFP, the city-wide Mello-Roos CFD program, or redevelopment funds.

**Major Projects Financing Plan:** The Major Projects Financing Plan (MPFP) was first adopted by the City of Davis in December 1989. The plan projects the infrastructure the City will need due to new development and outlines in detail where the City expects to obtain the funds to build or acquire the needed infrastructure.

The MPFP takes into account the financial participation of the State, UCD, and other agencies, as well as redevelopment tax increment financing, and then assigns the remainder of the costs to development areas throughout the City. The MPFP then assigns a fee per unit for new residential development or its equivalent for non-residential development to pay for facilities needed in each development area. The MPFP has been updated annually and is presently undergoing a major revision.

The approximately $363,200 cost of the Putah Creek bike connections under the SP railroad tracks and 1-80 is included in the MPFP. Projects developing within the Specific Plan will fund a fair share of the projects funded by the MPFP by paying the MPFP fee established...
for the Core Area of the City of Davis. UCD will fund the Aggie Village share of the MPFP.

**Redevelopment:** The boundary of the Davis Redevelopment Area includes the East Olive Drive, West Olive Drive, and SP Depot Subareas, but does not include the Nishi and Aggie Village subareas. The current MPFP schedules and the redevelopment agency to fund $8 million of the widening of the Richards Boulevard undercrossing.

**University of California at Davis (UCD):** The University of California at Davis is scheduled to fund approximately $890,000 of the widening of the Richards Boulevard undercrossing. In addition, UCD is scheduled to fund approximately $1.1 million of the Putah Creek bike connections under the SP railroad tracks and I-80. Also, UCD will be funding all of the on-site infrastructure for the Aggie Village development.

**Project Specific Funding:** Development occurring in the East Olive Drive subarea will fund $140,000 of the East Olive Drive street improvements as development proceeds with private financing as development proceeds. The $140,000 will pay for traffic calming measures on East Olive Drive.

**Other Funding Sources:** Approximately $1.4 million of the total infrastructure costs will be funded by other funding sources. The Putah Creek bike connections under the SP railroad tracks and I-80 will be funded by a combination of the MPFP fee program, UCD, and other funding sources. The contributions of the MPFP and UCD have already been discussed. The "other" funding sources include the City's construction tax and Proposition 116 monies. The City's construction tax will fund approximately 26 percent or $737,800 of the total $2.8 million cost of the undercrossings. Proposition 116 monies will fund approximately 23 percent or $635,000 of undercrossing costs.

**Other Subarea Improvements:** The East Olive Drive, West Olive Drive, and SP Depot subareas will fund their frontage and in-tract improvements with private financing. These improvements will be determined as individual projects are processed for approval.

UC Davis will fund the Aggie Village frontage and in-tract improvements.

The SP Depot improvements will be primarily funded through City funding sources, including the MPFP, or the redevelopment agency for project related components in the East Olive Drive area (underpass). The City may utilize other financing mechanisms if other opportunities become available.
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