



ECOS Land Use Committee Meeting Agenda
Monday March 9th, 2015
Mogavero / Notestine 2012 K Street
6:00 – 7:30 pm

Sacramento Commons (Proponents) – Dave Ede, Kennedy Wilson

Currently owns and manages Capitol Towers, 409 units, 203 units in high rise, and 206 units of garden apartments over 10-11 acres. Between N+P, 5th+7th

General Plan, Blueprint, 10k Homes – all calling for intensification downtown

Sustainable, eco-friendly plan

DEIR today, have until April 24th to comment

[Handouts]

Current: 2 acres surface parking

Planned: keeping Capitol Towers, but phasing out Capitol Villas and adding 1,100 units (i.e. 10% of Mayor Johnson's proposal)

Enhancing 6th and O Street promenades

Condos – 1.5 parking spaces

N and 7th corner – 5 story parking structure. Trying to line parking with live/work

1,168 new units/net project size

Removing the swimming pool to be a public access central plaza, gathering nodes where the beige eggs are on the diagram

7th and P – welcoming plaza for the whole project – shade structures and retail (coffee?) kiosk

tbd

Top level – Landscaping on top of the parking, swim/recreation open space

Lower height element between existing high rises

“5 over 2” projects in front of Capitol towers

Massing bulk and density in the 3d plan

Square footage 74k of retail w/hotel, 54k sq/ft with just condos

Likely to have another planning and design review and comment session during DEIR review

Kennedy Wilson currently plans to stay involved with the project, usually they joint venture,

contract to build or and sell projects. Regardless of whether they're involved, the PUD

guidelines are part of the EIR

Expected market: Expect singles, couples, some “people of affluence”. They really think they can get rich folks to live here. Not families – mainly one-two bedrooms.

Questions:

Phasing:

-let leases expire (mainly short term tenancies). AS they expire, don't rent again, and then demo that quadrant

Live-work units – 2 stories, with 3-4 floors of parking above

“Visually not be something terrible to look at”

Canyon Effect? See the EIR

“if I live here, where will I get my food, beer?”

Bike parking in garages, plan not refined, “plenty of provision for bikes”

In the retail area, there’s room for a Trader Joe’s, specialty market, etc., and if the markets are interested, Kennedy Wilson is interested. Otherwise...Safeway?

Overall sculpture? Will be retained, preserved, moved to be parallel with Capitol Towers

What determined the level of density/number of units? It’s a balance – General Plan allows for 400??, zoning 100?? 140 units/acre

No provision in the PUD to deal with what happens if they end up wanting to build it

Opponents

Gretchen Stienburg

Displacement of middle income renters in favor of upper income renters

Destruction of older growth trees

Improvements for density could be done more respectfully

Jim Pacht

Neat, although somewhat inaccurate) list of pending infill

Bulk issues: 75000 sq/ft footprint for residential towers 13500 and 17000 proposed = 180% beyond design guidelines

80 tall x 40 wide, gap from wall to wall

Carr Koontz

“Repeat the sins of urban renewal”

Households are going to be displaced. Maybe slowly, but they will. Currently, moderate and middle income households – currently about \$1,700/month for a two bedroom

Increasing problem of losses from the housing inventory – nationally and here as well. Rental stock under pressure b/c drop in home ownership

Cites SHA study!

[see Tree and Park Resource Impacts handout]

Questions:

Do rooftop trees even work?

Check out the PERS building – they grew great trees

How else could we get that density? By adding a high rise on one of the corners and maintaining the garden apartments

Affordable housing along the O Street pedestrian walkway vacated by land owner (Schuer Family Trust)

EIR Review

Next meeting is 30+ days away

Who wants to provide comments?

S

Depends on the alternatives presented – Odd that no reduced project size considered

Clearly there’s an economic impact of approving residential high rises – lots of competition, e.g. with railyards, etc. If we approve this project, it adds to the inventory and potential competing

market for financing and further justification to reduce other residential densities where there might be less of an impact

In commenting on an EIR, you're looking for inadequacies. Also want to propose alternatives, e.g. mitigating effects . affordable housing, trees, historic resources, etc.

Key issues: policy implications w/r/t affordability, history, trees

Are these really going to happen? Without a requirement in the PUD

Opponent's alternative

We have long supported density downtown, but this project has downsides and might undercut residential with fewer downsides, so don't charge ahead

Proposing a really specific alternative is the hardest to brush off

Density that is bad makes all density look bad

→ Rob can construct a topical outline of how to comment, by Friday. Ron will email to whole group and parcel sections out

- Housing – Veronica
- Transportation – Terry
- Design (e.g. canyon effect, sunlight and livability) and Alternatives – Barry
- Tree Canopy – Ron (with help from Nancy Finch attny at DWR who worked on levies? – email sent to Matt
- PUD – Molly

→ Start lookin' at the document

People being displaced will have to go somewhere else – gentrification

This project has to be as good as it can be – can't afford to have it go wrong

Impacts that say whether we need this project?

Will public access easements be changed substantively/guaranteed?

Other Projects

Kammerer Road – Elk Grove Transportation Project

Segment of the JPA Connector project, which ECOS sued about, and it was agreed that the Connector was growth inducing

At a minimum, ECOS should push for the growth inducement and mitigation be treated the same as the JPA

Only at the NOP stage

Have to look at the specific settlement language about restrictions on opposition to Connect project

Better to comment early

Terry and the ½ Cent Sales Tax – waiting on a presentation until the board givs go ahead, but they're interested in listening to us about what we would want in a sales tax. To that end, Terry is arranging a meeting with RT, with the goal of making Measure A go to transportation projects first, roads later.

Remember that now the sales tax on gas goes to roads, so should other sales tax go to transit?

Not all sales taxes have to be passed by the whole area – cf. Atlanta. Because the issue is that the County will never want to fund transit as much as we do. SO can we get a transit only measure in just Sacramento city?

Last week, James Drake spoke to TAQCC about the idea, and said to talk to Mike Wiley

CEQA Updates

Decided a case, 8 pending

When CatEx apply

Deadline for introduction of bills was Friday, not much was introduced, each legislator gets to nominate a project for expedient review

Something admin record, document dump

Nothing about expediting CEQA for a stadium, b/c Tuolumne Jobs case allows for circumvention of CEQA

New Projects List

Next Time

TC Equity Scorecard and lots of time for Robert to talk about projects

Elk Grove SOI

No application yet with the LAFCo, so no need to engage yet, but we should argue that we should consider the fill impact