CITY OF GRASS VALLEY
PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO.2011-02


WHEREAS, Loma Rica Ranch, LLC, submitted the following application packet: 1) Annexation Application 07PLN-46 to annex the 452 acre Loma Rica Ranch site and the 3.15 acre McCarthy property; 2) General Plan Amendment 07PLN-48 to change the Land Use Mix in Figure 3-4 of the General Plan; 3) Prezone Application (07PLN-47) to prezone the Loma Rica Ranch property to the (SP) Specific Plan Zoning District and the McCarthy property to M-1,; and 4) Specific Plan Application 07PLN-49 to create the Loma Rica Ranch Specific Plan, and

WHEREAS, the properties are located within the Grass Valley Sphere of Influence Plan's 2000-2005 annexation time horizon, and

WHEREAS, the proposed annexation is consistent with the City's Sphere of Influence Plan, and

WHEREAS, the City of Grass Valley desires to initiate proceedings pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, commencing with Section 56000 of the California Government Code, for annexation of the project area, and

WHEREAS, it is the City's desire that the proposed annexation be subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. That this annexation is subject to the terms of the MASTER TAX EXCHANGE AGREEMENT, entered into by the City Council and Board of Supervisors on October 9, 2001.

2. That the territory to be annexed to the City be detached from Nevada County Consolidated Fire District.
3. That the territory to be annexed to the City shall be subject to the levying or fixing and collection of any previously authorized taxes, benefit assessments, fees or charges of the City.

WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to amend Figure 3-4 of the City’s 2020 General Plan for the Loma Rica Ranch SDA to include a mixed-use project for a maximum of 700 housing units, 54,000 square feet of commercial and retail uses, 364,161 square feet of business park and light industrial uses, and 313.9 acres of open space and recreational uses, and

WHEREAS, as noted in the February 23, 2011, Staff Report to the Planning Commission and Attachment 5 (Comparison of the Grass Valley General Plan and Loma Rica Ranch Specific Plan) of said report, the proposed General Plan Amendment to change the land use mix in Figure 3-4 is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies established in the 2020 General Plan, specifically:

1. The current 2020 General Plan land use mix does not provide a healthy or balanced community or a balance jobs/housing mix.

2. The proposed General Plan Amendment provides a more balanced and sustainable land use mix and jobs/housing balance the City wishes to achieve.

3. The proposed General Plan Amendment provides a better opportunity to improve the City’s economic base and provides additional protection of the environment.

WHEREAS, Section 1.08.010 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code requires all proposed annexations to the City to be prezoned or preplanned by the Planning Commission prior to City Council authorizing submittal of an application to the Local Agency Formation Commission, and

WHEREAS, the proposed prezone of the Loma Rica Ranch site to the Specific Plan Zoning Designation is appropriate and consistent with the City’s General Plan, and the prezone of the McCarthy property to M-1 is appropriate based on surrounding land uses and site constraints, and

WHEREAS, the Loma Rica Ranch Specific Plan (LRRSP) is a policy-based document that is intended as a framework to guide future development on the 452-acre site, and
WHEREAS, the LRRSP sets forth a land use mix as well as development standards that will serve as the zoning regulations in order to provide specific direction as to the type and intensity of uses permitted in the LRRSP as well as development and design criteria within the LRRSP, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds the changes in Exhibit “A” are necessary to ensure certain City standards are included in the LRRSP and to address the long-term implementation of the LRRSP, and

WHEREAS, the City prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Loma Rica Ranch project and provided a 45-day public review period from October 1 to November 15, 2010, and

WHEREAS, on October 19 and October 25, 2010, the Planning Commission conducted public hearings, reviewed, and took public testimony on, the Draft EIR for the Loma Rica Ranch project, and

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2011, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the General Plan Amendment, Annexation, and Prezone applications and considered the Final EIR, and

WHEREAS, on March 15, 2011, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the Specific Plan application, and

WHEREAS, the City finds, as described in Section 1.2 of Exhibit “B” attached to this resolution, this Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been completed in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has independently reviewed, analyzed and considered the Final EIR, Findings of Fact in Exhibit “B”, Statement of Overriding Considerations in Exhibit “C” prior to making its recommendation on this project, and the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City of Grass Valley, and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission of the City of Grass Valley does hereby recommend the City Council certify the Environmental Impact Report, and approve Annexation 07PLN-46, General Amendment 07PLN-48, Prezone 07PLN-47, and Specific Plan 07PLN-49 as amended in the attached Exhibit “A”, and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Findings of Fact in Exhibit “B” confirm the FEIR adequately addresses the potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the Loma Rica Ranch project, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City has balanced the specific economic, legal, social, technology, and other benefits of the project noted in Exhibit “C” against its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts when determining whether to approve the project applications, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that certain mitigation measures in Exhibit “D” are partially or fully the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency. Said agencies have reviewed the Draft and Final EIRs. Therefore, said agencies can and should adopt those mitigation measures as it pertains to its area of jurisdiction, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the mitigation measures listed in Exhibit “D” be included as conditions of approval for the Loma Rica Ranch project and be made a part of this approving action.

ADOPTED as a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Grass Valley at a meeting on March

RESOLUTION NO. 2011-02

AYES in favor of:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

____________________________________
Daniel Swartzendruber, Chairman

ATTEST: _______________________________________
Sue Colbert, Clerk of the Commission
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## EXHIBIT A – MARCH 1, 2011
**RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE DRAFT LOMA RICA RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN**  
September 2009, date stamped October 14, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Current Text</th>
<th>Staff Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Purpose of Change</th>
<th>Planning Commission Recommendation</th>
<th>City Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Add after Safety Area 5: Development within the Lakes, Trailhead, and Creeks Neighborhoods will comply with the density standards established in the Airport Safety Areas.</td>
<td>To clarify future development will comply with the density standards established by the Airport Land Use Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Add sentence to end: Development within the Lakes Neighborhood will comply noise standards established by the Airport land Use Plan and the City General Plan.</td>
<td>To clarify intent to comply with those plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Under Total - Max. residential dwelling units: 700</td>
<td>Add the following: The 700 dwelling units include any dwellings within the Special District and Neighborhood Center zones.</td>
<td>Need to clarify that the 700 dwelling units within the commercial or business districts are included in the total count.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Add the following paragraph: Development within the commercial center shall incorporate public open spaces, provide orientation of buildings to the creeks or public spaces, and provide shared parking opportunities.</td>
<td>Ensure design concepts in illustrations are followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>Under Creeks Neighborhood column, references to minimum building types for each neighborhood</td>
<td>Replace with - A minimum of 5 Building Types (excluding Commercial Block and Non Residential) shall be used within the Creeks Neighborhood. Add new sentence – Each neighborhood shall include a mix of Architectural Styles as noted in Chapter 4.</td>
<td>Ensure a mix of residential building types and architectural styles in each neighborhood for consistency with the Specific Plan’s principles and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Under The Farm Neighborhood column</td>
<td>1. Provide examples of agritourism uses. 2. Add new sentence – Each neighborhood shall include a mix of Architectural Styles as noted in Chapter 4.</td>
<td>1. Need to define term. 2. Ensure a mix of residential building types and architectural styles in each neighborhood for consistency with the Specific Plan’s principles and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Add new sentence: The farm can be operated by a private entity, residents in the neighborhood, or for school purposes.</td>
<td>Provide additional guidance on the potential use and ownership of the organic farm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>Under The Lakes Neighborhood column</td>
<td>Add new sentence – Each neighborhood shall include a mix of Architectural Styles as noted in Chapter 4.</td>
<td>Ensure a mix of residential building types and architectural styles in each neighborhood for consistency with the Specific Plan’s principles and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8 &amp; 9, Table 4.1</td>
<td>Table 4.1 includes a list of uses allowed by right, MUP or UP for each district.</td>
<td>Modify the table as follows: 1. Farmers market – Delete P in the LR-NG column. 2. Manufacturing/processing, light &gt; 5,000 sf – Delete MUP from LR-NG and move to LR-NC column. 3. Storage, outdoor – add a footnote: If screened from public roads. 4. Schools, public or private – Add as a UP in the LR-NG column. 5. General retail and its 6 subcategories - Delete the P, MUP, and UP references in the LR-SD column. Add a new category – Retail uses serving business park uses as a P use 6. Add Conference / convention facility as a UP use to LR-NG/NC</td>
<td>1. This is a residential district. 2. This is a residential district and may be appropriate in the LR-NC farm area. 3. Outdoor storage areas should be screened from local roads. 4. Schools can be appropriate in residential districts. 5. This is a business park district and retail uses should be limited to serving those working in the district. 6. Expands options for LR-NG district for assembly uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>Under Setback, Rear – a 5’ setback adjacent</td>
<td>Allow a zero (0) setback.</td>
<td>Depends on plotting of lots and site planning, but there is a potential to have two buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to another use.</td>
<td>back to back which would create a 10(^\circ) corridor of unusable land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>It is important to maintain sight distance requirements so that motorists can see oncoming vehicles when pulling out of their driveways or traversing an intersection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>Under Placement Notes: Buildings must be placed to meet City standard sight distance requirements for adjacent driveways and intersections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11, 4-13, 4-15, 4-17</td>
<td>Under Parking Placement Notes: Where parking drive widths are discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11, 4-13, 4-15, 4-17</td>
<td>Under Parking Notes: Where further parking specifications are discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12, 4-13, 4-15, 4-17</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12, 4-13, 4-15, 4-17</td>
<td>Under Building Placement and Encroachments the minimum front and side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Placing Notes:** Buildings must be distance requirements so that motorists can see oncoming vehicles when pulling out of their driveways or traversing an intersection.

**Under Parking Placement Notes:** Where parking drive widths are discussed.

Add/Revise as follows: See Chapter 17.36 of the Development Code and the City Improvement Standards for further parking specifications.

Add the following under Encroachment Notes:

- Buildings and any encroachments must maintain a minimum setback of 5\(^\circ\) from the front and side property line.

- Buildings and encroachments must not impede or inhibit the movement of pedestrians.

- Encroachments in public right of ways must be constructed to meet ADA requirements. Protrusions within 9 feet above the sidewalk should not be allowed as they present a safety hazard for some people.

- With a building placement of 10\(^\circ\) for a front and side yard, and an encroachment of 10\(^\circ\) for the front and 8\(^\circ\) for the side, buildings could be on the property line on the front and back to back which would create a 10\(^\circ\) corridor of unusable land. This is listed as a frontage type but not described when or how it is used.

- The City Engineer may require wider driveways in certain cases due to safety issues such as sight distance, site accessibility, safety of motorists on the streets, and the safety of pedestrians.

- To clarify that parking standards are not only discussed in the Development Code but also in the City's Improvement Standards.

- With a building placement of 10\(^\circ\) for a front and side yard, and an encroachment of 10\(^\circ\) for the front and 8\(^\circ\) for the side, buildings could be on the property line on the front and back to back which would create a 10\(^\circ\) corridor of unusable land.
<p>| 4-13 &amp; 15 | Under Parking | Add a footnote: All garages with direct access to a primary street shall be setback a minimum of 5’ from the front façade of the house (not including any of the allowed encroachments) | To ensure the house, and not garage, dominates the view from the street. |
| 4-16 | Under Setback, Rear – a 5’ setback adjacent to another use. | Allow a zero (0) setback. | Depends on plotting of lots and site planning, but there is a potential to have two buildings back to back which would create a 10’ corridor of unusable land. |
| 4-20 | Under General Notes: Wider parking drives may be required to accommodate emergency access. | Add the following: …or safety requirements dependent on sight distance or traffic volumes. | Driveways may need to be widened for sight distance purposes or to accommodate traffic volumes. |
| 4-20, Table 4.2 | Parking space width of 8’-9’ for all spaces | Change to 9’ | 9’ wide parking stalls are a minimum to accommodate car sizes, unless compact as noted under “Required Parking Sizes” at the top of the page. |
| 4-23 | None | Add to end of second paragraph: Innovative Building Types must comply with the basic design principles of this specific plan and incorporate the architectural styles reflective of Grass Valley. <em>(Note for Discussion)</em> | To provide additional guidance in long-term implementation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-25, 4-27, 4-29, 4-31, 4-33, 4-35, 4-37, 4-39, 4-41, 4-43, 4-45</th>
<th>Heading of section: &quot;Services&quot;</th>
<th>Revise heading to state: “Trash/Recycling and AC/heating Units” or clarify that it is for trash and recycling purposes.</th>
<th>The term “services” is not defined. It should be clarified that this section does not apply to public utilities which may have limitations on screening.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-28</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Add as a new paragraph: A linear court or paseo feature is a semi-public or private open green space in which the frontage of residential units are oriented to, and have direct access to, this feature from their porch. These features include decorative landscaping, lighting, a common or centralized walkway (with connections to each individual unit front entry), and low level fencing. Optional features include a paved courtyard with potted plants, fountains and/or specimen trees as central focal elements, outdoor seating, and a themed courtyard to reflect the architectural character.</td>
<td>Assist in the implementation of these concepts when reviewing specific developments that incorporate these elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Add as a new paragraph: A common courtyard feature is a centrally-located, semi-public or private open green space. These features can include decorative landscaping, lighting, a paved courtyard with potted plants, fountains and/or specimen trees as central focal elements, outdoor seating, and a themed courtyard to reflect the architectural character.</td>
<td>Assist in the implementation of these concepts when reviewing specific developments that incorporate these elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-73</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Add the following: Project and site-specific traffic evaluations/studies shall be prepared in accordance with the City’s Improvement Standards for approval by the Public Works Director/City Engineer and other jurisdictional agencies as deemed appropriate. The purpose of the traffic evaluation/study will be: to accommodate phasing of improvements; to provide design details for intersections; to model proposed intersection improvements; to model any intersection interactions that are within close proximity to each other; and to evaluate the operations and safety of the proposed improvements. Specific intersection evaluations and reports will be required prior to any improvements occurring for intersections. The purpose of adding this statement is to inform future developers of the need for further evaluation of intersections since this was not stated in, nor necessary for, the mitigation measures associated with traffic improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4-74 | Primary and Secondary Streets - Circulation Plan exhibit | Replace the entire page with the attached text and map. Proposed street type widths are not adequate to meet minimum public service and emergency service requirements. In addition, streets in the Trailhead Neighborhood must be Collectors by definition. Streets serving the Farm Neighborhood should be Residential by definition. Implementation of this proposed change would be in line with Objective 3 on page 6-2 of the LRRSP. The City Municipal Code requires ½ width road improvements along all streets fronting a project site. Normally, this would require ½ half street improvements along: |
1) Idaho-Maryland Road from Sutton Way to Brunswick Road; 2) along Idaho-Maryland Road east of Brunswick Road to the eastern property boundary; 3) Brunswick Road from Idaho-Maryland Road to Loma Rica Drive; and, 4) Loma Rica Drive from Brunswick Road to the eastern property boundary.

The following provides the rationale why ½ street improvements may not be necessary for some of these road segments.

1.) Idaho-Maryland Road between Sutton Way and Brunswick Road: The proposed potential abandonment of public right of way of this section of street is due to the construction of the Dorsey Drive Extension. Although the public right of way may be abandoned, access to properties will remain. Another alternative is to retain the road as is but limit the turn movements to right in and right out at the intersection with Brunswick. Staff supports this approach since this will eliminate the need to improve its intersection with Brunswick Road; eliminate a substandard roadway with constraints such as the hillside to the south and the creek to the
and eliminate potential impacts to Wolf Creek.

2.) Idaho-Maryland Road east of Brunswick Road: The proposed abandonment of a portion of this section of street is due to the preferred relocation of its intersection with Brunswick Road to the north. However, the right of way for this section of Idaho-Maryland Road must be maintained for utility purposes.

The purpose of not requiring Collector Street Standard improvements on Idaho-Maryland Road east of the Trailhead Neighborhood is due to the improbability of substantial development occurring further east. Although the 2020 General Plan and Sphere of Influence Plan show approximately 108 acres available for annexation into the City, the majority of the land is zoned as open space while the remaining portion is zoned for manufacturing/industrial use next to the existing Nevada County Airport. Access to the area that is zoned for development will be challenging due to the creek near Idaho-Maryland Road, the steep topography of the land, and the lands vicinity to the airport. In
summary, due to the limitations on the land east of the LRRSP area, construction of City standard streets on this section of Idaho-Maryland Road would be unwarranted cost to the developer and to the City for future maintenance.

To support this approach, accessible pedestrian and bicycle improvements must be constructed parallel and/or adjacent to this section of Idaho-Maryland Road (i.e. Wolf Creek Trail). In addition, right of Way for a Collector Street Standard for this section of Idaho-Maryland Road must be dedicated to the City for future potential expansion and/or improvements.

The proposed far east connection from the Farm Neighborhood to Idaho-Maryland Road is necessary in order to meet dead end limitations which allow a maximum dead end of 750 feet.

The Circulation Plan also shows the City’s preference for Alternative 1 of Mitigation Measure 4.15-6. The City has concerns with the installation of a roundabout at the existing intersection of Brunswick Road and Idaho-Maryland Road to the
| 4-75 | Brunswick (Arterial) exhibit | Replace the Arterial exhibit with the attached Modified Arterial Street 1 cross section.  

Revise the Specifications to match the Modified Arterial Street Section 1 cross section. 

Replace the description with the following: 

**Arterials**  
Brunswick Road and Sutton Way are arterials designed to carry relatively large through-traffic loads. Improvement of Brunswick Road and the project’s half width improvements along Sutton Way will include space for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists.  

Improvements to Brunswick Road, south of Idaho-Maryland Road may not be necessary if accessible pedestrian and bicycle improvements are provided parallel to Brunswick Road. This may be achieved by connecting Loma Rica Drive to Idaho-Maryland Road although additional environmental review may be necessary for such an alternative alignment.  

In addition, if an intersection improvement is constructed at the history of accidents at this location and the multiple issues related to the slope of Brunswick Road.  

The proposed street section does not provide adequate width for emergency access, emergency vehicle turnaround and public service maintenance. The street section is too narrow to allow routine maintenance of underground utilities while maintaining traffic flow. nor does it provide facilities expected in City limits and currently required on all City streets.  

The proposed Modified Arterial Street 1 detail provides adequate width for emergency access, and public service maintenance. In addition, it includes sidewalks and the ability to accommodate bicycle lanes if Class I bicycle lanes are not provided along Brunswick per the Nevada County bicycle Master Plan. The proposed standard meets existing City Improvement Standards but clarifies minimum interim street widths developed in cooperation with the Fire Department. Implementation of this proposed change would be in line with Objective 3 on page 6-2 of the LRRSP.  

Another option would be to vacate... |
existing intersection of Idaho-Maryland Road and Brunswick Road, additional improvements on Brunswick Road may be necessary.

a portion of the existing right of way and construct the improvements according to City Standard Detail ST-21.

East side of Brunswick Road from south of Idaho-Maryland Road to the southern Loma Rica property line – In lieu of improving this section of Brunswick Road, the developer could evaluate a new connection between Loma Rica Drive with Idaho-Maryland Road thereby providing vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle access parallel to Brunswick Road. This section of Brunswick Road is improved, although not to City Standards, but sufficient for the outskirts of town especially considering bicycles and pedestrians will be provided with alternative parallel facilities. The 2020 General Plan identifies further manufacturing/industrial land available for improvement to the south of the LRRSP area along this section of street which will likely be accessed from Lorna Rica Drive.

4-76 Replace all wording as shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Circulation Plan identifies potential street and intersection alignments. One alternative evaluated as part of this project is to construct a roundabout at

To generally identify additional improvements that will be necessary if alternative (in relation to the proposed Circulation Plan) street and intersection
the existing intersection of Brunswick Road and Idaho-Maryland Road. If this roundabout is constructed, collector street improvements will be required along the projects half of Idaho-Maryland Road between Sutton Way and Brunswick Road and on the section of Idaho-Maryland Road to the east of Brunswick Road shown as potentially abandoned on the Circulation Plan. The above roundabout illustrates one way that Brunswick Road may transition successfully from an existing arterial to an in-town Arterial Street. The roundabout would require the installation of medians and other traffic calming devices.

To clarify that Brunswick Road is not a highway nor is it being proposed to be an “In-Town Boulevard.”

To eliminate the presumption that the speed limit in and out of the roundabout will be 25mph when roundabout entrance and exit speeds are generally 15mph.

| 4-77 | Neighborhood Center Boulevard exhibit | Replace the Neighborhood Center Boulevard exhibit with the attached Modified Collector Street 3 cross section. Revisit the Specifications to match the Modified Collector Street Section 3 cross section. Replace the description with the following: Collector Street Type 3 The Modified Collector 3 street is a thoroughfare traversing a neighborhood center, whose function is to provide both capacity for the movement of large numbers of vehicles and creating a pleasant environment for pedestrians strolling, window shopping and outdoor | The proposed Neighborhood Center Boulevard street section does not provide adequate width for emergency access, emergency vehicle turnaround and public service maintenance (particularly the street section is too narrow to allow routine maintenance of underground utilities while maintaining traffic flow and for snow plowing). The proposed Modified Collector Street 3 detail provides adequate width for emergency access, and public service maintenance. In addition, it includes width for bicycle lanes, which should be provided on a collector street per City |
A Modified Collector Street Type 3 is typically lined by a continuous line of buildings: housing, offices, and/or retail on the ground floor and office or residential uses above. On-street parking, relatively low travel speeds and a heavy flow of passing traffic are all critical for the success of the street’s retail trade.

Improvement Standards. The proposed standard meets existing City Improvement Standards but clarifies minimum street widths developed in cooperation with the Fire Department. Implementation of this proposed change would be in line with Objective 3 on page 6-2 of the LRRSP.

| 4-78 | Minor Collector Street exhibit | Replace the **Minor Collector Street exhibit** with the attached Modified Collector Street 4 cross section.  
Revise the **Specifications** to match the Modified Collector Street Section 4 cross section.  
Replace the **description** with the following:  
**Collector Street Type 4**  
The Modified Collector 4 street is a thoroughfare traversing industrial/commercial areas, and connecting between other main streets, whose function is to provide both capacity for the movement of large numbers of vehicles and creating a pleasant environment for pedestrians.  
A Modified Collector Street Type 4 is typically provides frontage for higher density buildings such as offices, shops, apartment buildings and rowhouses.  
The construction of the projects half of
Loma Rica Drive will include improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists.

If alternative accessible pedestrian and bicycle improvements are provided parallel to Brunswick Road, improvements to Brunswick Road, south of Idaho-Maryland Road may not be necessary.

Accessible pedestrian and bicycle improvements must be constructed parallel and/or adjacent to Idaho-Maryland Road east of the Trailheads Neighborhood (i.e. Wolf Creek Trail). In addition, right of Way for a Collector Street Standard for this section of Idaho-Maryland Road must be dedicated to the City for future potential expansion and/or improvements. If these improvements are not provided, then the portion of Idaho-Maryland Road bordered by the project will be required to be constructed to Collector Street Standards. Regardless, improvements to the intersection of Idaho-Maryland Road and the connection to the Farm Neighborhood will be necessary unless the dead-end concern is addressed with alternative improvements/revisions to the street alignments.

If an intersection improvement is required at the intersection of Brunswick Road and Idaho-Maryland
| 4-79 | Residential Street exhibit | Replace the Residential Street exhibit with the attached City Standard Drawings ST-14 through ST-16.  
Revise the Specifications to match the City’s Standard Drawings ST-14 through ST-16. | The plan currently has a collector street proposed for some residential streets. In addition, the Residential Street exhibit is not wide enough for parking and two lanes of traffic. The City’s residential street standards allow for different parking, sidewalk, and landscape scenarios. Implementation of this is consistent with Objective 3 on page 6-2 of the LRRSP. |
| 4-80 | Typical Rear Alley exhibit and: Rear alleys are paved as lightly as possible to driveway standards or with gravel. | Replace the Typical Rear Alley exhibit with the attached City Standard Drawing ST-13.  
Revise the Specifications to match the City Standard Drawings ST-13.  
Replace the second sentence with: Rear alleys are paved to City Standards. | The plan’s Typical Rear Alley includes unnecessary curb and gutter and is wider than necessary. The City’s Residential Alley details minimum requirements and includes limitations for its use based on traffic volume data and Fire Department requirements. In addition, all driving surfaces must be hard surface per the Development Code and City Improvement Standards. Implementation of this proposed change is in line with Objective 3 on page 6-2 of the LRRSP. |
| 4-82 | Under Trails & Paths and map | 1. Modify map and possibly text.  
2. Provide cross sections for paths and trails.  
3. Add the following: Individual | 1. Need to distinguish paths and trails since paths are described to be paved and trails are not.  
2. Assist in future review. |
neighborhoods shall provide pedestrian access to the path and trail system.

3. Ensure residential neighborhoods have access to the trail system.

4-83 Bicycle Circulation exhibit and: third sentence.

Revise the exhibit to include bicycle lanes on all collector streets.
Replace the third sentence with: Internal on-road bicycle circulation is accommodated by keeping traffic at low speeds on all streets and providing quiet and connected side streets.

All collector streets should include bicycle lanes. Arterial and collector streets (except for the proposed Neighborhood Center Boulevard) will be designed for 35 mph traffic.

5-3 none

Note: The text and map on page 5-3 will need to be modified pending the final determination on the proposed park and recreation plan and the Development Agreement. The City’s Parks and Recreation Commission reviewed the parks and recreation elements of the Specific Plan. The Commission developed a list of recommended priorities to be included in the plan. These are:

1. Dedication and/or construction of a community park with a multi-use ball field (softball/soccer) including parking, a public restroom, and a building sufficient in size to store necessary maintenance equipment for the park improvements.
2. Provide at least two pocket parks, which maintains MacBoyle Lake and includes public access and parking.
3. Provide land for future construction of a community center (i.e. within

The City’s General Plan shows 50 acres of recreation on Figure 3-4 and the Recreation Element identifies a community park in Loma Rica, as a high priority need.

The City’s Parks and Recreation Master Plan identifies two neighborhood or pocket parks and a community park within the LRRSP area. Additionally, the Master Plan identifies the LRRSP area as one of several potential sites for a community center and gym.
the community park site or at the location of the existing farm structures).

4. All paved and accessible trails/paths which will be maintained by the City, while other trails should be maintained by another entity.

All or a combination of the above improvements may be provided depending on the requirement of the developer to meet the Quimby Act requirements and the City’s Residential Development Impact fee Program for parks and Recreational Facilities.

<p>| 5-3 | Park and Open Space Plan | Show trail bridge crossing at the southwest end of site (crossing Olympia Creek) | Consistency with pages 4-82 and 4-83 |
| 5-6 &amp; 5-7 | Management Guidelines and Standards | 1. 1st bullet, insert word “minimum” prior to 50’ 2. 1st and 2nd bullets – Add after structures “and roads” 2. 5th, 6th, 7th, and 11th bullets – Replace the word “should” with “shall”. 3. Add last bullet, “Development shall be oriented to creeks or water ways, whenever feasible, particularly for the “Neighborhood Center” District. | 1. Confirm min. setback 2. to reduce improvements/impacts within the setbacks 3. To ensure proper restoration and protection of the creeks. 4. Implement Illustrative Site Section |
| 5-8 | none | Add the following: Small open space areas adjacent to public parks and open to the public may be maintained by the City. It is expected that all other open space areas will be maintained by private property owners and/or entities. | To clarify the maintenance responsibilities for open space areas. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 5</th>
<th>Replace with the following: A developer may enter into a reimbursement agreement with the City for any portions of infrastructure that are required to be oversized for the benefit of development outside of the Specific Plan.</th>
<th>Existing wording does not comply with City Improvement Standards, or California’s Subdivision Map Act. Reimbursement and credit for development fees are not applicable for oversized utilities unless other agreements or avenues such as an area of benefit have been established.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7</td>
<td>Replace with the following: Specific Plan improvement plans, including streets, walks, drainage facilities, water facilities, sewer facilities and underground utilities, must be accepted by the City and appropriate utility providers. Those utilities that are determined to be acceptable to the City or public utilities as public improvements will be conveyed to the City or public utilities.</td>
<td>All improvement and grading plans for the LRRSP area will be required to be accepted by the City prior to construction. In addition, the applicants proposed objective cannot enforce public utility inspection of improvements or acceptance of said improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 9</td>
<td>Replace with the following: Street and entry treatments and other common area type improvements constructed per City Improvement Standards and when accepted by the City may be maintained by the City when funded with assessment districts or other funding mechanisms.</td>
<td>The proposed wording in the Objective cannot be implemented. First, streets cannot be maintained through assessments collected by a landscaping and lighting district per the California Streets and Highways Code. Secondly, the City may not accept all streets, entry treatments, landscaping, common areas, etc. for dedication and maintenance purposes. The City will need to review each proposed development plan and review which improvements should be publicly maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td>Add a note that any public utility buildings shall incorporate the design themes noted in the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Water – second paragraph.</td>
<td>Delete the second paragraph since it involves storm water/drainage, which is discussed on page 6-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Sewer - second paragraph.</td>
<td>Replace all but the first two and last sentences with the following: As the build-out occurs, detailed improvement plans, including access to all existing and proposed sewer manholes, will be submitted to the Grass Valley City Engineer for review and acceptance. After acceptable installation with City inspection per City Standards, the City will accept the improvements and will take over ownership, operation, and maintenance of the new collection system components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>First paragraph.</td>
<td>Replace with the following: All detention basins will be sized based on a civil engineer’s calculations and the City Engineer will review and accept the improvement plans prior to construction. Drainage facilities meeting City Improvement Standards are expected to be owned and maintained by the City of Grass Valley upon completion and acceptance. The City requires an AB 1600 development impact fee to fund future, downstream drainage improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>Under heading Development Code Consistency</td>
<td>Modify Heading to: Development Code Consistency and Relationship with Local, State, or Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>Under Design Intent</td>
<td>Add the following sentence after second sentence – The review authority shall determine which preferred design items are to be included in a specific project based on the Specific Plan’s Guiding Principles and the location and existing physical environment surrounding the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Phasing</td>
<td>Need to add a timing element for public improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-18</td>
<td>Under Financing: Last sentence in first paragraph.</td>
<td>Replace with the following: A developer may enter into a reimbursement agreement with the City for any portions of infrastructure that are required to be oversized for the benefit of development outside of the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-19</td>
<td>Maintenance Responsibilities second paragraph, second and third sentences.</td>
<td>Delete all but the first sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-19</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Add the following: Additional City equipment and equipment storage areas for maintenance of streets and public improvements in the Loma Rica Ranch Specific Plan area may be necessary to adequately serve the Loma Rica area and the northern parts of the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-19</td>
<td>Table 7.5, Storm Drains/ Detention Basins, Alleys, and Water rows</td>
<td>Check Non-City Entity column also for the Storm Drains/Detention Basins row. Check City column for the Alleys row. Remove the check from the City column for the Water row.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary and Secondary Streets

The primary and secondary street network at Loma Rica Ranch consists of new major streets, such as the Dorsey Drive extension, and improved thoroughfares, such as Brunswick Road.

The locations and layouts of streets and intersections in the above Circulation Plan are illustrative in nature and subject to change and refinement through environmental review and approval process based on actual field conditions, City and County engineering requirements, emergency vehicle requirements, and other unforeseen constraints. Street alignment for the primary and secondary network may shift within the Plan, but must maintain similar levels of connectivity and alignment with all perimeter intersections. Street sections may be refined with submittal of tentative maps and improvement plans.

The above Circulation Plan identifies potential street alignments. If alternatives are selected, additional and/or revised improvements may be necessary. Refer to the following pages for additional information per street type.

Key

- **Modified Arterial 1 (100' ROW)**
  or **City Standard (82' ROW)**
- **Modified Collector 3 (84' ROW)**
- **Modified Collector 4 (56' ROW)**
- **Primary Residential Street (50' ROW)**
  (City Standard)
- **Minor Residential Street (32' to 42' ROW)**
  (City Standard)
- **Residential Alley (City Standard)**
- **Existing (Unchanged) Streets**
- **Potential Public ROW Abandonment**
- **Roundabout**
NOTES:

1. THIS MODIFIED ARTERIAL STREET SECTION IS TO BE USED ON BRUNSWICK ROAD, BETWEEN IDAHO MARYLAND ROAD AND TOWN TALK ROAD.

2. CURB AND GUTTER SHALL BE TYPE 2. MEDIAN CURBS SHALL BE TYPE 3 BARRIER CURB WHEN SOLID MEDIANS ARE INSTALLED AND TYPE 4 BARRIER CURB WHEN LANDSCAPED MEDIANS ARE INSTALLED.
NOTES:

1. THIS MODIFIED COLLECTOR STREET SECTION IS TO BE USED ON DORSEY DRIVE, BETWEEN SUTTON WAY AND BRUNSWICK ROAD, WHERE PARKING IS NEEDED.

2. CENTER TURN LANES OR LEFT TURN LANES ARE TO BE INSTALLED AS REQUIRED, OTHERWISE A LANDSCAPED MEDIAN ISLAND IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED.

3. CURB AND GUTTER SHALL BE TYPE 2. MEDIAN CURBS SHALL BE TYPE 3 BARRIER CURB WHEN SOLID MEDIANS ARE INSTALLED AND TYPE 4 BARRIER CURB WHEN LANDSCAPED MEDIANS ARE INSTALLED.
NOTES:

1. THIS MODIFIED COLLECTOR STREET SECTION IS TO BE USED WHERE PARKING IS NOT ALLOWED ON DORSEY DRIVE, BETWEEN SUTTON WAY AND BRUNSWICK ROAD, IDAHO-MARYLAND ROAD BETWEEN SUTTON WAY AND THE EASTERN CITY LIMITS, AND LOMA RICA DRIVE.

2. CURB AND GUTTER SHALL BE TYPE 2.
1. SEE THE DESIGN STANDARDS FOR STREET PAVEMENT REQUIREMENTS.

2. 25' SEPARATION FROM BUILDINGS IS REQUIRED IF PARKING IS ALLOWED IN FRONT OF GARAGES.
NOTES:

1. FOR STREET REQUIREMENT SEE THE DESIGN STANDARDS.
2. CURB AND GUTTER TO BE TYPE 1 ADJACENT TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS, TYPE 2 AT ALL OTHER LOCATIONS.
NOTES:
1. FOR STREET REQUIREMENTS SEE THE DESIGN STANDARDS.
2. CURB AND GUTTER TO BE TYPE 1 ADJACENT TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS, TYPE 2 AT ALL OTHER LOCATIONS.
NOTES:

1. FOR STREET REQUIREMENTS SEE THE DESIGN STANDARDS.

2. CURB AND GUTTER TO BE TYPE 1 ADJACENT TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS, TYPE 2 AT ALL OTHER LOCATIONS.
NOTES:

1. CENTER TURN LANES OR LEFT TURN LANES ARE TO BE INSTALLED AS REQUIRED OTHERWISE A SOLID OR LANDSCAPED MEDIAN ISLAND IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR/CITY ENGINEER.

2. CURB AND GUTTER SHALL BE TYPE 2. MEDIAN CURBS SHALL BE TYPE 3 BARRIER CURB WHEN SOLID MEDIANS ARE INSTALLED AND TYPE 4 BARRIER CURB WHEN LANDSCAPED MEDIANS ARE INSTALLED.