# PLANNING & REDEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT DESIGN COMMITTEE Meeting JANUARY 18, 2007

Prepared by: Steve Lindbeck, Project Planner

ITEM IV-C

DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT - 7001 GALILEE ROAD (DIAMOND PLAZA OFFICES) - FILE # 2005PL-108, DRP-000073

## **REQUEST**

The applicant requests approval of a Design Review Permit to construct ten buildings totaling 46,360 square feet and associated site improvements include parking, lighting and landscaping.

Applicant & Property Owner - Mustafa Sahtout

# **SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning & Redevelopment Department recommends that the Design Committee consider and discuss the issues identified in the following staff report, then provide direction to the applicant and staff regarding this application.

## **OUTSTANDING ISSUES**

The site plan attached as Exhibit B is the fourth design iteration for this project, but it still has some design issues. Before staff provides direction to the applicant to revise the site plan again, staff requests direction from the Design Committee concerning the building architecture and site design for this highly visible corner on Pleasant Grove Boulevard.

When the Diamond Plaza Offices application was first submitted, staff identified several concerns with the original site plan (Attachment 3). The applicant generally addressed those issues with a second submittal consisting of a significantly redesigned project (Attachment 4). However, the new design created new issues, which needed to be addressed by a third submittal (Attachment 5). The third submittal resulted in yet other issues, which led to the latest submittal (Exhibit B). Fortunately, the number of issues has diminished with each iteration, and the current site plan could work with some adjustment.

The remaining site plan issues include concerns with the design of vehicle circulation and parking, and the design of pedestrian space and amenities. Staff would also like the Design Committee to weigh in on the building architecture and colors. These issues are discussed in the Design Review Permit Evaluation.

## **BACKGROUND**

The 3 acre project site is located on the northwest corner of Galilee Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard within the North Industrial Planning Area. In 1991 the Diamond Plaza Subdivision created 13 industrial parcels flanking Galilee Road. The parcels to the north and east have been developed with self-storage, offices, and automotive services.

## SITE INFORMATION

Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (RCONA): The site is located in Industrial Area East (#38), which largely consists of industrial properties and does not have an active neighborhood association.

Lot Size: 3.05 acres

**Site Access:** Provided from a driveway to Galilee Road, which enjoys unrestricted turning movements.

**Topography:** Rough grading was completed with infrastructure improvements related to the Diamond Plaza Subdivision (Galilee Road), resulting in a relatively flat building pad, except for a southerly slope up to Pleasant Grove Boulevard, which crosses over the adjacent railroad grade. The site drains generally to the west. There are no native oak trees or other significant natural features on the subject parcel.

Fig. 1 Adjacent Zoning and Land Use

	Zoning	General Plan Land Use	Actual Use of Property
Site	Light Industrial (M1)	Light Industrial (LI)	Vacant
North	M1	Ц	Self Storage
East	General Commercial (GC)	General Commercial (GC)	Chevron Station
South	Single Family Residential (R1/DS)	Low Density Residential (LDR-5.4)	Single Family Neighborhood
West	M1	LI	NEC Campus

Fig. 2 Development Standards

	Required	Proposed
Building Setback	35' from Galilee Road * 75' from Pleasant Grove Bl. *	25' from Galilee Road ** 50' from Pleasant Grove Bl. **
Landscape Setback	20' from Galilee Road * 50' from Pleasant Grove Bl. *	20' from Galilee Road 50' from Pleasant Grove Bl.
Building Height Limit	50' maximum	23' 8"
Floor Area Ratio	20-50%	35%
Parking Spaces (total)	185	190
Compact (30% max.)	Up to 56 allowed	61 **
Handicapped (ADA)	8	8
Shade Cover (min.)	50%	51%
Bicycle Spaces	6	6

<sup>\*</sup> North Roseville Design Guidelines

The proposed office buildings are consistent with the land uses contemplated by the City's General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed design results in several issues with either the development standards stipulated in the Zoning Ordinance or contained in the North Industrial Area Design Guidelines. These issues are discussed in the Design Review Permit Evaluation.

<sup>\*\*</sup> See Design Review Permit Evaluation

## **PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES**

See attached Site Plan (Exhibit B), Building Elevations (Exhibits C & D), Roof Plan & Sections (Exhibit E), Grading Plan (Exhibit F), Landscape Plans (Exhibit G), and Color Elevations (Attachment 2).

## **DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT EVALUATION**

This project is subject to the development standards of the City's Zoning Ordinance and the design standards of the City's Community Design Guidelines (CDG) and North Roseville Area Design Guidelines (NRDG). Staff reviewed the proposal for consistency with all applicable standards and found the project generally consistent with the requirements and guidelines in each. The following discussion is provided to highlight the remaining areas of concern.

**Setbacks:** The CDG state that offices should be located to contribute to and strengthen the streetscape and present a pedestrian scale frontage. The NRDG indicate a 75-foot minimum building setback on Pleasant Grove Boulevard and a 35-foot setback on Galilee Road. Although the subject site is located within the North Roseville Industrial Area, staff finds the NRDG setbacks conflict with the CDG statement, and are inappropriate for the proposed type of development due to the following considerations:

- The majority of the North Roseville Industrial Area is developed with large buildings on large parcels (NEC, HP, Surewest, etc.). Broad setbacks are necessary for such large buildings, and typically the setbacks accommodate some of their parking lots.
- The subject site is about 3 acres in size, and about 300 feet deep from Pleasant Grove Boulevard. The parcel size and shape would not accommodate a large building, especially one with a pedestrian scale.
- The site is located at the southern edge of the NRIA facing Pleasant Grove Boulevard. Streetscape for the site has more in common with nearby commercial-office development on Pleasant Grove Boulevard than with the industrial development to the north.
- A building set back 75 feet from Pleasant Grove Boulevard and 35 feet from Galilee Road does not
  present a pedestrian scale frontage. When buildings are pushed back from the street, the building
  setbacks are typically used for parking.
- The current site plan shows Building A with a 64-foot setback from Galilee Road, with the additional setback being used for parking. Staff does not support this design approach, and believes the building should be closer to the street, consistent with the setbacks of other recent projects on Galilee Road.
- The original location for Building A was shown in the southeast corner with a 50-foot landscape setback on Pleasant Grove and a 20-foot landscape setback on Galilee (see Attachment 3). Staff supports this design approach, with Building A at the edge of the landscape corridor, because the project would have a stronger streetscape, especially if the design is more of a pedestrian scale, with attractive facades and generous display windows toward the street.

Staff recommends that the Design Committee:

- Direct that the site plan be revised to show Building A closer to the corner, with a pedestrian scale design.
- Direct that the site plan be revised to show a direct walkway from the bus stop at the street corner.

**Pedestrian Amenities:** The CDG state that buildings should be clustered to create plazas and other spaces for sitting, eating, strolling and gathering. Plazas should use durable, functional and aesthetic site

furniture, shade structures, lighting, art, graphics or other focal elements and should consider protection from the local climate.

- The original plan was to develop one long building adjacent to Pleasant Grove Boulevard, and a long L-shaped building to the north and west. Because this site is located close to several large employers, staff felt that the project could attract not only office tenants, but support businesses like photocopy services and a sandwich shop. Staff suggested to the applicant that the site be developed with several smaller buildings instead, to create more end-tenant spaces with storefront window systems that would better accommodate support businesses.
- The second submittal and subsequent revisions feature 2 one-story buildings adjacent to Galilee Road and 8 two-story buildings to the west. The ten building site plan creates eight gaps between buildings. Restrooms occupy four of these gaps, which limit the use landscape or amenities in those locations.
- The other four gaps are open. Staff suggested that these open gaps be 12-16 feet wide to provide some pedestrian space, i.e. seating-gathering-lunch space. On the current plan, the open gaps between the north buildings are only 10 feet wide, and the plans do not show landscape or amenities in any of the gaps.

Staff recommends that the Design Committee:

- Direct that the site plan be revised to provide minimum 12-foot wide gaps between buildings.
- Direct that amenities be identified for the open gaps and a conceptual design be shown on the landscape plan. Amenities could be (from most preferred to least):
  - durable tables and benches
  - seat-walls around raised tree planters
  - o art or water features (should be used sparingly as signature pieces)
  - o shade trellises

**Architecture:** The CDG state that materials, shapes, elements and details used on the front or main elevation, including the roof style and materials, should be extended to all elevations.

- The project site is highly visible from Pleasant Grove Boulevard, thus warrants a high quality building design to provide visual interest. Building A will be the most visible from the street and should be given special consideration.
- The elevations show four-sided architecture on all buildings; however, the design of the one-story buildings is better in this regard. The brick columns appear on all elevations, and the arches on the tower fronts are also used on the sides.
- The two-story buildings have windows on the rear elevation, but incorporate minimal detailing. This
  simple design is acceptable for the four buildings on the north, which back up to the adjacent selfstorage buildings. However, the four buildings on the south need to make a better presentation toward
  Pleasant Grove Boulevard. This could be accomplished with more windows on the rear elevation, as
  well as added definition to the building corners.
- Façade articulation appears limited, and could be improved with window recesses, or arcades. The
  vertical brick elements add some visual depth, but need to be extended outward from the wall to
  provide actual depth and shadow relief. Such architectural elements are permitted to extend into the
  setbacks, but walkways may need to be adjusted to meet accessibility requirements.
- Four-sided tower forms are used on the one-story buildings, but appear flush with the building façade.
  The corner towers could extend out from the building to add real depth. These architectural elements
  do not constitute floor area and are permitted to extend into the setbacks; however, walkways may
  need to be adjusted to meet accessibility requirements.

Staff recommends that the Design Committee:

- Direct that the two-story building elevations facing Pleasant Grove Boulevard be revised to add windows on the rear elevations and provide some definition to the building corners.
- Direct that the plans be revised to provide greater façade articulation on all buildings with features including (from most preferred to least):
  - corner towers extended outward
  - brick columns extended outward
  - window recesses
  - o arcades

**Materials and Finishes:** The CDG state that innovative use of durable, high quality materials such as brick, stone, tile, stucco and certain forms of concrete is encouraged. Materials used on the front or main elevation, including the roof style and materials, should be extended to all elevations.

- The plans indicate that the building exterior stucco will be a medium taupe color. Brown stucco panels will be used as wainscot and white panels used below the eave line on the one-story buildings.
- Red brick will be used for vertical elements on all buildings, and as a wainscot on the two-story buildings. The two-story building will have an exterior trim relief at the upper-floor line extending on all four elevations.
- A metal roof with brown composition finish will form a shed around the roof-mounted equipment recesses. The same metal will also be used as a hip roof capping the three towers on the one-story buildings. The center entry towers on the two-story buildings will have a gable metal roof.
- Staff believes that the colors and materials are consistent with the intent of the CDG. Nevertheless, we feel that more visually appealing colors and materials should be used for this highly visible site. For example, commercial buildings often use cement tile roofs, which are available in a variety shapes, colors and finishes. A better complement to the proposed brick would be provided with a lighter body color (sand or tan) and a deeper secondary color (dark green, dark blue). White should not be used for stucco panels, but should be limited to features like gutters, facias, and window/door trims.

Staff recommends that the Design Committee:

- Direct that the colors be revised to a lighter body color, a deeper secondary color, and no white panels.
- Direct that the roof be a flat cement tile with a rough surface in either a dark, solid color to complement the building colors, or a light-dark color mix.

**Circulation and Parking:** The Zoning Ordinance allows a maximum 30 percent of required parking stalls to be compact size. Also, the CDG state that compact stalls should be dispersed throughout the parking lot, and not be concentrated or grouped in one area. Drives should facilitate emergency access to the site and all buildings. The Building Code stipulates that accessible parking stalls shall be dispersed and located near accessible entrances.

- The site plan indicates that 61 stalls are compact size, or 33 percent of the required parking. The
  compact stalls are generally well-dispersed, except for one row of parking in southeast corner where all
  nine stalls are compact. (Staff favors having the building in this location instead of parking.)
- The entry drive is designed such that access is direct to the north aisle of the parking lot. However, the design does not accommodate a left turn for a fire truck to the south aisle, nor exiting from the south aisle. Public Works Engineering staff recommends that the entry drive be located southward 20 feet. With that, the planter at the end of the central double row of parking must be shifted westward to accommodate left turns for trucks.

- The site plan indicates 8 accessible parking stalls; however, these should be dispersed better by shifting some to the west.
- Staff believes that the recommended circulation and parking changes can be accommodated on this site. The changes might be designed to also provide 185 parking stalls, which is the minimum number required for the proposed office floor area. However, if an adequate circulation plan does not provide 185 parking stalls, the building floor area would need to be reduced.

Staff recommends that the Design Committee:

• Direct that the site plan be revised to locate the entry drive 20 feet south, to accommodate truck turn movements, and to better disperse the accessible parking.

#### CONCLUSION

As discussed above, the current project design has significantly improved from the original submittal. Staff had contemplated writing conditions to address the few remaining issues during plan check for the site improvements and building permits. After further consideration, staff determined that the design of the project is not of the caliber expected by the Design Committee. Accordingly, we request that the Committee consider the design issues and recommendations, and discuss them with the applicant. Then we ask for the Committee to provide specific design direction to staff and the applicant to incorporate into the project plans, which will be brought back for Committee action at a future date.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION**

An Initial Study and Negative Declaration were previously prepared in accordance with the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines as the environmental document for this project (Exhibit A). The Initial Study and Negative Declaration were posted for a 20-day public review and comment period, from June 30, to July 20, 2006. No comments were received.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning & Redevelopment Department recommends that the Design Committee consider and discuss the issues, before providing specific design direction to the applicant and staff regarding this application. Staff requests that the Committee identify specific changes to be made to the plans. Staff also request that the public hearing on this matter be tabled off-calendar. When revised plans are ready, a new public hearing notice will be posted.

# **ATTACHMENTS**:

- 1. Vicinity Map
- 2. Color Elevations
- 3. Original Site Plan
- 4. Second Site Plan
- 5. Third Site Plan

#### **EXHIBITS**:

- A. Initial Study & Negative Declaration (not included in this printing)
- B. Site Plan (Sheet 1)
- C. Building Elevations (E1)
- D. Building Elevations (E2)
- E. Roof Plan & Sections (Sheet E3)
- F. Grading Plan (Sheet C2)
- G. Landscape Plan (Sheet L1)

Note to Applicant and/or Developer: Please contact the Planning Department staff at (916) 774-5276 prior to the Design Committee meeting if you have any questions on any of the recommended conditions for your project. If you challenge the decision of the Committee in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues which you or someone else raised at the public hearing held for this project, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Director at, or prior to, the public hearing.