

CHAPTER 5.0

LAND USE, ZONING, AND ADOPTED PLANS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides information regarding current land use, land use designations and land use policies in the vicinity of the project site. Section 15125(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states that “The EIR shall discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans”. This section therefore, reviews the land use assumptions, designations and policies of the General Plan of the City of Sacramento which governs the project area. In addition, this Chapter includes a land use compatibility assessment to identify whether or not implementation of the project will result in conflicts between land uses or displacement of land uses.

In order to analyze land use consistency and land use impacts, the following approach was employed; 1) the proposed project was reviewed relative to the land use assumptions, policies and designations of the City of Sacramento General Plan and related land use plans; 2) the proposed uses of the plan and alternatives were reviewed to identify any potential conflicts between the planned project and existing or proposed land uses in the vicinity. In some instances, a plan or land use inconsistency also poses physical environmental consequences, such as noise or traffic. In these cases, the consequences are discussed in the specific chapter of this EIR that focuses on that issue. The discussion provided in this chapter provides a basis for understanding the physical environmental impacts presented in the rest of the document.

5.2 LAND USE INFORMATION

The Proposed Project and project alternatives are located within the Land Park Community area. The project site is contained within the boundaries of the existing Zoo grounds located south of Downtown Sacramento on 14.7± acres in the southwesterly corner of William Land Park. The Zoo is bordered by Sutterville Road to the south, Land Park Drive to the east, 15th Avenue and William Land Park Drive to the north, the Holy Spirit School (3290 West Land Park Drive) and the Sacramento Southern rail line to the west.

William Land Park provides a variety of entertainment and recreational amenities including, Funderland, Fairytale Town, the William Land Park Golf Course, and the Sacramento Zoo. The 238-acre park also includes other amenities such as picnic areas, an amphitheater, ball fields, a rock garden, and lakes.

The Land Park Community area covers the portion of the City of Sacramento directly south of the Central City. The area is roughly bordered by Broadway to the north, the Sacramento River to the west, Fruitridge Road and 35th Avenue to the south, and Highway 99 to the east. Although the General Plan refers to this area as the Land Park Community Plan Area, there is currently no Community Plan adopted by the City for this area.

5.2.1 EXISTING LAND USES

The project site is located within a developed area of the City of Sacramento. Land uses surrounding the zoo include a railroad to the west; and Holy Spirit School located directly northwest of the project site at 3920 West Land Park Drive. Land uses directly to the south of the Zoo include: Dublirer Gallery at 1250 Sutterville Road, Park Side Plaza at 1300 Sutterville Road, a Shell service station on the corner of Sutterville Road and South Land Park Drive, a “76” service station on the corner of Sutterville Road and Del Rio Road, and a shopping center on the corner of South Land Park Drive and Del Rio Road. Residential neighborhoods surround the Zoo to the north, west, and south. **Figure 5-1** displays the existing land uses surrounding the project site.

5.2.2 APPLICABLE LAND USE DESIGNATIONS, GOALS, AND POLICIES

CITY OF SACRAMENTO GENERAL PLAN

The 1988 City General Plan is a 20-year policy guide for the growth and development of the City of Sacramento. The General Plan acts as the overall guiding policy document for land uses in the City and is the principal tool for evaluating public and private projects.

Applicable Goals and Policies

The General Plan includes the following specific goals and policies that are applicable to the Proposed Project and the project alternatives:

SECTION 1. THE GENERAL PLAN FOR SACRAMENTO

Policy 1: It is the policy of the City to enhance and maintain the quality of life by adhering to high standards for project and plan evaluation as these relate to the following characteristics that help define the quality of life in the City (Sec. 1-30).

A valuable asset for each community is the open space and parks that are provided for recreational purposes. Adequate land and funding for improvements and maintenance will be necessary in newly developing areas to ensure the provision of this asset.

Insert **Figure 5-1** – Existing Land Uses in Project Vicinity

- Cultural amenities such as symphonies, theater, schools, libraries, museums and are help to enhance the urban environment. Support for these amenities will help ensure a rich vital urban experience.

Policy 10: It is the policy of the City to conserve and protect natural resources and the planned open space areas, and to phase the conversion of agricultural lands to planned urban uses (Sec. 1-37).

SECTION 5. CIRCULATION ELEMENT

Streets and Roads

Goal C, Policy 1: Continue wherever possible to design streets and approve development applications in such a manner as to eliminate high traffic flows and parking problems within residential neighborhoods (Sec. 5-11).

Parking

Goal A: Provide adequate off-street parking for new development and reduce the impact of on-street parking in established areas (Sec. 5-19).

Policy 1: Continue to use parking standards which will provide adequate off-street parking (Sec. 5-19).

Policy 4: Continue to use the preferential parking program in residential areas where traffic and on-street parking generated from non-residential projects would otherwise have a major negative impact (Sec. 5-21).

GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

The project site as shown in **Figure 5-2**, is designated as Parks-Recreation-Open Space. Alternatives A and B are located on the project site, and as such, have the same General Plan land use designations.

ZONING ORDINANCE

The City of Sacramento Zoning Ordinance regulates land use and development of land within the City (**Figure 5-3**). Buildings, structures and uses of lots that existed prior to the Zoning Ordinance, may be considered to be generally incompatible with permitted uses. Nonconforming uses may not be enlarged, modified or otherwise changed except as provided by the Zoning Ordinance. Modifications of the Zoo must therefore comply with the Zoning Ordinance, even though the use of the site is preexisting.

Insert Figure 5-2 – General Plan Designations

Figure 5-3

The project site is zoned Standard Single-Family Zone (R-1). This zone includes recreational facilities as basic elements of a neighborhood. The Zoning Ordinance includes development standards addressing building location (setbacks) and size, building design and coverage, parking requirements, provision of open space, and identification of allowed land uses. Alternatives A and B are located on the project site, and as such, are located within this zone. The Standard Single-Family Zone is defined in the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

R-1--Standard Single-Family Zone

This is a low density residential zone composed of single-family detached residences on lots a minimum of fifty-two (52) feet by one hundred (100) feet in size...This zone may also include recreational, religious and educational facilities as the basic elements of a balanced neighborhood. Such areas should be clearly defined and without encroachment by uses not performing a neighborhood function.

As shown in **Figure 5-3**, the area surrounding the project site contains seven zones, including the Standard Single-Family Zone described above. The remaining six zones are listed below along with the descriptions provided in the Zoning Ordinance.

R-1A--Single-Family Alternative Zone

This is a low to medium density residential zone intended to permit the establishment of single-family, individually owned, attached or detached residences where lot sizes, height, area and/or setback requirements vary from standard single-family. This zone is intended to accommodate alternative single-family designs which are determined to be compatible with standard single-family areas and which might include single-family attached or detached units, townhouses, cluster housing, condominiums, cooperatives or other similar projects. Approximate density for the R-1A zone is ten (10) dwelling units per acre. Maximum density in this zone is fifteen (15) dwelling units per net acre.

R-2--Two-Family Zone

This is a residential zone allowing two single-family attached or detached units under one ownership. This zone is intended to provide a low density buffer between single-family and more intense land uses. Minimum land area per unit is two thousand six hundred (2,600) square feet per unit for an interior lot and three thousand one hundred (3,100) square feet per unit for a corner lot. Maximum density for the R-2 zone is fourteen (14) to sixteen (16) dwelling units per acre.

R-3--Multi-Family Zone

This is a multi-family residential zone intended for more traditional types of apartments. This zone is located outside the central city serving as a buffer along major streets and shopping centers. Minimum land area per unit is one thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet. Maximum density for the R-3 zone is twenty-nine (29) dwelling units per acre.

C-1--Limited Commercial Zone

This is a limited commercial zone which allows certain office, retail stores, and commercial service establishments which are compatible with residential developments. This zone is intended to be applied to small parcels which are surrounded by a residential neighborhood.

C-1-R – Limited Commercial – Plan Review

This limited commercial zone allows the same development as the C-1 Zone but with the added requirement of a Planning Commission Plan Review for the development of any property within the zone.

M-1 – Light Industrial Zone

This zone permits most fabricating activities, with the exception of heavy manufacturing and the processing of raw materials. In addition, regulations are provided in the M-1(S) zone to provide more attractive and uncrowded developments.

DRAFT MASTER PLAN FOR PARK FACILITIES AND RECREATION SERVICES

The Master Plan for Park Facilities and Recreation Services (Master Plan) guides the planning and management of the City's park facilities and recreation resources. In 1997, the City of Sacramento commissioned an update of the Master Plan. The current draft is based on the 1984 Master Plan and the 1989 Update. The current update was initially undertaken as a two-phase project; the first phase addressing facilities and the second phase addressing programs. The Draft Master Plan however, is currently being revised to include both phases. The first phase, although not formally adopted has been publicly released. The Draft has received input from the Citizens Advisory Committee for Parks and Recreation and has been reviewed by the City Council (Teresa Haenggi, pers. comm.).

APPLICABLE POLICIES

The Master Plan includes the following specific policies that are applicable to the Proposed Project and the project alternatives:

Policy 1.22: Adequate parking shall be provided at each community and regional park location to minimize parking problems on residential and arterial streets.

Policy 1.28: The City shall design community and regional parks for night use, as appropriate. Lighting at night shall provide for safety, and anticipated recreational uses, while limiting glare impacts on nearby residential areas.

Policy 5.6: The Parks Department shall work cooperatively with other community, City, County and State agencies in coordinating facility development and program offerings.

5.3 LAND USE ANALYSIS

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives A and B are located on the project site and as such, have the same land uses on and around the project site as identified above for the Proposed Project.

LAND USE CONSISTENCY AND COMPATIBILITY

Below is an evaluation of the consistency of the Proposed Project and project alternatives with adopted plans, policies, and ordinances for the downtown area.

METHODOLOGY

This section is divided into two separate analyses: (1) Compatibility with Existing Uses, and (2) Consistency with Adopted Plans. Environmental impacts resulting from the Proposed Project or alternatives are discussed in the respective environmental categories (e.g., traffic section for significant traffic impacts, air quality section for air quality impacts, etc.). An inconsistency is identified if the Proposed Project or alternatives are inconsistent with the adopted plans identified below. This section differs from other discussions in that plan consistencies are addressed as opposed to environmental impacts and mitigation measures. This discussion complies with Section 15125 (b) of the CEQA *Guidelines*, which requires EIRs to discuss inconsistencies as part of the environmental setting.

COMPATIBILITY WITH ADJACENT LAND USES

The Proposed Project and alternatives are evaluated for compatibility with the existing land uses surrounding the project/alternative sites. The evaluation considers the type and intensity of uses in the plan area. The analysis will evaluate the proposed plan and alternatives against the existing environment and will determine if it is compatible with those existing uses.

COMPATIBILITY OF LAND USES

PP Development of the Proposed Project would alter and intensify the existing zoo grounds by replacing some of the existing exhibits and facilities with updated exhibits and more extensive facilities. The increased intensity would be most noticeable in three areas. The first area being the southwestern corner of the Zoo where a new service core would include one 2-story buildings providing approximately 17,800 square feet of space for zoo operations and a below-ground

parking structure for up to 52 vehicles. The second area would be on the lawn area in the northern portion of the Zoo, where a 38 x 80 foot multi-use pavilion would be constructed as a permanent structure, replacing the occasional use of a 40 x 80 foot tent. The third area being Kampala Center where a 40 x 60 foot covered deck will be located immediately adjacent to the existing building. Additionally, the existing service section and west patio section of the Kampala Café will be enclosed with a roof and walls.

While the Proposed Project would be a more intense development of the existing project site, the project would be considered compatible and consistent with current and anticipated development within the project area. The area surrounding the project site is currently dominated by recreational (park) and residential uses, with some commercial uses located at the intersection of Sutterville Road, South Land Park Drive and Del Rio Road. Recreational and residential land use areas are considered to be more sensitive to land uses that could cause visual, noise, and other impacts. However, two of the three key areas of increased intensity described above would be located in such a manner as to reduce impacts to surrounding land uses. The southwestern corner of the Zoo, where the proposed service core would be located, is adjacent to the Southern Pacific railroad to the west and the Holy Spirit School to the northwest. The railroad is approximately 12 feet above grade, substantially shielding the western view of the service core. The Holy Spirit School consists of several facilities including an approximately 28 foot high auditorium situated adjacent to the Zoo service area. The proposed service core facilities would be generally compatible with the level of intensity of the Holy Spirit School, in terms of square footage of building space, height of buildings, and noise generated. The Kampala Center improvements will be located in the center of the Zoo, and as such, would have minor impacts to surrounding land uses.

The proposed multi-use pavilion located in the second key area of increased intensity - the lawn area in the northern portion of the Zoo - has the potential to generate impacts on neighboring uses. These potential impacts are discussed in Chapter 6.0, Environmental Settings, Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Other developments of the Proposed Project, including updating exhibits and the Zoo entrance are considered to be compatible with current developments within William Land Park including Fairytale Town, Funderland and the Land Park Golf Course. The developments of the Proposed Project are generally consistent with these surrounding park uses, and would not constitute a substantial intensification over the existing Zoo facilities that would be replaced. However, potential impacts that will occur to surrounding land uses as a result of the

proposed entrance and other proposed facilities will also be discussed in Chapter 6.0.

- AA Under the No Project Alternative, the Sacramento Zoo would not be redeveloped to the intensity envisioned under the Proposed Project. Rather, in the near term, existing conditions would remain. However, future improvements assumed for the No Project Alternative include a proposed 5,300 square foot health care facility that would contain space for surgery, x-rays, quarantine, storage and office space. The proposed facility, as identified in *Zoo - 2002*, would be located directly southeast of the current administration building. This facility would likely be constructed under the No Project Alternative as a response to current AZA requests for the development of veterinary clinic and quarantine facilities. As noted above, the southwestern corner of the Zoo, where the health care facility would be located, is adjacent to the Southern Pacific railroad to the west and the Holy Spirit School to the northwest. The intensification of use in this area, to include a health care facility is considered to be compatible with surrounding uses including the Holy Spirit School.

Impacts resulting occasional use of Zoo's 40 x 80 foot tent would continue to occur. The analysis of existing site conditions has identified noise impacts to adjacent residential areas, which are addressed in greater depth in Chapter 6.0. These impacts would be likely to occur in the short term as well as in the long term.

- AB The Reduced Intensity Alternative would provide improvements to the existing Zoo grounds that would be focused on maintaining standards set by the AZA and USDA. The Medical/Service Complex components described in Section 3.4 are included in this alternative. These components would be constructed in the southwest corner of the Zoo. As discussed under the Proposed Project above, the proposed service core facilities would be generally compatible with the level of intensity of the Holy Spirit School.

Impacts resulting occasional use of Zoo's 40 x 80 foot tent would continue to occur, as the multi-use pavilion would not be constructed under this alternative. Analysis of existing site conditions has identified noise impacts to adjacent residential areas, which are addressed in greater depth in Chapter 6.0. These impacts would be likely to occur in the short term as well as in the long term.

In the long range, it is assumed that redevelopment of the Zoo would occur as exhibits and facilities further age and deteriorate, and renovations are required to meet AZA and USDA standards. However, as with the Proposed Project, these

developments are considered to be compatible with current developments within William Land Park.

CONSISTENCY WITH ADOPTED PLANS AND POLICIES

This section discusses any inconsistencies between the Proposed Project/alternatives and existing adopted plans and policies. The consistency analysis considers the adopted goals and policies of the various plans identified in the setting discussion above. Mitigation measures are not identified for any inconsistencies identified; however, these inconsistencies may be considered in the determination of physical environmental impacts identified in the technical sections of this document.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO GENERAL PLAN

PP The developments included in the Proposed Project would maintain and update the facilities of the Sacramento Zoo consistent with the intent of the Parks-Recreation-Open Space designation.

The Proposed Project would enhance the Zoo as a valuable community asset of William Land Park (General Plan: Section 1, Policy 1). The Proposed Project is generally consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. However, the Proposed Project could exacerbate parking problems currently experienced in the vicinity due to increased visitation to the Zoo. This potentially significant impact is discussed in Chapter 6.0, Environmental Settings, Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

AA, AB The No Project and Reduced Intensity Alternatives would maintain the facilities of the Sacramento Zoo consistent with the intent of the Park-Recreation-Open Space designation. The Zoo would be maintained as a valuable community asset of William Land Park (General Plan: Section 1, Policy 1).

It is unlikely that these alternatives would substantially increase demand for parking, as most improvements – including a veterinary clinic, quarantine facilities and administration space – would not attract a significant increase in Zoo visitation. Improvements that would attract a significant increase in Zoo visitation would be limited to those that are included in the Zoo – 2002 plan and meet current AZA standards. Due to changes in AZA standards, some of the exhibits improvements included in the Zoo – 2002 plan would no longer meet current standards. AZA standards for elephants, for example, now require a minimum of 5 acres of enclosure. A 5-acre enclosure, however, would cover over a third of the Zoo’s grounds, making an elephant exhibit infeasible.

ZONING ORDINANCE

PP, AA, AB The Proposed Project and project alternatives have been designed to conform to use, height, and lot configuration standards set forth for the site's R-1 zoning.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN PHASE I

PP The Proposed Project would maintain and update the facilities of the Sacramento Zoo generally consistent with the policies of the Master Plan.

The Proposed Project has been developed in cooperation with community and city agencies including: the Land Park Community Association, the Sacramento Zoological Society, and the City of Sacramento (Policy 5.6). The Proposed Project includes a multi-use pavilion that will be used for after-hours (evening) functions (Policy 1.28).

However, the Proposed Project may add to parking problems currently experienced in the vicinity of William Land Park and adjacent residential areas. While the Proposed Project includes a 52 car parking structure, this is intended for Zoo employees rather than patrons. Increased visitation may result in additional parking related impacts in the vicinity (Policy 1.22).

AA, AB The No Project and Reduced Intensity Alternatives would maintain the facilities of the Sacramento Zoo and would be generally consistent with the policies of the Master Plan.

The pavilion site would continue to be used occasionally for after-hours (evening) functions utilizing the Zoo's 40 x 80 tent (Policy 1.28). However, it is assumed that the parking problems currently experienced in the vicinity of William Land Park would continue in the short term and possibly in the long term (Policy 1.22).