



2/26/2016

VIA EMAIL

Garrett Norman, Assistant Planner  
City of Sacramento Community Development Department  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

**RE: Panhandle Annexation (P16-013)**

Dear Mr. Norman:

WALKSacramento has conducted an initial review of the Panhandle Annexation (P16-013) project and we offer the following preliminary comments. We will follow up with more detailed comments.

1. Elementary school site should be closer to Club Center Drive.
  - a. The proposed site was more logical for the 2006 PUD which had a lot of high- and medium-density residential nearby. Now the site is within the least dense area of the PUD, therefore walking and biking rates will be the lower than if the site was closer to more residences.
  - b. The proposed location is far from Regency Park neighborhoods that might be within the school's attendance area, hence more driving and less walking and biking.
  - c. The park site next to the school site has some limited access to Natomas Park via Mayfield Street, a residential street.
2. Commercial Center
  - a. Pedestrian and bicycle access will be limited by the limited number of crossings of National Drive, a 4-lane arterial. Intersection crossing distances will be long and midblock crossings may require signals of some type.
  - b. There may be a desire to cross at the northern edge of the center, but it may be too close to the Mayfield intersection to allow for a midblock crossing.
  - c. The project description in the routing states that the 10-acre site is "intended to serve the neighborhood shopping and service needs of the community." The peripheral location at the intersection of 6-lane and 4-lane arterials is not contiguous with any residential parcels; it doesn't convey a neighborhood orientation nor a pedestrian orientation.
3. Streets
  - a. The streets labeled cross section E, Modified "Residential Street", on the north and south sides of the elementary school and adjoining park have unacceptably narrow sidewalks. We'd like to see schools and parks frontage with 10'-wide sidewalks. If the streets are constructed after the school and parks plans are approved, then appropriate segments for 8' sidewalks could be identified.

- b. The street on the west side of the park and school, cross section C, has a wall on the side opposite the park. This virtually eliminates “eyes on the park” and will discourage legitimate park use and walking/biking to school.
- c. The street on the east side of the school, cross section B, and on the west side of the school do not allow parking. With parking on only two sides of the school and a student body that will likely have lower than desired walking and biking rates, more parking will be needed on the school site. This will generate more traffic at ingress and egress points, which means more vehicle-pedestrian and vehicle-bike conflicts and greater rates of injuries and fatalities.
- d. Club Center and Collector ‘A’ will have walls on sides that have residential. Are VMT and speeds so high that walls are needed? If so, that means the PUD is not designed to encourage and facilitate walking and biking. Also, note that the Regency Park side of existing Club Center in North Natomas has side-on homes but doesn’t have walls. Residential streets with walls don’t have good “eyes on the street” and many people feel isolated and unsafe walking in such places.
- e. Street ‘A’, cross section G, has detached sidewalks and landscape planter with rolled curb on the residential side. Not only is the 6.5’ landscape planter narrow for “estate homesites” but the 30’-wide pavement will encourage drivers to park with one side of the vehicle in the planter. The setback distance is not indicated, but perhaps it could be reduced with an equivalent increase in the planter width.
- f. Sorrento Road, cross section D, also has a narrow landscape planter. The 25’ setback could be reduced with an equivalent increase in the planter width.
- g. Del Paso Road and Elkhorn Blvd, cross section A, each have an 8.5’ landscape planter, detached sidewalk and 25’ landscape corridor/PUE. Considering the traffic volumes and speeds on those roadways, the pedestrian environment would be improved by a few more feet of separation between the travel lanes and the sidewalk. Pedestrian scale lighting is important for these sidewalks, too.

WALKSacramento is working to support increased physical activity such as walking and bicycling in local neighborhoods as well as helping to create community environments that support walking and bicycling. The benefits include improved physical fitness, less motor vehicle traffic congestion, better air quality, and a stronger sense of cohesion and safety in local neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and recommendations. If you have questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 446-9255.

Sincerely,

Chris Holm  
Project Manager

Attachment: Development Checklist for Biking and Walking

# **DEVELOPMENT CHECKLIST for BIKING and WALKING**

*Prepared by WALKSacramento and SABA (Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates)  
September 2012*

This checklist is provided to give an indication of design, engineering, and policy elements that we consider when reviewing development projects.

## **POLICIES**

- Walking and biking is a priority
- Adopted a policy to develop a full multi-modal and ADA accessible transportation system

## *Project Review and Comment*

## **POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

- Pedestrian Master Plan
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Regional Blueprint
- Regional Blueprint Consistent General Plans
- Adopted Climate Action Plans
- Subdivision ordinances to support pedestrian and bicycle access and safety
- Zoning ordinance to support pedestrian and bicycle access and safety

## **ENGINEERING**

- SIDEWALKS & BIKELANES ON BOTH SIDES OF MAJOR ROADWAYS**
  - Pedestrian Level of Service "C" or better on arterials
  - Bicycle Level of Service "C" or better on arterials
- SAFE CROSSINGS FOR PEDESTRIANS**
  - every 300-600 feet on major arterials
  - well lit, marked crosswalks
  - audible signals & count-down signals
  - median refuge islands
- SPEED MANAGEMENT**
  - Speed limits based on safety of pedestrians and bicyclists
  - Implement "road diets" where there is excess lane capacity
- STREET DESIGN STANDARDS**
  - Maximize pedestrian and bicyclist safety
  - Sidewalks buffered by trees and landscaping on major arterials
  - Vertical curbs
  - 5' minimum sidewalk widths, 8' in front of schools
  - 6' minimum bike lanes on busy streets

- ❑ **INTERSECTIONS**
  - Median refuge islands for pedestrians
  - Signal timing to enable safe passage
  - Signal detection for bicyclists
  - Crossings on all 4 legs of intersections
  
- ❑ **ELIMINATE BARRIERS**
  - Freeway, railroad, river and creek crossings
  - Obstructions in sidewalks and bike lanes

### **NEW DEVELOPMENT – REQUIRE**

- ❑ Walking & bicycling circulation plans for all new development
- ❑ Direct and convenient connections to activity centers, including schools, stores, parks, transit
- ❑ Mixed uses and other transit supporting uses within ¼ mile of light rail stations or bus stops with frequent service
- ❑ Minimum width streets
- ❑ Maximum block length of 400'
- ❑ 4-lane maximum for arterials; Recommend 2 lanes wherever possible

### **NEW DEVELOPMENT – DISCOURAGE**

- ❑ Cul-de-sacs (unless it includes bike/ped connections)
- ❑ Gated and/or walled communities
- ❑ Meandering sidewalks
- ❑ Inappropriate uses near transit (gas stations, drive-thru restaurants, mini storage and other auto dependent uses)

### **BUILDINGS – REQUIRE**

- ❑ Direct access for pedestrians from the street
- ❑ Attractive and convenient stairways
- ❑ Bicycle parking – long & short term
- ❑ Shower & clothing lockers

### **OLDER NEIGHBORHOODS**

- ❑ Improve street crossings
- ❑ Reduce speeds
- ❑ Provide new connections
- ❑ Create short cuts for walkers and bicyclists by purchase of properties or other means
- ❑ Provide sidewalks on both sides of major streets

## *Policy Review and Comment*

### **ENFORCEMENT & MAINTENANCE**

- ❑ Enforce speed limits
- ❑ Enforce crosswalk rules – conduct crosswalk sting operations
- ❑ Enforce restrictions against parking on sidewalks
- ❑ Enforce bicycle rules including riding with traffic, lights at night, stopping at red lights
- ❑ Implement CVC 267 setting speed limits based on pedestrian and bicyclist safety
- ❑ Sweep streets and fix hazards
- ❑ Repair and replace broken sidewalks

### **EDUCATION**

- ❑ Train staff on pedestrian and bicycle facility design.
- ❑ Train development community about pedestrian and bicycle planning and safety issues
- ❑ Bicycle skills training

### **FUNDING**

- ❑ Include pedestrian and bicycle facilities in capital improvement programs
- ❑ Include pedestrian and bicycle facilities as a part of roadway widening and improvement projects
- ❑ Support Measure A pedestrian and bicycle facility allocation
- ❑ Set priorities based on safety and latent demand
- ❑ SACOG Community Design grants & Bike/Ped grants
- ❑ California Bicycle transportation Account
- ❑ Safe Routes to School

*www.walksacramento.org*

WALKSacramento  
909 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 203  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 446-9255

*www.sacbike.org*

Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates  
909 12th Street, Suite 116  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 444-6600