

CHAPTER THREE

Comparative Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

The following analysis consists of a comparative evaluation of the three land use options to assist the community, City Council, and Planning Commission in providing policy direction for the preparation of the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan. The evaluation rates the concepts and options according to several factors including Auburn Boulevard's regional role, circulation, community design and appearance, market feasibility, and fiscal impacts. Each of the evaluation criterion is phrased in the form of a question and later evaluated in a matrix at the end of this chapter.

REGIONAL POSITION

Goal: Position Auburn Boulevard as a desirable address within the region.

How does the option:

Take advantage of future regional economic opportunities?

Option 1:

- Option 1 envisions a limited niche role for Auburn Boulevard to capture a modestly larger share of specialized products and services, such as automotive services.

Option 2:

- Option 2 would capitalize on market opportunities for both commercial retail and higher density residential apartments and townhouses. The strength of the residential market for Roseville and South Placer County suggests that this demand could spill over to the north portion of the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan area.

Option 3:

- Option 3 would focus on a regional market for offices and hotel conference facilities. Option 3 has more risk than Options 1 and 2 because it is more speculative from a market standpoint.

Acknowledge Auburn Boulevard's future regional transportation/transit role?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would perpetuate the existing role of bus stops along Auburn Boulevard. There would be no specific coordination of bus stop locations with surrounding land use.

Option 2:

- Option 2 is the strongest option in terms of its regional transportation/transit role because it would provide multiple bus stops along Auburn Boulevard. Two of these bus stops are located at mixed-use hubs/centers which would create the best opportunities to use transit.

Option 3:

- Option 3 would provide transit service at the larger commercial destinations in Subareas 4 and 5. Option 3 would provide more opportunities for transit use than Option 1, but fewer opportunities than Option 2.

TRANSPORTATION

Goal: Improve Auburn Boulevard's performance as a transportation facility supporting regional and local mobility while enhancing its pedestrian friendliness.

How does the option:

Improve pedestrian and bicycle safety?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would provide sidewalk improvements to the segments along Auburn Boulevard that currently lack sidewalks.
- Option 1 would not provide on-street (Class II) bike lanes.
- Extensive undergrounding under Option 1 would increase access opportunities on sidewalks for pedestrians, especially for the disabled.

Option 2:

- Option 2 would include Class II bike lanes, continuous sidewalks, and planting strips, consistent with General Plan goals. The proposed planting strips would serve as a buffer between vehicle and pedestrian traffic.
- Additional right-of-way may be required to implement these improvements depending on the combination of facilities



There are several segments along Auburn Boulevard that need sidewalk improvements.

Auburn Blvd. Specific Plan • Concepts and Options Report

selected for Auburn Boulevard.

- Extensive undergrounding under Option 2 would increase access opportunities on sidewalks for pedestrians, especially for the disabled.

Option 3:

- Option 3 would include Class II bike lanes, continuous sidewalks, and planting strips, consistent with General Plan goals. The proposed planting strips would serve as a buffer between vehicle and pedestrian traffic.
- Additional right-of-way may be required to implement these improvements depending on the combination of facilities selected for Auburn Boulevard.
- Extensive undergrounding under Option 3 would increase access opportunities on sidewalks for pedestrians, especially for the disabled.

Enhance transit accessibility?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would not include any significant changes to transit facilities and service.

Option 2:

- Transit stops at mixed-use centers including bus turnouts would be provided. Additional bus turnouts would help reduce vehicle congestion along the corridor but may require additional right-of-way (approximately 8 to 12 feet of additional right-of-way for each bus turnout).

Option 3:

- Transit stops at larger commercial destinations including bus turnouts would also be provided. Additional bus turnouts would help reduce vehicle congestion along the corridor but may require additional right-of-way (approximately 8 to 12 feet of additional right-of-way for each bus turnout).

Limit traffic congestion?

Option 1:

- This option would generate the lowest number of new vehicle trips of the three options.

Option 2:

- Option 2 would have higher traffic levels on Auburn Boulevard in comparison to Option 1. While intersection capacity improvements could be made to mitigate these increases,

Auburn Blvd. Specific Plan • Concepts and Options Report

unacceptable operations could still occur, thus violating the level of service policies established in the City's General Plan. Further analysis would need to be conducted to determine the level of potential traffic impacts and required mitigation.

Option 3:

- Similar to Option 2, Option 3 would increase traffic levels on Auburn Boulevard in comparison to Option 1. While intersection capacity improvements could be made to mitigate these increases, unacceptable operations could still occur, thus violating the level of service policies established in the City's General Plan. Further analysis would need to be conducted to determine the level of potential traffic impacts and required mitigation.

Improve traffic turning movements and safety?

Option 1:

- Unlike Options 2 and 3, Option 1 does not propose to consolidate nor relocate driveways to provide for safer and more efficient traffic movement. Under this option, Auburn Boulevard would likely continue to have higher average accident rates than state and areawide accident rates.
- Option 1 is inconsistent with General Plan Policy 29.7 which seeks to minimize access points along major arterial roadways including consolidating or relocating driveways to provide for safer and more efficient traffic movement

Option 2:

- Option 2 would improve traffic safety on Auburn Boulevard compared to Option 1 because it proposes to consolidate or relocate driveways. However, the overall traffic safety of this option is dependent on the level of driveway consolidation, movement restrictions, and provision of acceleration and deceleration lanes into driveways.
- Option 2 is consistent with General Plan Policy 29.7.

Option 3:

- Option 3 would improve traffic safety on Auburn Boulevard compared to Option 1 because it proposes to consolidate or relocate driveways. However, the overall traffic safety of this option is dependent on the level of driveway consolidation, movement restrictions, and provision of acceleration and deceleration lanes into driveways.
- Option 3 is consistent with General Plan Policy 29.7.

Improve access to private property?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would retain existing curb cuts and maintain access to private properties but would not provide cross-parcel access easements included in Options 2 and 3.

Option 2:

- Option 2 would consolidate driveways wherever possible, reducing individual property access points. Currently, U-turns at signalized intersections along the study segment of Auburn Boulevard are permitted at two locations, Antelope Road and northbound at Rollingwood Drive. With the proposed raised median in Option 2, additional right-of-way would be required at other signalized intersections (e.g., at Twin Oaks Avenue, Grand Oaks Avenue, and/or Kanai Avenue) to accommodate U-turn movements necessary to access adjacent parcels.
- Option 2 would allow cross-parcel access easements for vehicles and pedestrians to improve connectivity between properties.
- Option 2 would be better integrated into surrounding neighborhoods, providing shorter walking distance for pedestrians to neighborhood commercial stores.

Option 3:

- Same as first and second bullets under Option 2.

Impact on-site parking?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would maintain the same on-site parking configuration that exists today.

Option 2:

- Option 2 proposes to consolidate access points and driveways, which may result in a net gain in the number of on-site parking spaces for various properties.

Option 3:

- Same as bullet under Option 2.

Improve school access?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would provide continuous sidewalks which would improve pedestrian access to nearby schools.

Option 2:

- Option 3 would provide continuous sidewalks and bikelanes which would improve pedestrian and bicycle access to nearby schools.

Option 3:

- Same as Option 2 bullet.

Affect traffic volumes on adjacent neighborhood streets?

Option 1:

- In general, existing traffic patterns on neighborhood streets would continue under Option 1 since it would not include a raised median along Auburn Boulevard.

Option 2:

- Since Option 2 would include a raised median along Auburn Boulevard, traffic volumes on neighborhood streets may increase or decrease depending on the quantity and location of turning movement restrictions and where access is permitted on Auburn Boulevard.

Option 3:

- Same as Option 2 bullet.

COMMUNITY IMAGE AND DESIGN

Goal: Improve the image of the corridor's buildings, signage, and streetscape.

How does the option:

Create distinctive residential and business identities on Auburn Boulevard?

Option 1:

- Option 1 has the potential to create an auto cluster district that capitalizes on its existing auto-oriented businesses.
- Option 1 would be much weaker than Options 2 and 3 in creating residential and business identities because it involves just minor signage improvements and does not involve substantial new development.

Option 2:

- Option 2 is the strongest option in creating distinctive identities because it addresses both new residential and commercial

Auburn Blvd. Specific Plan • Concepts and Options Report

districts (i.e., two horizontal mixed-use villages), whereas Options 1 and 3 focus only on commercial uses.

Option 3:

- Option 3 creates two strong commercial districts — the community center in Subarea 4 and the business/office center in Subarea 5.

Improve the land use and design interface with adjacent neighborhoods?

Option 1:

- Since Option 1 would essentially maintain the same design conditions that exist today, poor interface issues between commercial development along Auburn Boulevard and the surrounding neighborhoods would remain unchanged.

Option 2:

- Option 2 would focus heavily on both scale and use transition between commercial uses and surrounding neighborhoods in all subareas.
- The mixed use villages would be integrated with surrounding neighborhoods allowing for better pedestrian connections between commercial and residential uses that do not exist today.
- Option 2 would have the best transition/interface between commercial uses and surrounding neighborhoods of the three options.

Option 3:

- The land use and design interface in Subarea 5 under Option 3 would be significantly improved over existing conditions.
- Option 3 would have a better commercial and residential interface than Option 1, but not as strong as Option 2.

Improve design and investment in new and existing buildings and signage?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would include improved building facades, site landscape, and signage, but would not have the same level of improvement in building design as the other options because Options 2 and 3 would have a greater percentage of new development with modern building and design standards.
- Option 1 would lack the district and subdistrict theme signage that is included in both Options 2 and 3.

Option 2:

- Same as bullets under Option 1.
- Option 2 would create two attractive, pedestrian-scale mixed-use villages that would enhance considerably the built landscape.
- Option 2 would create a “main street” feel that is absent in Options 1 and 3.

Option 3:

- Same as bullets under Option 1.

Create a pleasant streetscape image and environment?

Option 1:

- Due to the number of existing curb cuts that would remain under this option, there are limited landscaping opportunities.
- Option 1 would have little to no landscaped medians.
- Option 1 would include completion of sidewalks and curbs where there are none.
- Option 1 would have future infill buildings located close to the sidewalk with parking in the rear creating a more intimate streetscape. However, this would only be for infill parcels.

Option 2:

- Option 2 would have two attractive, pedestrian-scale mixed-use villages that would considerably enhance the built landscape.
- Unlike Option 1, Option 2 would have a continuous streetscape with theme signage and street furniture.
- Option 2 would create a “main street” feel that is absent in Options 1 and 3.
- Option 2 would have street-oriented commercial buildings that would provide a more human scale than Option 1.

Option 3:

- Option 3 would include gateway developments in Subarea 5 that are not included in Options 1 and 3.
- Unlike Option 1, Option 3 would have a continuous streetscape with theme signage and street furniture.
- Similar to Option 2, Option 3 would have a larger number of street-oriented commercial buildings that would provide a more human scale than what exists today.

Underground utilities?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would include extensive undergrounding of utilities that would improve the aesthetics of the Boulevard and provide flexibility in landscaping and open opportunities for new street lighting.
- Undergrounding utilities would have a major impact on the aesthetic enhancement of the Boulevard, including reducing visual “noise,” improving both pedestrian and vehicular experience along the corridor, opening more opportunities for planting, and eliminating the need for pruning and topping mature trees.
- Extensive undergrounding would increase access opportunities on sidewalks for pedestrians, especially for the disabled.

Option 2:

- Same as bullets under Option 2

Option 3:

- Same as bullets under Option 2

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Goal: Increase Citrus Height’s economic diversity and the private sector’s economic capacity through public and private investment along Auburn Boulevard.

How does the option:

Contribute to job creation, stability, and diversity?

Option 1:

- Option 1 has the least potential for job creation and diversity.

Option 2:

- Option 2 anticipates higher unit retail sales due to qualitative characteristics superior to Option 1.
- Option 2 has the potential to create new jobs and increase business diversity far more than Option 1.

Option 3:

- Option 3 also anticipates higher unit retail sales due to qualitative characteristics superior to Option 1.
- More jobs would be generated by Option 3 since it has more proposed commercial development than Option 2. Due to the office component included in Subarea 5 of Option 3, the jobs



Auto-related stores are a common use along Auburn Boulevard.

created would be higher-paying than in both Options 1 and 2.

Enhance Citrus Height's property and sales tax base?

The City's Consultants conducted a cursory analysis to estimate the change in property tax increment and sales tax revenue that the three redevelopment options would have on each subarea. Many assumptions are incorporated into the analyses, but the primary concepts include the following:

- Small infill developments would produce the same assessed values and retail sales per square foot that are currently being produced by businesses along the Auburn Boulevard corridor.
- Larger pockets of more intense new development would produce higher assessed values and retail sales per square foot than are currently being produced.
- Options 2 and 3 in Subareas 4 and 5 involve the displacement of some existing commercial land uses. The assessed values and retail sales associated with displaced land uses are deducted from the assessed values and retail sales associated with new development.
- A portion of existing land uses that is not assumed to be displaced is assumed to be renovated. Renovated property is assumed to generate additional assessed value and retail sales.

Tables 3-1 and 3-2 present the results of the preliminary analysis. Assumed development in Subarea 1 is based on the Sylvan Corners Redevelopment Plan, so the assessed values and retail sales changes are the same for each option. For purposes of comparison, the total impacts of each option are shown in Tables 3-1 and 3-2, both *including* and *excluding* the effects of Subarea 1.

TABLE 3-1			
ESTIMATED CHANGE IN ANNUAL TAX INCREMENT REVENUE (\$ IN THOUSANDS)			
Subarea	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
1	\$78	\$78	\$78
2	\$15	\$20	\$23
3	\$27	\$30	\$31
4	\$18	\$194	\$81
5	\$18	\$111	\$144
Total	\$156	\$433	\$357
Excl. Subarea 1	\$77	\$355	\$278

TABLE 3-2			
ESTIMATED CHANGE IN ANNUAL SALES TAX REVENUE (\$ IN THOUSANDS)			
Subarea	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
1	\$221	\$221	\$221
2	\$38	\$35	\$57
3	\$36	\$39	\$41
4	\$33	-\$71	\$239
5	\$53	-\$144	-\$152
Total	\$381	\$80	\$406
Excl. Subarea 1	\$159	-\$141	\$185

Option 1:

- Same as bullets under Option 2.

Option 2:

- Table 3-1 demonstrates that the residential development associated with Option 2 produces slightly higher tax increment revenue than commercial development associated with Option 3.
- The significant amounts of new development associated with Options 2 and 3 produce much higher tax increment revenues than the infill development associated with Option 1.
- Table 3-2 illustrates how the sales tax revenue is affected by the displaced commercial land uses. Option 2 residential development and the Option 3 combination of office and hotel development (possibly producing small amounts of retail sales) that displace existing commercial land uses may result in

Auburn Blvd. Specific Plan • Concepts and Options Report

reduced sales tax revenue in Subareas 4 and 5. However, the new retail development associated with Option 3 in Subarea 4 produces significant retail sales. [Note that the analysis does not address the current status and future prospects for the K-Mart in Subarea 5. Should that store close due to market conditions or corporate restructuring, property tax increment and retail sales would decline until another business assumes ownership and operates out of that location.]

Option 3:

Same as bullets under Option 2.

Make the community a more desirable and competitive address?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would be the weakest of the three options in creating a more desirable and competitive business address.

Option 2:

- Option 2 presents a better opportunity for making the community a more desirable and competitive address than does Option 1.

Option 3:

- Similar to Option 2, Option 3 presents a better opportunity for making the community a more desirable and competitive address than does Option 1.
- Option 3, due to the inclusion of a hotel and office cluster at I-80, would create a symbolic new address for this section of Auburn Boulevard.

ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY

Goal: Planning concepts for Auburn Boulevard should be financially achievable and reflect market opportunities.

How does the option:

Reflect the near- and long-term commercial and residential market opportunities?

Option 1:

- Option 1 would be the weakest of the three options reflecting commercial and residential market opportunities.



Office commercial on the corner of Auburn Boulevard and Twin Oaks Avenue.

Option 2:

- Option 2 would reflect market opportunities for both commercial retail and appropriate higher density residential apartments and townhouses. The strength of the residential market for Roseville and South Placer County suggests that this demand could spill over to the north end of the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan area. There are opportunities for mid-to high-density residential, which could be included in a horizontal mixed-use village center.

Option 3:

- Option 3 introduces office and hotel space, which would be more speculative from a market viewpoint than residential clusters.

Realistically reflect the financial feasibility of private development?

Option 1:

- Since Option 1 involves development of small commercial uses similar to what currently exists, private development would entail relatively minor private investment. However, the return on that small investment would likely be smaller due to lower retail sales generation rates and lower lease rates.

Option 2:

- The more intense aspects of Option 2 would involve greater private investment but would also produce higher retail sales and higher lease rates for the minor non-residential aspect of Option 2. In addition, the mixed-use feature of Option 2, with its for-rent and for-sale residential components, would diversify the risk of higher investment. Also, Option 2 may be more realistic from a short-term market perspective.

Option 3:

- Since the focus of Option 3 would be larger commercial development to make room for larger tenants, significant private investment of a magnitude similar to that of Option 2 would need to be made. The potential to create commercial synergy and a regional destination, together with some commercial diversification into office and hotel uses, could also lead to significant returns on private investment for Option 3. However, the longer-term nature of Option 3 market acceptance may involve more risk than Option 2.

Reflect the City's ability to fund infrastructure improvements?

Option 1:

- To the extent the City can leverage sales tax revenue to fund infrastructure, Option 1 would generate incremental sales tax revenue that is less than Option 3 but greater than Option 2.

Option 2:

- Option 2 would generate the most negative impact on the City, since existing sales tax producing land uses would be replaced by residential land uses.
- While Option 2 would result in more residents and, therefore, more funding from sources that are population based (e.g., gas tax), more residents would also translate into higher service costs as compared to non-residential land uses.

Option 3:

- The City would be most positively impacted by Option 3, since this option would generate the highest sales tax revenue for most subareas. However, Option 3 development in Subarea 5, which contemplates office and hotel uses that would generate much less sales tax than retail uses, would impact the City even more negatively than Option 2 development. These sales tax impacts translate into general fund impacts on the City, and general fund impacts would have to be considered in estimating the City's financial capabilities for infrastructure.
- Option 3 in Subarea 5 would produce transient occupancy taxes and hotel-related sales taxes and have lower service costs than Option 2.

Reflect the Redevelopment Agency's ability to fund infrastructure improvements?

Option 1:

- The Redevelopment Agency's financial capabilities for infrastructure relate almost exclusively to the amount of tax increment produced in the area. Option 1 generates far less tax increment than either Option 2 or Option 3.

Option 2:

- Option 2 appears to generate the highest property tax increment, although Option 3 generates only 16 percent less tax increment than Option 2.
- Option 2 appears to generate the highest property tax increment.

Option 3:

- Option 3 in Subarea 5 would produce transient occupancy taxes and hotel-related sales taxes and have lower service costs than Option 2.
- Option 3 generates only 16 percent less tax increment than Option 2.

Require the Redevelopment Agency's financial participation in private development?

Option 1:

- The market-driven, small-project nature of Option 1 would require minimal Redevelopment Agency financial participation.

Option 2:

- Technical assistance from staff, commercial rehabilitation loans, tax increment financing for infrastructure, and some land assembly would likely be required for Option 2, resulting in fairly active Redevelopment Agency participation in terms of staff time and financial commitment. This option may also have the need for a business improvement district (BID) or property-based business improvement district (PBID).

Option 3:

- The large commercial tenant emphasis of Option 3 would likely include the same types of participation from the Redevelopment Agency as for Option 2, with the added component of proactive land assembly.

