RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board adopt the required findings contained in the agenda report and approve the proposed project, subject to the recommended conditions.

Proposed Motion

I move that the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board adopt the required findings contained in the agenda report and approve Architectural Review 15-41 (Floral Gardens Square, Building Four), subject to the recommended conditions.

BACKGROUND

The applicant proposes to construct a single story 5,960 square foot office structure on a 0.56 acre site at 1260 East Avenue, just east of Floral Avenue. The site is designated Office Mixed Use on the City of Chico General Plan Land Use Diagram, and is located in the OR (Office Residential) zoning district.

The building is to be located on a “pad” site created as a part of the overall Floral Gardens Square project, a complex of five office/commercial buildings approved in 2002. Three of the pads have been subsequently developed. All parking and other site improvements relating to development of the subject Building Four pad are already in place.

DISCUSSION

Architecture: In terms of general massing and form, the proposed office structure is similar in design to those already constructed as part of the overall project. The structure will be finished with lap-style siding and standing-seam metal roof. Proposed colors are “Casual Gray” for the body of the building, with trim to be an off-white “Melting Icicles”. Roofing is to be “Ash Gray”. No roof-mounted equipment is proposed. A materials board will be presented at the Board’s meeting.

The applicant is pursuing a “Southern Federal” character for the building, incorporating columns and shutters consistent with this theme. The East Avenue façade, on which the main entry would be located, is strengthened with a column-supported covered porch feature.
Signage consists of one six-foot tall free-standing monument type sign in front of the building, facing East Avenue.

Site Planning: As most of the site has already been developed with related parking and landscape areas, site planning is limited to the location of the building on the pad location. The proposed site plan improvements are consistent with zoning requirements and responsive to existing site improvements and conditions.

Vehicle access to the site is via existing driveways to both Floral and East Avenues. All parking improvements to support the proposed use of the building are already in place. Bicycle parking per Municipal Code requirements is noted on the site plan.

Landscaping and Lighting: Landscaping is provided in all non-paved areas, with Zelkova and Chinese Pistache trees being used to shade parking areas. Estimated shade coverage is 57%, exceeding the usual 50% standard. Crepe Myrtle trees are used in other locations, along with ground cover and shrubbery. In addition to these elements, Creeping Fig vines will be used to further screen and enhance the trash enclosure. An outdoor employee area consisting of a small patio with an arbor is also proposed.

Parking lot lighting will be provided by decorative post style fixtures between roughly eight and 10 feet in height.

As of July 1, 2015 the City of Chico is responsible for implementing Low Impact Development (LID) requirements as part of the State Water Resource Control Board’s MS4 General Permit. Because of this new requirement, recommended conditions allow flexibility in the final landscape plan to ensure the project will be in conformance with LID standards.

RECOMMENDED DISCUSSION ITEMS

Proposed Colors

Design Guidelines Objective 3.2.3 calls for “Design continuity throughout the building architecture, including materials and colors that clearly follow a project’s overall design intent, concept, and style.” To advance this objective, the Guidelines suggest that designers “Select building colors and accent materials from a rich palette that enhances the streetscape, rather than simply blends with surrounding architecture. Avoid bland color palettes and unnecessary ornamentation.”

The proposed use of darker gray colors for both the body and roof of the proposed structure may appear somewhat monochromatic, and incongruent with the “Southern Federal” architectural theme being sought.

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

Environmental Review
The project has been determined to be categorically exempt under CMC Section 1.40.220 and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15332
In-Fill Development Projects. Consistent with this exemption, the project is: consistent with the applicable general plan designation, zoning regulations, and general plan policies; is less than five acres in size, substantially surrounded by urban uses; has no habitat value for special status species; will not result in any significant impacts regarding traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

Architectural Review
According to the Chico Municipal Code Section 19.18.060, the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board shall determine whether or not a project adequately meets adopted City standards and design guidelines, based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan, any applicable specific plan, and any applicable neighborhood or area plans.

   The proposal is consistent with several General Plan policies, including those that encourage compatible infill development (LU-1, LU-4, and CD-5). The project also includes landscaping that is fundamental to the design, softens the structure appearance while complementing existing landscaping found on abutting parcels. Further, the project bicycle parking and the structures are at pedestrian scale and height (CD-3.2.1). The site is not located within the bounds of a Neighborhood Plan or area plan.

2. The proposed development, including the character, scale, and quality of design are consistent with the purpose/intent of this chapter and any adopted design guidelines.

   The project promotes orderly development in that it is a component of a previously approved complex of commercial structures. The subject site is surrounded by single story development. The project is also consistent with Design Guidelines that call for a pedestrian-level scale, incorporation of elements that reflect the surrounding neighborhood, proper screening of utilities, landscaping to soften and block views, and a clear pedestrian entry (DG 3.1.11, 3.1.12, 3.1.35).

3. The architectural design of structures, including all elevations, materials and colors are visually compatible with surrounding development. Design elements, including screening of equipment, exterior lighting, signs, and awnings, have been incorporated into the project to further ensure its compatibility with the character and uses of adjacent development.

   The design, materials and neutral color pallet of the proposed office structure are visually compatible with the surrounding office developments. Exterior equipment will be properly screened by fences or painted to match the structures. The proposal treats all elevations equally in materials, and details (DG 3.2.33, 3.2.27).

4. The location and configuration of structures are compatible with their sites and with surrounding sites and structures, and do not unnecessarily block views from other structures or dominate their surroundings.

   The proposed structure is a component of a previously approved site plan for a complex of commercial buildings. The project configuration creates a compatible site plan where
parking will be adequately hidden from public view and convenient. The buildings will not unnecessarily block views or dominate its surroundings as the height of the structures is below the allowed height of the zoning designation (DG 1.1.14, 1.1.15)

5. The general landscape design, including the color, location, size, texture, type, and coverage of plant materials, and provisions for irrigation and maintenance, and protection of landscape elements, have been considered to ensure visual relief, to complement structures, and to provide an attractive environment.

The proposed landscaping will provide visual relief around the structures and provide adequate parking lot shading, along with screening of the trash enclosure.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All approved building plans and permits shall note on the cover sheet that the project shall comply with AR 15-41 (Floral Gardens Square Building Four), as may be modified by any conditions added by the ARHPB. No building permits related to this approval shall be issued or final occupancy granted without authorization of Planning Division staff.

2. All wall-mounted utilities and roof or wall penetrations, including vent stacks, utility boxes, exhaust vents, gas meters and similar equipment, shall be screened by appropriate materials and colors. Adequate screening shall be verified by Planning staff prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

3. Building mounted lighting shall be of an architecturally compatible full-cutoff design, and subject to staff approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

4. The proposed landscape plan may be modified to meet LID requirements. The Final landscape plan shall be designed to incorporate materials and themes reflected in the proposed plan.

5. Remove, replace, and/or construct any deficient public improvements along East Avenue to achieve compliance with current ADA and Title 24 Accessibility requirements.

PUBLIC CONTACT

Public notice requirements are fulfilled by placing a notice on the project site and by posting of the agenda at least 10 days prior to the ARHPB meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Location Map
B. Applicant’s Project Description
C. Site Plan: Previously Approved Floral Gardens Square Complex
D. Site Plan: Proposed Project
E. Elevations, Fencing, Trellis, and Signage
F. Elevations
G. Landscape Plan
H. Landscape Key
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Project Description: Floral Gardens Square – Building 4

We are pleased to present this Southern Federal style building design for an existing vacant lot which is located at 1260 East Avenue. Originally developed in 2002... lots 1 and 4 have remained undeveloped throughout the periods of “the overbuilding of office structures” - 2002 to 2006... and the “real estate financial crises” that began in the latter part of 2007—both of which have, until now, severely affected 'start-up' construction projects in the City of Chico.

The building design which is being presented for your review, comment and approval... represents the continuation of the unique architectural styles found in Floral Gardens Square with its building structures and their features that, not only meet and/or exceed the design elements of the City of Chico’s Design Guidelines—but enhances the quality of work-life for the tenants who will occupy it in the future.

The building’s Southern Federal design, together with its unique elements, illustrate our continued approach to the initial architectural designs of the Floral Gardens Square and the design elements that meet each of the required guidelines of the City—as follows:

- The existing three buildings in “Floral Gardens Square” (FGS), are timeless in their traditional architectural designs... French County, Italian Mediterranean—and New England Cape Cod. The addition of our Southern Federal style architectural design will equally enhance the continuation of the project and compliment each of the existing buildings in this village style development project. The village style architecture of FGS has clearly defined project entry features with fully landscaped parking areas adjacent to each building’s entry and a distinguishable building theme that makes finding a tenant's business—easy for its visitors.
In 2001, as well as today... Floral Gardens Square continues to set an exemplary example for the future development of other neighboring properties and the existing East Avenue corridor of Office/Residential areas with its unique architectural design and landscape features—making it consistent with the objectives of Chico’s DG 3.1.11 & 12.

• As in the original design of Floral Gardens Square development plan... Lot 1’s Development Plan meets the building coverage to total site area at 24.47%; and exceeds the parking lot area to parking landscape area ratio at 22.2%, the parking area shading coefficient ratio at 89.40% and the building to landscape/hardscape ratio at 28.22%—all of which continue to exceed the percentage requirements of the City’s design ordinances. The landscape enhancements also serve to further minimize the visual impacts of the vehicular parking areas... reduce the effects of heat generated by the asphalt concrete parking areas—and enhance the visual and dimensional effects of the landscape to the building, making it consistent with the objectives of DG 3.1.21, 22, 23, 24 & 25.

• The convenient bicycle parking and patio gathering area, which will be utilized by Suite C’s employees, has been enclosed to ensure their privacy and security. Employee gathering areas will be incorporated within the interior design of the building’s Suite’s A and B... and their bicycle parking has been strategically located to be convenient to the building’s entries—where bicycles can be visibly observed by their owners at all times, in accordance with the design guidelines of 3.1.31, 32, 33 & 34.

• The 5’ and 6’ wide sidewalks which serve the building’s entries from East Avenue and the parking lot areas have been spaciously provided in ample widths for ADA compliant pedestrian and wheel chair traffic, per DG 3.1.37.

• All HVAC cooling units and electrical metering panels have been located on the easterly side of the building and are sufficiently hidden, behind a decorative screen and staggered trees and shrubs, from view by passing pedestrians and vehicular traffic—being more than 60’ from the southerly property line and more than 75’ from the public sidewalk and street view, complying with DG 3.1.35, 36 and 3.2.28.

• In compliance with former requirements of the City’s ordinances, the existing enclosed trash enclosure which serves the Floral Gardens Square project, was strategically located central to all building occupancies and screened from general public view by its stucco enclosure and by both on and off-site landscape features and parking areas, making it compliant with today’s requirements of the DG 3.1.35 guidelines.

• The building’s unique Southern Federal style architecture, with its mass, scale and form has been uniquely designed to not only serve the needs of its future occupants... but to provide a pleasing building art form which adds visual interest
for its future public viewers passing by. The multi-level eave heights, and roof lines and multi-dimensioned widths of the building offers a visual break in what would normally be one long single building expanse of wall and roof. The beaded plank siding is an old world craft and adds to the traditional look of each building found in the FGS development project. As the building’s eave heights and interior ceiling’s are higher than most typical office buildings... they command heightened window glazing—assuring more natural light to be enjoyed by its occupants and, accordingly, less demand on utility usage. The combination of these design features also make it compliant with DG 3.2.11, 12, 24, 25 and 33 and the provisions of the 2013 California Building Code - Title 24 Energy and Green Code requirements.

- The use of metal roofs at multiple elevations, has both “green” and economical advantages... i.e. metal roofing is more reflective and therefore less heat absorbent... greatly reducing heat buildup in the attic spaces—and it will outlast composition shingle roofing materials by two or more times, thus virtually eliminating the need for new finish materials and the disposal and/or recycling of the old materials during the lifecycle of the building structure. In addition to its “green” and long-term economic advantages... its use serves to comply with the requirements of DG 3.2.22, 23, 24 & 25.

- The building’s ‘Casual Gray’ color, chosen by our tenants, together with its ‘Silhouette Gray’ metal roof and white ‘Bit of Sugar’ trim colors are representative of those found on Southern Federal style buildings and are complimentary to the color schemes of the existing structures in Floral Gardens Square and are in compliance with DG 3.2.31.

In summary... we believe that the overall color scheme, design, elevational features, continuity of design, parking and landscape designs of this Southern Federal style building will ensure that its future relationship to the ‘Floral Gardens Square’ project and the surrounding buildings and neighborhood area will sufficiently meet, and will be consistent with each of the design objectives found in Chapter 3 – Office & Office Mixed-Use Policies of the “Design Guidelines”—together with the design concepts and architectural styles found in the original Development Plan of...
### BUILDING SITE DATA: GARDENS SQUARE

**SOUTHERN FEDERAL STYLE ARCHITECTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24353</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6024</td>
<td>24.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5959.96</td>
<td>24.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANDSCAPE - TREES, SHRUBS & GROUNDCOVERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4924</td>
<td>20.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HARDSCAPE - SIDEWALKS, PATIO & PORTICOS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OF LANDSCAPE AND HARDSCAPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6672</td>
<td>28.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING AND DRIVEWAYS - MAIN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7361</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING AND DRIVEWAYS ACCESSING REAR PARKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2582</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OF ALL PARKING AND DRIVEWAYS TO PARKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9943</td>
<td>40.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING LOT LANDSCAPE AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2506</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMON TRASH FACILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING LOT & ACCESS AREAS - MAIN AND REAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9943</td>
<td>40.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING LOT TO PARKING LANDSCAPE - REQUIRED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING LOT TO PARKING LANDSCAPE - ACTUAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRIP-LINE OF TREES IN PARKING LOT - SHADE AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5652</td>
<td>(BY PHYSICAL MEASUREMENT OF MATURE TREE DRIP-LINES INTO REFLECTED PARKING &amp; DRIVEWAY PAVED AREAS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING LOT & DRIVEWAY AREAS - MAIN AND REAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING LOT TO DRIP-LINE SHADE AREA - REQUIRED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRIP-LINE SHADE AREA OVER PARKING LOT - ACTUAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FLORAL GARDENS SQUARE
PARCEL ANALYSIS

Building 1A @ 5822 SF
Restaurant @ 1320 SF
Food Preparation @ 967 SF
Office @ 1820 SF

Total Spaces Required for Building 1A
9 Spaces
24 Spaces

Building 1B @ 5822 SF
Restaurant @ 1714 SF
Food Preparation @ 2 Employees
Office @ 200 SF

Total Spaces Required for Building 1B
5 Spaces
15 Spaces
20 Spaces

Building 2 @ 7440 SF
Office @ 7400 SF

25 Spaces

Building 3 @ 6000 SF MAX
Office @ 7000 SF

24 Spaces

Building 4 @ 6000 SF MAX
Office @ 8000 SF

20 Spaces

TOTAL SPACES REQUIRED
113 Spaces

TOTAL SPACES PROVIDED
113 Spaces

LEGEND

= RECORD MONUMENTATION
= PARCEL BOUNDARY

FLORAL GARDENS SQUARE
NOVEMBER 2002
SHEET 1 OF 1

RECEIVED
JUL 01 2012
ATTACHMENT C
ASH GRAY METAL STANDING SEAM ROOF TYP

WEST ELEVATION

MELTING ICICLES WHITE HARDI-TRIM AND DOORS TYP

CASUAL GRAY HARDI-PLANK BEADED CEDAR MILL SIDING TYP

4X12 DF#1 ROUGH SAWN
2X12 DF#2 45 DEG. @ 12" O.C. - TYP

24'-0"
10'-6"
35'-6"

12" ROUND TUSCAN COLUMN TRIMidental POST TYP

NORTH VIEW OF LATTICE FENCE OF PATIO AREA
TRELLIS NOT SHOWN
1/4" = 1'-0"

BUILDING EDGE LINE

REAR BUILDING EDGE LINE

FRONT BUILDING EDGE LINE

2X12 DF#2 LEDGER NAILED TO STUDS W/16O TYP
12" ROUND TUSCAN COLUMN TRIMidental POST TYP

4X6 REDWOOD CAP

MULTI-TENANT MONUMENT SIGN
8" LETTERS APPLIED TO 2X10 REDWOOD ATTACHED TO 4X8' - 3/4" MARINE PLYWOOD SIGNAGE AREA = 32 SF
1/4" = 1'-0"

NORTH VIEW OF TRELLIS AND SOUTH LATTICE FENCE FROM EAST AVE
1/4" = 1'-0"

RECEIVED MAR 01 2019
ATTACHMENT E
NOTES:
A. Urban Forest Manager to check all trees prior to planting. Call for Inspection PRIOR TO PLANTING.
B. Excavate all finger island and parking field planters to a minimum depth of 24". Sock fill with imported top soil. Install vertical 24" root barriers against all curbs within 10' of tree locations. Provide for a sub-surface drain system where able to drain excess water from base of tree planting areas.
C. All structures and landscaping shall be installed in accordance with AR 10-02.
D. As per the HECO, the landscape contractor will submit a soil analysis report for landscape amendments post grading operations but before commencement of work. The analysis recommendations will be used for incorporating soil amendments into the proposed new landscape areas.

Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance:
A. The landscape plans will comply with the requirements of the water efficient landscape ordinance (HECO).

Elements of the Landscape Documentation Package:
(a) The Landscape Documentation Package shall include the following six (6) elements:
   (1) project information;
      (A) date
      (B) project applicant
      (C) project address (if available, parcel and/or lot number)
   (2) total landscape area (square feet)
   (3) project type (e.g., new, redeveloped, public, private, cemetery, homeowner-installed)
   (4) water supply type (e.g., potable, recycled, well) and identify the local retail water purveyor if the applicant not served by a private well
   (5) checklist of all documents in Landscape Documentation Package
   (6) project contacts to include contact information for the project applicant and property owner
   (i) applicant signature and date with statement, "I agree to comply with the requirements of the water efficient landscape ordinance and submit a complete landscape documentation package."
(b) Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet:
   (A) Hydrozoned information table
   (B) Water budget calculations
      1. Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MANA)
      2. Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU)
   (C) soil management report;
   (D) landscape design plan;
   (E) irrigation design plan;
   (F) grading design plan.

PLANT LEGEND

Key: Botanical Name - Common Name ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>PF**</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TREES
1. Lagerstroemia x fauriei 'Tuscana' Std. - Tree Grape Myrtle
2. Pistacia chinesis 'Keith Davey' - Chinese Pistachio
3. Zelkova serrata 'Green Vase' - Japanese Sawleaf Zelkova

PERENNIALS
1. Agapetes africanus 'Peter Pan' - Dwarf Lily of the Nile
2. Dietes semper - Fortnight Lily
3. Tulbaghia violacea 'Variegata' - Variegated Society Garlic

SHRUBS
1. Loropetalum chinesis 'Razzle Dazzle' - Chinese Fringe Flower
2. Nandina domestica 'Gulf Stream' - Gulf Stream Heavenly Bamboo
3. Olea europaea 'Little Olives' - Dwarf Olive
4. Raphiolepis indica 'Ballerina' - Dwarf Pink India Hawthorne
5. Rosa x Flower Carpet White - White Flower Carpet Rose
6. Spiraea bumalda 'Anthony Waterer' - Anthony Waterer Spiraea
7. Tecmuse x 'Lucy's' - Dwarf Geranium
8. Teucrium fruticans - Geranium

VINES
1. Plectranthus callistegioides - Lavender Trumpet vine
2. Calyculus pumilus - Creeping Fig, staked

GROUND COVERS
1. Rosmarinus o. Prostrate - Prostrate Tailing Rosemary, plant 1 gal at 36" o.c.
2. Trachelospermum jasminoides - Star Jasmine, plant 1 gal at 24" o.c.

Note: Contractor to verify all quantities from plan. Plant legend is for reference only.

Note: PF: HECO IV Species Evaluation List 2019, Sunset Zone 4, HECO Region 2, Central Valley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shade Calculations for the Floral at East Office Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia 'Keith Davey'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelkova serrata 'Green Vase'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Shade Allot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking lot area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% shade required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Shade Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECEIVED
MAR 1, 2016
CITY OF CHICO
PLANNING SERVICES

ATTACHMENT G