

8/20/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: EDHAPAC_DR-R18-0001_Saratoga_Retail_Phase2_Aug18-2018.pdf

PC 8-23-18
#7
3 Pages



Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

Fwd: EDHAPAC_DR-R18-0001_Saratoga_Retail_Phase2_Aug18-2018.pdf

1 message

Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>
To: Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>


Mon, Aug 20, 2018 at 7:51 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Timothy White** <tjwhitejd@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Aug 18, 2018 at 11:20 AM
Subject: EDHAPAC_DR-R18-0001_Saratoga_Retail_Phase2_Aug18-2018.pdf
To: Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>
Cc: gary.miller@edcgov.us, jeff.hansen@edcgov.us, james.williams@edcgov.us, brian.shinault@edcgov.us, jvegna@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Dear Ms. Tim.
Attached please find The El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee's Comment Letter on the Saratoga Retail Phase 2 Project.
Please include it as an official Public Comment to File # 18-1215 on the Planning Commission's August 23, 2018 Agenda.
Thank you.

Timothy J. White- EDHAPAC Chair

 EDHAPAC_DR-R18-0001_Saratoga_Retail_Phase2_Aug18-2018.pdf
105K



El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee

1021 Harvard Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

2018 Board Chair

Tim White

Vice Chair

John Raslear

Secretary

Kathy Prevost

Vice Chair

John Davey

August 17, 2018

The County of El Dorado Planning Commission
The County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors
County of El Dorado Planning and Building Department
El Dorado County Planning Services
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

DR-R18-0001 Saratoga Retail Phase 2

The voting members of The El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (“EDHAPAC”) voted unanimously to file a letter of Non-Support for the Project. After reviewing the documents on file for the Project at the Planning Department’s and the Planning Commission’s websites, EDHAPAC believes significant issues regarding traffic, RV parking and design review standards remain, and until those issues are answered and addressed this Project should not be allowed to proceed.

RV PARKING - Mr. Joel Wiley, an experienced RV owner and driver, sent a Public Comment to the Planning Commission raising several concerns regarding both the size of the 2 allocated RV parking spaces and the tight turns necessary to get into and out of those spaces. We suspect that these spaces are designed on a computer in an office, but do the people who do the design have any real-life experience driving and maneuvering an RV? Does any member of Planning Department Staff responsible for reviewing and/or approving the RV parking space layout have any real-life experience driving and maneuvering an RV? Have they ever set up plastic cones in a parking lot with the dimensions of the spaces and turns planned for the Project and tried to maneuver an RV in and out? Is there a State of California, or El Dorado County ordinance addressing the definition, requirements, and design elements of what constitutes an RV parking space?

There are further issues and concerns about the whole RV Parking requirements for the Project that are addressed with great specificity in the Public Comment from 8 neighborhood residents (the “Washburn/Camom Comment”) received by the Planning Commission on August 13, 2018, and those comments adequately reflect the issues and concerns of EDHAPAC, and thus are incorporated herein by reference.

TRAFFIC – Many of the issues and concerns that EDHAPAC has with the traffic that would be generated by a busy and popular drive-thru restaurant located next to a residential neighborhood are

El Dorado Hills APAC - Non-partisan Volunteers Planning Our Future

addressed with great specificity in the Washburn/Camom Comment, and thus those comments are incorporated herein by reference.

Additionally, EDHAPAC finds it extremely “interesting” that there are disparate current condition and near-term condition traffic impact data for 3 different project’s Traffic Study in the immediate area in a 4-year time span, two of which are provided by the same traffic analysis consultant. [DR-R18-0001 Saratoga Retail Phase II, TM14-1520/Z14-0007/PD14-0006 Saratoga Estates, and A16-0001/RZ16-0004/PD94-0004-R El Dorado Hills Apartments]. Those traffic analysis numbers are seemingly tailored differently for each project to achieve a finding of No Significant Impact or Less Than Significant Impact – i.e those numbers and statistics appear to be modeled to achieve a desired result. EDHAPAC also questions whether traffic impacts generated by the Project that exceed Measure E triggers can be mitigated by TIM Fee contributions from multiple other projects that may, or may not, happen at some uncertain, undefined future date.

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION- EDHAPAC is concerned and bewildered that Planning Department Staff would prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this Project that does not address (in fact, completely ignores) the County of El Dorado Ordinance governing drive thru facilities. The Community Design Standards for Parking and Lodging, Section H, 1-8 mandates that drive thru facilities SHALL (not “should” or “can” but “shall”) comply with the circulation and traffic control standards set forth therein. Subsection 2. provides that ingress to and egress from a drive thru facility shall be prohibited from driveways directly facing a residential zone. All 4 proposed access driveways for this Project face a Residential Neighborhood- obviously zoned residential! The reason the County of El Dorado mandated the 8 specific compliance standards goes to the heart of the issue with a drive thru restaurant at this location – it is located immediately adjacent to a long-established residential neighborhood, and the County’s intent was and is to protect residential neighborhoods from the intrusiveness of such an establishment.

EDHAPAC has valid concerns about this Project at this location – the nearby residents in the Washburn/Camon Comment have set forth in detail and with specificity legitimate and significant negative impacts that the operation of a drive thru restaurant adjacent to their homes would have in terms of traffic, noise, air quality, visual blight, crime and the quiet enjoyment of their property. Assuming for the sake of argument that the Project proponent has a right to build the Project as presented, it does not mean that it is the right thing to do. To quote G. Guga Mona “It is better to wait until you get the right thing, at the right time and in the right place; than to race for the wrong thing, at the wrong time and in the wrong place...”.

As always, EDHAPAC appreciates the Planning Commissioners for listening to our concerns, appreciates the assistance provided by Planning Department Staff in our review of this Project, and wishes to thank the Project Proponent and the members of his team for attending the EDHAPAC meeting and answering questions about the Project.

Sincerely,
Timothy J. White – EDHAPAC Chair

cc: Read File