

1/12/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Saratoga Way El Dorado Hills

PC 1/11/18  
#2

(Distributed at hearing)



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

## Saratoga Way El Dorado Hills

Mary <mbruner\_athome@yahoo.com>  
To: Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Wed, Jan 10, 2018 at 4:46 PM

Hi - yes, this is for the January 11th meeting.

Thank you!!

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 10, 2018, at 7:45 AM, Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us> wrote:

The public hearing was closed for the Saratoga Retail project at the December 14, 2017 meeting. Unless it was your intent that information in your email was to be considered as part of the adoption of the Findings for Denial being heard by the Planning Commission at the January 11, 2018 meeting, your email will be placed in the project folder as public comment received on the project. Please advise. Thank you.

On Wed, Jan 10, 2018 at 6:03 AM, Mary <mbruner\_athome@yahoo.com> wrote:  
Planning Commission El Dorado County:

As a resident of El Dorado Hills, I am strongly opposed to the opening of any fast food drive thru being built on Saratoga Way in El Dorado Hills.

Thank you,  
Mary Bruner-Arbogast

Sent from my iPhone

--

**Char Tim**  
Clerk of the Planning Commission

**County of El Dorado**  
Planning and Building Department  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5351 / FAX (530) 642-0508  
charlene.tim@edcgov.us

**WARNING:** This email and any attachments may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any unauthorized review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments) by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments.



(Distributed at hearing) PC 1-11-18  
#2

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

4 pages

## Re: EDC Planning Commission Findings Document re: DR 08-0003 Saratoga Retail.

1 message

Brooke Washburn <washburn\_bew@yahoo.com>

Wed, Jan 10, 2018 at 7:49 PM

To: "jvegna@edcgov.us" <jvegna@edcgov.us>, "james.williams@edcgov.us" <james.williams@edcgov.us>, "gary.miller@edcgov.us" <gary.miller@edcgov.us>, "jeff.hansen@edcgov.us" <jeff.hansen@edcgov.us>, "brian.shinault@edcgov.us" <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, "charlene.tim@edcgov.us" <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>, "rommel.pabalinas@edcgov.us" <rommel.pabalinas@edcgov.us>, "planning@edcgov.us" <planning@edcgov.us>, "efren.sanchez@edcgov.us" <efren.sanchez@edcgov.us>, "roger.trout@edcgov.us" <roger.trout@edcgov.us>, David Livingston <david.livingston@edcgov.us>, Kim S - Camom <CAmom2345@hotmail.com>  
Cc: "tjwhitejd@gmail.com" <tjwhitejd@gmail.com>, "jjrazzpub@sbcgloabl.net" <jjrazzpub@sbcgloabl.net>, "hpkp@aol.com" <hpkp@aol.com>, "jdavey@daveygroup.net" <jdavey@daveygroup.net>, "aerumsey@sbcglobal.net" <aerumsey@sbcglobal.net>, "gvralliance@gmail.com" <gvralliance@gmail.com>, "john.hidahl@edcgov.us" <john.hidahl@edcgov.us>, "shiva.frentzen@edcgov.us" <shiva.frentzen@edcgov.us>, "brian.veerkamp@edcgov.us" <brian.veerkamp@edcgov.us>, "michael.ranalli@edcgov.us" <michael.ranalli@edcgov.us>, "sue.novasel@edcgov.us" <sue.novasel@edcgov.us>, Rebecca - neighbor <rebecca.isbell@ymail.com>, Hilary Krogh - Saratoga <hilaryd73@gmail.com>, Melissa Garske - Saratoga <fashiongirlmelissa@yahoo.com>

Dear Commissioners-

Thank you for your diligent review of the proposed design revision to the Saratoga Retail Project (DR-08-0003-R). I echo the grounds to reject the revisions raised in the Findings for Denial, and the public comment contained in this email chain. However, I strongly encourage, and respectfully request, the Commission to deny this proposed revision WITH prejudice.

Pursuant to the authority contained in El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance 130.54.70, the Commission can issue a denial with prejudice of this proposed project. Unlike the findings suggest, recourse for said rejection would fall under El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance 130.52.90. (i.e., a denial "without" prejudice to allow for a resubmittal is not a requirement or a condition of denial.) The revisions proposed to the Saratoga Retail project significantly modify the 2009 approved design and use plans. This significant modification goes to the heart of the accommodation with regard to El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance 130.35.030, that allowed for the waiver of the RV parking requirement - expressly conditioned upon the determination by this Commission that the "use" on the land not be a "tourist serving facility." Changing the nature of the use from a sit-down boutique restaurant to a fast-food drive thru restaurant, qualifies as a "significant modification" that under the County ordinances requires public hearing prior to approval. During said hearing, each Planning Commissioner is afforded the opportunity to deny a proposed project based on their assessment of the cumulative impacts and effects of the proposed modifications. Several grounds for rejection of the design revisions were given in the public comments and during the hearing in December. The Commission is afforded the authority to rely upon these grounds in addition to the findings when denying a project. We ask that the Commission consider all grounds for denial, and in that capacity deny WITH prejudice this design revision.

As this Commission is aware, a public hearing was held on this matter after the County Planning Department recommended approval and submitted a Negative Declaration for execution. As a resident of the affected neighborhood, I did not receive any notice of public hearing on this matter and would ask that should any additional revisions be submitted that conflict significantly with the original 2009 approval, a public hearing will be conducted in advance of approval and proper notice of the same provided, pursuant to El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance 130.54.70(B)

Lastly, while the Findings state that the record is not sufficient with regard to information or analysis, it appears that possibly some of the negative impacts to traffic were not addressed in the proposed negative declaration. More specifically, the report submitted by Kimley Horn, clearly states "As defined by the County, the addition of the proposed project to the existing and cumulative scenarios significantly worsens conditions at three study intersections." As clearly depicted in the public comment and in the reports attached to the negative declaration, the proposed revision would have a negative, irreparable impact on the surrounding community. For these reasons and those previously submitted to this Commission, I urge and respectfully request, the findings be adopted with a denial WITH prejudice.

Brooke Washburn  
Resident of Crescent Ridge

On Tuesday, January 9, 2018, 5:23:39 PM PST, Kim S - Camom <CAmom2345@hotmail.com> wrote:

Dear Planning Commissioners et. al,

Thank you for your work in producing the document of Findings regarding the Saratoga Retail DR 08-0003.

However, the document does not go far enough and needs to be amended, begs to be amended and properly vetted.

The Findings document neglects to address the very issue at the heart of this project: Fast Food Restaurants next to freeways are by their nature "Tourist Serving" and DR 08-0003 specifically addresses this point - see highlighted areas below. (Let's be honest Chik Fil A is a nation-wide fast food chain that is closer aligned with being an "anchor" fast food drive thru facility and it is unarguably "Tourist Serving.")

There are other issues of car stacking and blocking parking stalls (a violation of county code), loading space, loading hours, MAJOR traffic backing up onto Saratoga (100 cars per hour by Chik Fil A's own admission), traffic backing up on EDH Blvd as a result of people trying to turn left at Saratoga (causing Level F service of traffic - again a violation of the General Plan), along with the many other points that were brought to bear as part of the public record that are either not addressed or "thinly" addressed - up to an including carbon emissions from idling cars in the neighborhood of 500-700 - to potentially thousands of cars A DAY between the two fast food proposed businesses. Do we need to provide your staff with the long list of violations to be included?? Did your staff take a break over the holiday's and hastily put this together?? {Everyone knows that of the 60 parking spaces (we are not including the disabled spots) at least 25-30 of them would be used by employees - Park Village does not have sidewalks and these businesses would demand parking on our residential streets putting children, families and pets at grave risk.}

**Your Findings document should require language that specifically addresses the non granting of approval for ANY proposals that include Fast Food Drive thrus or other "tourist serving" businesses in perpetuity, among other issues.**

To define what is and what is not "tourist serving" for that splinter of land one cannot imagine any sort of amusement park, water park, miniature golf, go-carts or any other type of "fun park" businesses that cannot possibly FIT on that piece of land. The only type of tourist serving businesses that could possibly fit and is specifically addressed and dismissed are Fast Food restaurants and gas stations. To suggest otherwise borders on the ludicrous.

The Planning Commission and the County Board of Supervisors are the two governing entities responsible for seeing this parcel of land developed in a way that mitigates any negative effects on the adjacent residential neighborhood. Fast Food drive thrus generate those negative effects and therefore need to be specifically disallowed. The "bow needs to be tied" so the county and Park Village residents don't have to keep going back again and again and around and around, finish this now.

Why not a family style sit down restaurant?? Again, El Dorado Hills is an elegant community and brings much charm and character to the county. Don't cheapen the "Scenic Highway" with the blight of Fast Food as its gateway to El Dorado County.

Why not hold out approving any project until the developer realizes that sit-down restaurant businesses such as the ones linked below are much more suitable to this location.


Kim Shultz  
Park Village Resident

<http://tradervics.com/>

### Trader Vic's – Home of the Original Mai Tai

[tradervics.com](http://tradervics.com)

International chain. Includes locations, news, and company information.



<http://www.mimiscafe.com/>

### Mimi's Cafe | French inspired restaurants serving ...

[www.mimiscafe.com](http://www.mimiscafe.com)

With a philosophy that puts fresh food first, our chef-led restaurants and our new menus are guaranteed to add a little more joie to your vivre and a lot more 'mmm ...

**Section 17.18.030.B.6** requires:

Drop-off/Loading Areas Required. Parking lots for public assembly, major retail shopping facilities, and certain apartments and motel/hotels shall include a designated on-site location for drop-off and loading of passengers at an entrance to the facility. Drop-off areas shall consist of vehicle turnout lanes located outside of the normal travel lanes with minimum dimensions of thirty-five feet in length and ten feet in width.

Discussion: Due to the odd-shaped lot that resulted from the Saratoga Way expansion project, onsite circulation is limited as discussed earlier in the staff report. Provision of an on-site location for drop off and loading of passengers is physically impossible given the on-site

circulation pattern. In addition, the project would not be considered a major retail shopping facility (defined as a shopping center exceeding 30,000 square feet), as the majority of the shops and restaurants in the facility will be "boutique" type shops, with the only major anchor being the Walgreens store, which is generally considered a retail pharmacy, serving the needs of the immediate surrounding area. Administrative relief findings have been made for this requirement in Attachment 2.

**Section 17.18.060.16 & 18** requires:

For restaurant (nonfast food), bars, cocktail lounge, one (1) space per three fixed seats or equivalent occupancy per Uniform Building Code plus one (1) recreational vehicle space per each 10 parking spaces One (1) recreational vehicle space per each ten (10) parking spaces.

Retail (general merchandising not in a shopping center) one (1) space for each three-hundred (300) square feet of retail space

Discussion: The applicant has proposed 153 parking stalls to be constructed with the project. Per the County's Zoning Ordinance, Section 17.18.060, the applicant would be required to provide 152 spaces (22,182 square feet general merchandising @ 1 space/300 s.f. = 74 spaces; 8500 s.f. restaurant with 234 fixed seats @ 1 space/3 fixed seats = 78 spaces, Total Required = 152 spaces).

In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 17.18.060.16, the applicant is required to provide for 1 recreational vehicle (RV) parking space for every 10 spaces of parking designated for the restaurant use. Thus, eight (8) RV spaces would be required for the proposed restaurant uses. The project does not include recreational parking spaces. However, the project parking exceeds the County requirements and would be sufficient to serve the proposed commercial use given that **the project is not a regional retail center, nor is it a tourist-serving facility, and it is unlikely that it would draw recreational vehicles to the site.**

Administrative relief findings from the strict compliance with the provisions for commercial use have been made and are included in the Findings for Approval, Attachment 2.

Sent from Outlook