

FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 2014

2. (14-0278) Hearing to consider request for a Specific Plan Amendment, Development Plan Amendment, and a Special Use Permit to allow a residential senior care facility, a Parcel Map creating one 14.8 acre and one 5.5 acre lot, and a Development Plan revision to the existing commercial property [Specific Plan Amendment SP13-0001/Planned Development Revision PD95-0002-R/Planned Development Revision PD95-0007-R/Parcel Map P12-0004/Special Use Permit S13-0017 El Dorado Hills Retirement Residence]* on property identified by APN 117-160-38, consisting of 20.30 acres, in the El Dorado Hills area, submitted by Lenity Architecture, LLC (Agent: Mark Lowen); and staff recommending the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to take the following actions:

- 1) Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared by staff based on the Initial Study;
- 2) Adopt Specific Plan Amendment SP13-0001 based on the Findings and subject to the Amendments and Revisions document;
- 3) Approve Planned Development Revision PD95-0002-R based on the Findings and subject to the Amendments and Revisions document;
- 4) Approve Planned Development Revision PD95-0007-R based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval;
- 5) Approve Parcel Map P12-0004 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval; and
- 6) Approve Special Use Permit S13-0017 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval.

(Supervisory District 1) (Cont. 05-08-14, Item 3)

Lillian MacLeod presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation for approval to the Board of Supervisors. She referenced the Staff Memo dated February 19, 2014 and the Staff Memo dated June 10, 2014, each containing recommended changes.

Jim Wiley, applicant's agent, concurred with all the recommended Conditions of Approval and introduced Dan Roach of Lenity Architecture. Mr. Roach gave a PowerPoint Presentation.

Chair Mathews closed public comment.

Significant discussion ensued on the point that the project was being considered a community care facility yet no care was being provided.

County Counsel David Livingston read into the record the portion of the Zoning Code that described the three categories of a Community Care Facility. He stated that it was determined that the project does fit into the residential facility category as that it is providing care, just not medical care. County Counsel Livingston also read into the record Section 17.32.210 and spoke on the General Plan. He stated that this Specific Plan utilizes the Zoning Code.

Mrs. MacLeod stated that the project requires a Special Use Permit and, therefore, can't be transitioned into apartments.

Commissioner Stewart made the following comments:

- Inquired on the maximum height of the building;
- Concerned about water use during this time of drought;
- Discussion on the County's Landscaping Ordinance;
- Would like a condition requiring artificial turf; and
- Indicated that traffic counts would be very low.

Commissioner Pratt made the following comments:

- Confirmed that standard widths for sidewalk were being used;
- Confirmed that the aesthetics for the project had not yet been finalized;
- Felt the project fit into the residential facility category because there were no kitchens in the apartments; and
- Project would not bring in as many jobs as other businesses would, but recalls an analysis study done for another project in that area that indicated that El Dorado Hills had an over-supply of commercial areas.

Commissioner Heflin made the following comments:

- Concerned if project was conforming to the economic element of the General Plan;
- Questioned if this was a good use for that type of acreage versus a building that could employ 200+ employees; and
- Great project that is needed but would like to see if in a different location.

Commissioner Shinault felt, as it relates to the Building Code, this project would be considered a congregate care residential building.

Chair Mathews made the following comments:

- Business Park is not very full;
- Project would bring in a large number of people with disposable income;
- Inquired where else would a project like this be placed; and
- Good discussion on the economic element, but this is a well thought-out project.

There was no further discussion.

Motion: Commissioner Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Pratt, and carried (4-1), to recommend the Board of Supervisors take the following actions: 1. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared by staff based on the Initial Study; 2. Adopt Specific Plan Amendment SP13-0001 based on the Findings and subject to the Amendments and Revisions document as modified; 3. Approve Planned Development Revision PD95-0002-R based on the Findings and subject to the Amendments and Revisions document as modified; 4. Approve Planned Development Revision PD95-0007-R based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as modified; 5. Approve Parcel Map P12-0004 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as modified; and 6. Approve Special Use Permit S13-0017 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval modified as follows: (a) Amend Condition 40 as identified in

the Staff Memo dated 02-19-14; (b) Amend Revisions 1, 2, and 3 in the Amendments and Revisions document as identified in the Staff Memo dated 06-10-14; (c) Amend Conditions 14, 18, and 23 as identified in the Staff Memo dated 06-10-14; and (d) Further modify Condition 40 to state that a copy of the referenced Zoning Ordinance citation would be provided to tenants.

AYES: Shinault, Pratt, Stewart, Mathews
NOES: Heflin