

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY
8:29 am, Mar 01, 2011

TODD A. WILLIAMS (925) 979-3352 twilliams@mmblaw.com

± 32

LATE DISTRIBUTION

8:29 am, Mar 01, 2011

February 28, 2011

### VIA EMAIL and FACSIMILE

Board of Supervisors c/o Clerk of the Board of Supervisors County of El Dorado, Government Center 330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667 Planning Department c/o County of El Dorado Planning Services 2850 Fairlane Court, Building C Placerville, CA 95667

Re:

March 1, 2011 Board of Supervisors Agenda Item No. 32 Appeal of 1/13/11 Planning Commission Determination of Consistency with Town Center West Development Plan Our File No. 10093-001

Dear Honorable Supervisors and Planning Department:

We submit this letter on behalf of the appellant Syers Properties III, LLC ("Syers") in response to the Board of Supervisors Staff Memo dated February 8, 2011, and the letter submitted on behalf of Armstrong Development by Amanda Monchamp dated February 24, 2011. Several statements in both the staff report and Armstrong letter are inaccurate and require correction. Together, they provide no basis to support a determination that the proposed project is "similar in nature" to allowed uses within the Town Center West Planned Development Plan ("TC West Plan"), and ignore several key points raised in the appeal.

### 1. Planning Commission Made No Findings As Claimed in the Staff Report.

The staff report (at p. 1) purports that the Planning Commission found that the concept of a drug store has changed over the last 15 years since the TC West Planned Development was approved and that drug stores are "no longer locating within strip retail centers ... and are modeled after a stand-alone convenience store." In fact, the Planning Commission made no findings at all. This comment came from a public speaker representing the developer who requested the compliance determination. In no way did the Commission adopt such a position, nor are these sweeping statements supported whatsoever.

Further, in the original consistency finding, the planning staff member who made the determination (rather than the planning director as required) only determined that a drug store was not among the listed uses in the TC West Development Plan, but – without citing any evidence in support – concluded it was similar in nature to the permitted uses.

While the TC West Plan states that the *planning director* can make a finding of consistency in an appropriate situation, this is not such a situation. Here, there is a request to

dramatically expand the allowed uses for TC West without any basis and without processing an amendment or seeking a variance. This request – to allow major retailers selling general merchandise in TC West rather than the limited support retail permitted under the Plan – implicates important determinations of policy; notably, does the County want to allow competing anchor tenants – like a drug store or supermarket – in TC West to compete and cannibalize sales from the approved retail hub that is Town Center East?

This project, if approved, opens the door to the installation of at least three more similar uses of a similar size in TC West. If the County approves a drug store on the basis that it sells a few items that are sold by the permitted retail uses, then it cannot possibly deny a supermarket or any other retail use so long as it includes some items sold by the listed retail uses. Establishment of such a low bar is contrary to the intent of the adopted Plan and constitutes an abuse of discretion. Such a change, if desired, can only be legally approved by processing a major amendment to the Plan including the required public hearing and process.

## 2. <u>A Drug Store Was a Known Use When the TC West Plan Was Approved and Its Exclusion Was Intentional.</u>

A finding that drug stores are designed differently, even if it were made, would be irrelevant to any consistency determination. There is nothing in the underlying TC West Plan documents which specifies any size for any one kind of retail use (other than an overall cap on total retail square footage). However, what the list of approved "ancillary" uses in "support of" the dominating business park uses clearly omits are general merchandise uses which were commonly known to exist when the TC West Plan was approved, such as a convenience market, drug store and supermarket. These uses were specifically permitted for TC East. Had a drug store, a mini-mart, a liquor store, or even a general merchandise store, been an allowed use for TC West, it would have been so specified as it was in TC East.

Drug stores of many sizes and configurations existed long before and after the approval of the TC West development plan. They were a commonly known use in 1995, as evidenced by their specific inclusion in the TC East Development Plan. Clearly, had the intent been to include a drug store use in TC West, it could have and would have been included in the listed uses. The reason for its exclusion is obvious: a drug store is not an "ancillary" support retail use like those permitted TC West retail uses.

Further, there is nothing unprecedented about the proposed drug store, other than it is purportedly the preferred prototype of the applicant CVS/pharmacy, and that it is dissimilar to the limited retail approved for TC West.

The language that both the staff report and the Armstrong letter cite regarding TC West responding to changing markets and conditions is contained not in the plan itself but in the 1995 Negative Declaration (at pages 10-14) and is taken out of context. That discussion, not surprisingly, relates to the light industrial and manufacturing uses that comprise 96 percent of the TC West Plan area and was the focus of the environmental review. (See, e.g., page 12 of the TC West Environmental Evaluation, finding "the proposed research development or light

manufacturing uses proposed in the development as being consistent with the zoning and specific plan" and not mentioning retail uses at all.)

## 3. The Town Center East and West Are Related Developments and Must Be Construed Together.

Both the staff report and Armstrong letter claim that TC West is a stand-alone development and therefore it was not error to ignore the TC East approvals. In fact, the staff report goes so far to call TC East "irrelevant." This statement is astounding coming from a planning department, i.e. to suggest it should ignore any other related planning approvals. While the two neighboring areas could have been developed separately, they were not which is why both the TC West and TC East Plan refer to each other and say that they are "distinct yet complimentary" developments. (See Syers Appeal letter at pp. 2-3.) Any contrary conclusion conflicts with the development history and intent behind the Plans. It is undisputed that both Plans were developed together by the same group of investors, spearheaded by The Mansour Company and processed in the same time frame and pursuant to the same specific plan.

Most important, as noted in Syers' appeal, both Plans cross-reference each other noting that they are "complimentary" and have distinct but complimentary purposes. (See Syers Appeal letter at pp. 2-3 and Exhibits 2 and 3 thereto [excerpts of the TC West and TC East Design Guidelines and Development Standards].) This language confirms that they were not to be in competition with one another and took each other into account. It also provides the obvious reason that general retail was approved and enumerated for TC East while office, manufacturing and light industry with only limited specific types of retail was identified for in TC West. Hence, the kind of support services allowed in TC West were subordinate to the purposes of office use, and the area was not to be a platform for the same kind of major retail services designated for TC East.

### 4. The Proposed Project Is Not Similar In Nature To Permitted Uses.

Both the staff report and Armstrong confuse size with use in searching for support for the consistency determination. The issue here is not the size of the proposed store, but the use. Nothing in the list of allowed or suggested uses describes an "anchor", "department store", supermarket, drugstore, pharmacy, convenience market, etc. The absence of these types of uses is significant because these were known common retail uses which could have been listed if they were to be uses allowed within the TC West area.

The argument that a proposed use becomes "similar in nature" when it includes or aggregates certain products sold by permitted uses is not supported since it sets up an untenable precedent that removes virtually any limit to what kind of retail use would be allowed. Such a determination is clearly contrary to the letter and spirit of the adopted plan. This is true for several reasons.

First, Armstrong cites the short list of allowed uses under the TC West Plan then asserts that the proposed CVS/pharmacy will include consistent commercial uses such as the "sale" of

certain enumerated items. However, the proposed "uses" in the underlying documents did not list a pharmacy, a liquor store, or a general merchandise store, etc. The uses listed were in the nature of *limitations*, because there was no general retail or merchandising stores listed. If the County allows the CVS use, there would be no limit in the future because, for example, a grocery store (which is also not listed) sells "food", newspapers, and magazines. In fact, under Armstrong's theory, a car wash that sells magazine and snacks would be an allowed use, as would a Home Depot that sells flowers, etc.

A far more reasonable and supportable interpretation is that the uses listed in the TC West Plan are stores whose **primary** purpose was enumerated – or could have been enumerated – at the time the plan was adopted, if it were a purpose then known. The TC West Plan could have easily said a store that sells any of the listed products in any quantity are similar in nature, but it does not. Clearly, the exclusion of drug store, supermarket and other generalized major anchor type stores is simply not "consistent" with the specialized store uses contemplated as a support for the office/industrial park.

Additionally, there is nothing "similar" between a general merchandise store and one that specializes in stationery, or office supplies, etc. The fact that Armstrong claims that the proposed CVS "will not sell general merchandise" (Armstrong letter at p. 16), does not help its cause. There are at least two problems with this statement. First, nothing in any of the permit applications for this project (or prospective permits themselves) contain this limitation, nor has such a commitment been made to the County. In short, this statement is nothing more than an empty, unenforceable promise. Worse, it is demonstrably false.

The objective fact is that the proposed CVS could carry any products typically associated with drug stores which includes, as is evident to anyone, general merchandise. One need only look at the CVS/pharmacy website, to see that it does in fact carry wide variety of general merchandise. (See Exhibit 1 hereto.) Further, similarly-sized CVS stores to the one proposed (such as the one located at 2790 East Bidwell Street in Folsom, which includes a drive-through) advertises general merchandise including toys, home decoration products, photo equipment, DVDs, toiletries, etc. in far greater amounts than office supplies, flowers or stationary that Armstrong and staff claim make it "similar in nature" to the permitted uses. (See Exhibit 2 hereto [advertising flyer for Folsom location].)

## 5. The Proposed Project Conflicts With the General Plan and Cannot Be Legally Approved Barring an Amendment.

As noted in the appeal, both the County and the applicant admit that the General Plan land use designation and zoning are inconsistent with the proposed use, i.e. a portion of the site is designated and zoned as research and development.

It is elementary that any decision by a city or county affecting land use and development must be consistent with the general plan. See Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553, 570; Families Unafraid to Uphold Rural El Dorado County v. County of El Dorado (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 1332, 1341-42. In fact, any subordinate land use action that is

not consistent with the county's current general plan is "invalid" at the time it is passed. Lesher Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 531, 544. General Plan and zoning amendments must be done pursuant to state law.

The County General Plan clearly recognizes this fact as well and prohibits the granting of any permit that is inconsistent with the land use designation. Policy 2.2.5.20 states that "[a]ll building permits shall be consistent with the land uses described in the land use designation established for the site, as provided in Policy 2.2.1.2 and set forth on Figure LU-1." See also Policy 2.2.5.2 ("No approvals shall be granted unless a finding is made that the project or permit is consistent with the General Plan.")<sup>1</sup>

In addition, the proposed retail use represents a "major" change to the TC West Plan since it is contrary to the intent of the development plan (specifying that only limited, ancillary support retail uses be allowed), and allows a previously unpermitted use that is not "similar in nature" to the permitted uses. (See Ordinance Code section 17.04.070.) Such a change must be processed as required under the zoning code, including the requisite notice, public hearing and planning commission approval.

Armstrong and staff attempt to convince the Board that the proposal should be approved in order to accommodate CVS's preferred store prototype and because of the construction of a competing Walgreens on the north side of Highway 50. This appeal does not dispute CVS's desire to pursue a particular business strategy, but the County's approved plans should not be distorted in order to accommodate such desires. Rather, CVS may apply for an amendment to the TC West plan if it wants to install a use, like a drug store, that is not "similar in nature" to the approved uses. The point is not whether the County wants to keep CVS as a tenant at Town Center East, but whether the County would ultimately support cannibalizing the planned retail area to support a general merchandise and major retail uses in TC West.

### 6. <u>Staff and CVS Claim the Proposed Store Is Similar to a Convenience Store.</u>

Both the staff report (at p. 2) and the Armstrong letter (at pp. 3, 6, 15) claim that the proposed store is more in the nature of a convenience market than a traditional drug store. These statements, rather than provide support for the approval, undermine it.

### A. Convenience Market Is Not a Permitted Use in TC West.

First, neither a convenience market nor anything similar is listed among the permitted uses in TC West. However, like a drug store, supermarket and other general retail uses, "variety store" and "mini-mart" are expressly listed as allowed retail uses in the TC East Development Plan. (See Syers Appeal, Exhibit C and Exhibit 3 thereto at pp. 3, 6.) Therefore, even if one

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Further, the permitted uses in the R&D Zone do not include a drug store. (Ordinance Code section 17.35.020.)

believes that a CVS/pharmacy is nothing more than a convenience market, it would not support a conclusion that it is allowed in TC West.

### B. The Project Fails to Comply with CEQA.

If, as both staff and Armstrong claim, the proposed store is really akin to a convenience store then it would need to have been analyzed as such from an environmental perspective in the Negative Declaration and Traffic Study that both claim support approval.

However, the 1995 Traffic Study (attached as Exhibit A to the Armstrong letter) is inadequate to support the project. That study, which relied on the I.T.E.'s Trip Generation Manual, estimated the PM trip rate in Planning Area E as 9.61 trips per 1,000 square feet. (See Traffic Study at p. 5.) This rate is well below rates used in the I.T.E. Manual for drug stores. (See Exhibit 3 attached hereto, ITE Trip General Rate PM Peak Hour, listing a Pharmacy/Drug Store with Drive-Through at 10.35 trips per 1,000 square feet.)

However, the difference between the rate used in the traffic study and negative declaration and the appropriate rate for a 24-hour convenience market is far more dramatic. The I.T.E. trip rate for that type of convenience market is 52.41 trips per 1,000 square feet – over 500% higher than the rate used in the traffic study. (See Exhibit 3). <sup>2</sup>

Thus, even if none of the other 20,000 square feet of retail were developed, the traffic count for a 15,000 square foot convenience store (as staff and the Armstrong purport the project to be) is more than double what the traffic study calculated for 35,000 square feet of retail use. (786 trips compared to 336). As such, the traffic study relied on by the County is inadequate to constitute compliance under CEQA.

Further, that Traffic Study only looked at the traffic intersections internal to project and did not examine impacts at the White Rock/Latrobe road intersection. (See Traffic Study at p. 7)

In addition, the County cannot rely on the now 20-year old EIR done for the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan as the County admits it did not include all of the property that is included in the subject parcel in the specific plan and the EIR. As such, Public Resources Code section 21166 is not applicable, not to mention that the EIR and 16-year-old negative declaration have outlived their useful life. In addition, since the proposal would make changes to the previously approved project additional CEQA review is required as explained in Syers' Appeal letter (at p. 7). As explained therein, the County's determination to allow a qualitatively different retail use (and open the door to other such uses) is clearly a discretionary decision that is at odds with the approved TC West Plan.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Armstrong's letter incorrectly focuses on retail square footage rather than the type of retail usage which results in traffic generation figures.

Further, additional projects, such as the retail center developed on the southeast corner of Latrobe and White Rock Roads, have been developed in the time since the EIR and negative declaration were approved, thus there has been a change in circumstances. Last, none of the prior documents take into account impacts of global climate change as required under CEQA.

### 7. Other Inaccuracies.

The Armstrong letter claims (at p. 5) that there have not been a number of consistency determinations in the life of the TC West Development Plan. This is incorrect and not surprisingly they cite no such determinations. However, in one relevant instance described in Syers appeal letter, the planning department and planning commission rejected a proposal by Mansour for a Home Depot as being similar in nature even though a Home Depot, like the CVS sells magazines, flowers, paper products and often includes food sales in the front of stores. In other words, there are no prior consistency determinations for TC West that set a precedent for the one at issue here, the opposite is true.

Finally, the Armstrong letter claims without any support that Syers' application to accommodate a 15,000 square foot drug store pad with a drive through in Town Center East is somehow "suspicious." In truth, such an application is wholly consistent with approvals for TC East and would accommodate the proposed use at issue.

### Conclusion

For the reasons stated herein, as well as those set forth in the appeal, we respectfully ask the Board of Supervisors to grant the appeal and find that a drug store is not a permitted use pursuant to the TC West Development Plan.

Very truly yours,

MORGAN MILLER BLAIR

TODD A. WILLIAMS

TAW:st Attachments

# **EXHIBIT 1**



Medicine Cabinet

Home | Shop

Baby & Child

### **Shopping Directory**

Household

Beauty

Departments Baby & Child Beauty 360 **Beauty Diet & Nutrition Home Medical** Household **Medicine Cabinet** Natural & Organic **Personal Care Sexual Health** 

**Beauty** Fragrance Gifts Inner Beauty Makeup Manicure & Pedicure Men's Grooming Salon Hair Care Skin Care Spa

**Home Medical Bariatric Care Bathroom Safety Braces & Supports Diabetes Care ExtraCare Advantage** for Diabetes Fitness & Rehab

**Hearing Assistance** 

**Foot Care** 

Household As Seen on TV **Automotive** Bags, Wraps & Storage **Batteries & Flashlights** Cameras & Film Candles Candy

Whether you're searching for household items or natural proc skin care, beauty products or vitamins, you can shop the CVS/pharmacy online store by department, brand or category

Sexual Health

**Personal Care** 

Baby & Child Bath & Skin Care **Diapers & Wipes** Feeding & Nursing Food & Formula **Gifts & Tovs** Health **Nursery & Home** Pregnancy



Beauty 360 Bath & Body Fragrance Gifts **Hair Care** Makeup Men **Nail Care** Natural **Personal Care** Skin Care **Tools & Accessories** 

Skin Care

Featured Brands

View All

Skin Care

**Vitamins** 

Sales & Specials **FSA Eligible Items Online Only Items Shopping Directory** 

Diet & Nutrition Fitness & Yoga Equipment **Health & Fitness** Monitors **Medical Nutrition** Nutritional Foods & Dr **Sports Supplements** Weight Loss

Home Tests
Hot & Cold Therapy
Incontinence
Respiratory Care
Solutions for Daily Living
Specialty Nutrition
Support Hosiery
Walkers, Wheelchairs & Canes
Wound Care

**Cleaning Supplies Electronics** Food & Snacks **Gifts** Hardware **Hosiery & Underwear Laundry Supplies Light Bulbs** Office Supplies Paper & Plastic Produ **Pet Supplies** Rain Gear **School & Art Supplies Shoe Care Small Appliances Toys & Games** Valentine's Day Shop Water Filtration

Medicine Cabinet
Allergy & Asthma
Braces & Supports
Cough, Cold & Flu
Diabetes Care
Ear Care
Eye Care
First Aid
Home Tests
Pain & Sleep
Stomach
Stop Smoking



Natural & Organic
Baby & Child
Beauty
Food & Snacks
Household
Medicine Cabinet
Personal Care
Pet Supplies
Skin Care
Vitamins & Supplemen

Personal Care
Bodywash & Soap
Deodorant
Ear Care
Eye Care
Feminine Care
Foot Care
Hair Care
Hair Removal
Incontinence
Lip Care
Men's Hygiene
Oral Care
Shaving
Tissues & Cotton Swabs



Sexual Health
Condoms
Contraceptives
Enhancers
Fertility & Ovulation
Home Tests
Łubricants

Skin Care Acne Treatments Bath Eye Creams Vitamins Condition Specific For Pets Herbals Facial Cleansers
Facial Moisturizers
For Men
Hand & Body Lotions
Healthy Skin Care
Scar & Fade Therapy
Sensitive Skin
Sun Care & Outdoor
Supplements



Minerals Sexual Health Supplements Vitamins Vitamins A to Z

### **Pharmacy Services**

Consultation Corner
Drug Information Center
Health Information Center
New Prescriptions
Refill Prescriptions
Transfer Prescriptions
View/Print Prescription History

### **Shopping**

ExtraCare My Account Shopping Directory

#### Help

Contact Us Privacy Policy Return Policy Shipping Information Site Map View All

### CVS/pharmac

CVS Gift Cards MinuteClinic CVS Photo Weekly Store / Store Locator



Terms of Use | Privacy Policy | Accessibility
© Copyright 1999 - 2011 CVS.com

Questions? Call 888-607-4287

# **EXHIBIT 2**

Close 🔾



Prices effective February 27 - March 5

Your Location:2790 East Bidwell Street CA 95630 Tel: 983-8719



Close 🗘



Prices effective February 27 - March 5

Your Location:2790 East Bidwell Street Folsom, CA 95630 Tel: 983-8719









Prices effective February 27 - March 5

Your Location:2790 East Bidwell Street Folsom, CA 95630 Tel: 983-8719





Close 🔾



Prices effective February 27 - March 5

Your Location:2790 East Bidwell Street Folsom, CA 95630 Tel: 983-8719









Prices effective February 27 - March 5

Your Location:2790 East Bidwell Street Folsom, CA 95630 Tel: 983-8719









Prices effective February 27 - March 5

Your Location:2790 East Bidwell Street CA 95630 **Tel:** 983-8719





Close 🔾



Prices effective February 27 - March 5

Your Location:2790 East Bidwell Street Folsom, CA 95630 Tel: 983-8719



page 13







Prices effective February 27 - March 5

Your Location:2790 East Bidwell Street Folsom, CA 95630 Tel: 983-8719









Prices effective February 27 - March 5

Your Location:2790 East Bidwell Street Folsom, CA 95630 **Tel:** 983-8719



# **EXHIBIT 3**

# INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS TRIP GENERATION RATE (PM Peak Hour)

(Trip Generation Manual, 6th Edition)

			Trips Per
	Description	Unit of Measure	Unit
PORT	AND TERMINAL	Part of the Section of the Section of	<b>在</b> 社会的。
30	Truck Terminal	Acres	6.55
90		Parking Spaces	0.62
NDU	STRIAL		高級企業的
110	General Light Industrial	1,000 S F	0.97
120	General Heavy Industrial	Acres	2.16
130	Industrial Park	1,000 S F	98.0
140	Manufacturing	1,000 S F	0.73
150	Warehousing	1,000 \$ F	0.32
151	Mini-Warehouse	1,000 SF	0.26
152	High-Cube Warehouse	1,000 SF	0.10
170	Utilifes	1,000 SF	0.76
RESIL	DENTIAL		(80)
210	Single-Family Detached Housing	Dwelling Units	1.01
220	Apartment	Dwelling Units	0.62
230	Residential Condominium / Townhouse	Dwelling Units	0.52
240	Mobile Home Park	Dwelling Units	0.59
251	Servor Adult Housing - Detached	Dwelling Units	0.27
252	Senior Adult Housing - Attached	Dwelling Units	0.16
253	Congregate Care Facility	Dwelling Units	0.17
254	Assisted Living	Beds	0.22
255	Continuing Care Retirement Community	Dwelling Units	0.29
LODG	ING	A A STATE OF THE S	
310	Hotel	Rooms	0.59
320	Matel	Rooms	0.47
330	Resort Hotel	Rooms	0.42
RECR	EATIONAL		的研究的
411	City Park	Acres	0.16
412	County Park	Acres	0.06
413	Stale Park	Acres	0.07
415	Beach Park	Acres	1.30
416	Campground/ Recreation Vehicle Park	Camp Sites	0.37
417	Regional Park	Acres	0.20
420	Marina	Berths	0.19
430	Golf Course	· Acres	0.30
431	Miniature Golf Course	Holes	0.33

			Trips Per		
	Description	Unit of Measure	Unit		
432	Golf Driving Range	Tees / Driving Positions	1.25		
433	Batting Cages	Cages	2.22		
435	Multi-Purpose Recreational Facility	Acres	5.77		
437	Bowling Alley	1.000 SF	3.54		
441	Live Theater	Seata	0.02		
443	Movie Theater without Matinee	1,000 \$F	6,16		
444	Movie Theater with Matinee	1,000 SF	3.80		
445	Multiplex Movie Theater	1,000 SF	4.01		
452	Horse Race Track	Acres	4.30		
454	Dog Race Track	Atlandance Capacity	0.15		
460	Arena	Acres	3.33		
473	Casino / Video Lottery Establishment	1,000 SF	13.43		
480	Amusement Park	Acres	3,95		
488	Soccer Complex	Fields	20.67		
<u> </u> 490	Tennia Courts	Courts	3.88		
491	Recquet / Termis Club	Courts :	3.35		
492	Health / Fitness Club	1,000 SF	3.53		
493	Athletic Club	1,000 SF	5.96		
495	Recreational Community Center	1,000 SF	1.45		
INSTI	UTIONAL	Special Contraction of Special Party	减强的.		
520	Elementary School	1,000 SF	1.21		
522	Middle School / Junior High School	1,000 SF	1.19		
530	High School	1,000 SF	0.97		
536	Private School (K-12)	Students	0.17		
540	Junior / Community College	1,000 SF	2.54		
580	Church	1,000 SF	0.55		
585	Daycare Center	1,000 SF	12.46		
566	Cemetery	Acres	0.84		
571	Prison	1,000 SF	2.91		
	Library	1,000 SF	7.30		
591	Lodge / Fraternal Organization	Mambers	0.03		
	VEDICAL				
610	Hospital	1,000 SF	1.14		
620	Nursing Home	1,0 <del>00</del> SF	0.74		
630	Clinic	1,000 SF	5.18		
640	Animal Hospital / Veterinary Clinic	1,000 SF	4.72		

	Description	Unit of Measure	Trips Par Unit
OFFIC		GARLES (LANGE RESIDEN	Marie Carl
710	General Office Building	1,000 SF	1.49
714	Corporate Headquarters Building	1,000 8F	1.40
715	Single Tenant Office Building	1,000 SF	1.73
720	Medical-Dental Office Building	1,000 SF	3.46
730	Government Office Building	1.000 SF	1.21
732	United States Post Office	1,000 SF	11.12
733	Government Office Complex	1,000 SF	2.85
750	Office Park	1,000 S F	1.48
760	Research and Development Center	1,000 SF	1.07
770	Susiness Park	1.000 SF	1.29
RETAI		TO THE PROPERTY OF THE	a Superior State
812	Building Materials and Lumber Store	1.000 SF	4.49
813	Free-Standing Discount Superstore	1.000 S F	4.61
814	Specialty Retail Center	1,000 SF	2.71
815	Free Standing Discount Store	1.000 SF	5.00
816	Hardware / Paint Store	1.000 S F	4,84
B17	Nursery (Garden Center)	1.000 SF	3.80
818	Nursery (Wholesale)	1,000 SF	5.17
820	Shopping Center	1,000 SF	3.73
823	Factory Outlet Center	1.000 SF	2.29
841	New Car Sales	1.000 SF	2.59
843	Automobile Parts Sales	1.000 SF	5.98
848	Tire Store	1.000 SF	4.15
850	Supermarket	1.000 SF	10.50
	Convenience Market (Open 24 Hours)	1.000 SF	52,41
	Convenience Market (Open 15-16 Hours)	1.000 SF	34.57
	Convenience Market with Gasoline Pumps	1.000 SF	59.69
	Discount Supermarket	1.000 SF	8.90
	Discount Club	1,000 SF	4.24
	Wholesale Market	1.000 SF	0.88
	Sporting Goods Superstore	1.000 S F	3.10
	Home Improvement Superstore	1,000 SF	237
****	Electronics Superstore	1.000 S F	4.50
	Toy / Children's Superstore	1,000 SF	4.99
	Pet Supply Superatore	1,000 SF	3.38
	Office Supply Superstore	1.000 SF	3,40
		1.000 SF	1.78
A(3	Department Store	I.UUU a.F	1-/0

			Trips P
er March 1981	Description	Urit of Measure	Unit
	Apparet Store	1,000 SF	3.83
879	Arts and Craft Store	1,000 SF	6.21
880	Pharmacy / Drugstore without Drive- Through Window	1,000 SF	B.42
881	Pharmacy / Brugstore with Drive-Through Window	1,000 SF	10.35
890	Fucriture Store	1,000 SF	0.45
	Video Rental Store	1,000 SF	13.60
ERV	ICES A	A. M. S. Marie Conf.	<b>多項公司</b> 第
	Walk-in Bank	1,000 SF	12.13
912	Drive-In Bank	1,000 SF	25.82
925	Drinking Place	1,000 SF	11.34
931	Quality Restaurant	1,000 SF	7,49
932	High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant	1,000 SF	11.15
933	Fast Food Restaurant without Drive- Through Window	1,000 SF	28.15
934	Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window	1,000 SF	33.84
935	Fast Food Rectaurant with Drive-Through Window and No Indoor Sealing	1,000 SF	153.8
936	Coffee / Donut Shop without Drive-Through Window	1,000 \$F	40.75
937	Coffee / Donut Shop with Drive-Through Window	1,000 SF	42.93
938	Goffee / Donut Shop with Drive-Through Window and No Indoor Sealing	1,000 SF	75
940	Bread / Donut / Bagel Shop with Drive- Through Window	1,000 SF	19.56
941	Quick Lubrication Vehicle Shop	Service Baya	5.19
942	Astomobile Care Center	1,000 SF	3.38
943	Automobile Parts and Service Center	1,000 SF	4.46
944	Gasoline / Service Station	Fueling Positions	13.B7
945	Gasoline / Service Station with Convenience Market	Fueling Positions	13.38
946	Gasoline / Service Station with Convenience Market and Car Wash	Fueling Positions	13.94
947	Self Service Car Wash	Statis	5.54
948	Automated Car Wash	1,000 SF	14.12

Note: All land uses in the 800 and 900 series are entitled to a "passby" trip reduction of 60% if less than 50,000 ft<sup>2</sup> or a reduction of 40% if equal to or greater than 50,000 ft<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>\*</sup> Approximated by 10% of Weekday average rate.