



MEMORANDUM

Date: October 21, 2013
To: Chair Cisco and Members of the Planning Commission
From: Jessica Jones, Senior Planner
Copy: Clare Hartman, Supervising Planner
Molly Dillon, Assitant City Attorney
Subject: Elm Tree Station – Amendment to Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Please be aware that the following typographical errors were identified on pages 36 through 46 of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, dated August 26, 2013, prepared for the Elm Tree Station project:

- The impact boxes for the subsections under the Mineral Resources and Noise sections of the document (pages 36 and 37) were inadvertently left unchecked; and
- The roman numeral numbering of the discussions on pages 36 through 46 were off by one number.

With regard to the impact boxes, it should be noted that, under the discussion in each section, the impacts for each subsection were identified. Specifically, under Mineral Resources, the discussion begins by stating “XI.(a-b) No Impact.”, and, under Noise, the discussion begins by stating “XII.(a-f) Less than Significant with Mitigation.”

Staff has corrected the errors by checking the appropriate boxes under Mineral Resources and Noise, and corrected the roman numeral numbers appropriately. The corrected pages, 36 through 46, are attached.

The Initialy Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Elm Tree Station project is still valid, and no new information has been provided. The checked boxes only further clarify the discussion and findings provided in the document, and the corrected roman numeral numbering in the discussions now simply match the roman numeral numbers for the section.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

XI.(a-b) No Impact.

The project site does not contain any locally or regionally significant mineral resources. The proposed development of the project site will not create an adverse impact upon locally or regionally significant resources since there are no such resources located on the project site.

Standard Measures:

None.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation required.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR, certified November 3, 2009

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

XII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
borne noise levels?				
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

XII.(a-f) Less than Significant with Mitigation.

The Noise Element of the City of Santa Rosa's General Plan identifies policies that are intended to guide the development of new projects with regard to exposure to or generation of noise. The policies support the City's goal of maintaining an acceptable community noise level. The following policies are applicable to the proposed project:

- NS-B-1** Do not locate noise-sensitive uses in proximity to major noise sources.
- NS-B-2** Encourage residential developers to provide buffers other than sound walls, where practical. Allow sound walls only when projected noise levels at a site exceed land use compatibility standards in Figure 12-1 (of the Santa Rosa General Plan 2035).
- NS-B-3** Prevent new stationary and transportation noise sources from creating a nuisance in existing developed areas. Use a comprehensive program of noise prevention through planning and mitigation, and consider noise impacts as a crucial factor in project approval.
- NS-B-4** Require new projects in the following categories to submit an acoustical study, prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant:
 - All new projects that could generate noise whose impacts on other existing uses would be greater than those normally acceptable.

- NS-B-5** Pursue measures to reduce noise impacts primarily through site planning. Engineering solutions for noise mitigation, such as sound walls, are the least desirable alternatives.
- NS-B-6** Do not permit existing uses to generate new noises exceeding normally acceptable levels unless:
- Those noises are mitigated to acceptable levels; or
 - The activities are specifically exempted by the City Council on the basis of community health, safety and welfare.
- NS-B-14** Discourage new projects that have potential to create ambient noise levels more than 5 dBALdn above existing background, within 250 feet of sensitive receptors.

The City of Santa Rosa has adopted a quantitative noise ordinance in Chapter 17-16 of the Municipal Code. Section 17-16.120 regulates noise from machinery and equipment: “It is unlawful for any person to operate any machinery, equipment, pump, fan, air conditioning apparatus, or similar mechanical device in any manner so as to create any noise which would cause the noise level at the property line of any property to exceed the ambient base noise level by more than 5 decibels. Ambient base noise levels for residential office, commercial, and industrial areas are established in Section 17-16.030. The applicable ambient noise level criteria are shown in Table 1, below:

TABLE 1: City of Santa Rosa Municipal Code Ambient Base Noise Levels (dBA)			
Land Use Zone	Daytime Level	Evening Level	Nighttime Level
Single-Family Residential	55	50	45
Multi-Family Residential	55	55	50
Office and Commercial	60	60	55
Intensive Commercial	65	65	55
Industrial	70	70	70

Source: City of Santa Rosa, City of Santa Rosa Municipal Code 17-16.030

The Noise Ordinance defines ambient noise as follows: “Ambient noise is the all-encompassing noise associated with a given environment usually a composite of sounds from many sources near and far. For the purpose of this chapter, ambient noise level is the level obtained when the noise level is averaged over a period of 15 minutes without inclusion of noise from isolated identifiable sources at the location and time of day near that at which a comparison is to be made.” The noise descriptor, Leq, is used in the noise report for the purposes of determining noise with respect to these limits.

Based on the results of the Environmental Noise Study, Elm Tree Station, prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., dated May 16, 2013, it was determined that the following project activities could exceed the site-specific allowable noise levels at adjacent residential uses:

- Nighttime market/retail deliveries; and
- Daytime, evening or nighttime fuel deliveries.

The mitigation measures listed below will reduce these potential project noise impacts and allow project compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance limits.

Standard Measures:

- Standard City conditions of project approval limit the hours of construction to 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Saturdays. No construction is permitted on Sundays and holidays.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:

- N-1** To mitigate the potential project noise impacts and allow daytime fuel deliveries and daytime, evening and nighttime market deliveries to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance limits, prior to the occupancy of future residences on the adjacent to property to the east, a sound wall with a minimum height of ten (10) feet above parking lot grade shall be constructed. The sound wall shall be located on the eastern property line from the northern edge of the proposed southeast corner pedestrian access point, northward for approximately 160 feet to a point approximately 30 feet north of the southernmost edge of the market footprint (as illustrated in Figure 2 in the Environmental Noise Study, Elm Tree Station, prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., dated May 16, 2013).

To be effective as a noise barrier, the wall shall be built without cracks or gaps in the face or large or continuous gaps at the base and have a minimum surface weight of 3.0 pounds per square-foot.

- N-1** To mitigate potential impacts to future residential uses from heavy (semi-trailer type) truck fuel deliveries, fuel deliveries shall be during the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. only.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR, certified November 3, 2009
- City of Santa Rosa Zoning Code, 2006
- Environmental Noise Study, Elm Tree Station, prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., dated May 16, 2013

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

XIII. (a-c) Less than Significant Impact.

The Retail and Business Services General Plan category allows retail and service enterprises, offices, and restaurants. Self-storage facilities are permitted under the existing CG (General Commercial) zoning with a Minor Use Permit (MUP).

The subject site is bordered Sonoma Highway to the northwest, a commercial center including car wash, retail and offices to the northeast, commercial to the southeast and Santa Rosa Creek to the southwest. The proposal does not include substantial changes to the infrastructure beyond the established baseline of existing conditions. Given the types of development allowed under the Retail and Business Services General Plan designation and the scope of the proposal, the proposed project is not anticipated to induce substantial population growth in the area, nor is it expected to displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The proposed project is not expected to translate into comprehensive environmental impacts with respect to the current General Plan designation and Zoning classification.

Standard Measures:

None

Recommended Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation required.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR, certified November 3, 2009
- City of Santa Rosa Zoning Code, 2006

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less-Than-
Significant With
Mitigation
Incorporation

Less-Than-
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. Fire protection?

☐☐☒☐

b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

XIV.(a-e) Less than Significant. The project site is located within the City of Santa Rosa and would receive all necessary public services. Fire protection services will be provided by the City of Santa Rosa. Police protection services will be provided by the City's Police Department. The proposal is not anticipated to cause the need for new public services or facilities. Existing fire and police protection are determined to be adequate to serve the Project.

Standard Measures:

- The Fire Department has reviewed plans for the proposed project and imposed standard conditions of approval.
- Other standard conditions of approval will apply, including provision of a fire flow analysis to ensure adequate water pressure and flow rates.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:

None.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR, certified November 3, 2009
- Community Development Department's Standard Conditions of Approval dated August 27, 2008

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

XV. RECREATION

Would the project:

a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
physical effect on the environment?				

Discussion:

XV.(a-b) Less than Significant. No on-site park or recreational facilities are proposed with the project. The project will provide an on-site connection to the Joe Rodota Trail, and will provide seating areas for bicyclists and pedestrians, although the area will not be a City park. Potential impacts to parks and recreation, relative to the proposed Elm Tree Station project, are anticipated to be less than significant.

Standard Measures:

None

Recommended Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation required.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR, certified November 3, 2009

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

- a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

- b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

XVI.(a-b and d-f) Less than Significant.

A Traffic Impact Study was prepared for the proposed Elm Tree Station project by Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc. (W-Trans), dated July 26, 2013. The Study states that the proposed project is expected to generate an average of 1,506 net new daily trips after deductions are made for the pass-by component, which 73 of these trips during the morning peak hour and 91 during the evening peak hour. The study intersections of State Route (SR) 12/Fulton Road and Sebastopol Road/South Wright Road are currently operating acceptably and are expected to continue doing so upon the addition of project-generated traffic. Both study intersections are expected to operate acceptably at LOS D or better under existing plus project conditions, and both are currently experiencing collisions at a rate that is below the statewide average for similar facilities. Under future conditions, both intersections are expected to operate deficiently both without and with project traffic added. However, planned improvements in the Santa Rosa General Plan are assumed to improve both intersections to acceptable operation.

As outlined in the Study, existing facilities for non-vehicular modes of transportation are largely provided by the Joe Rodota Trail. However, connectivity between North Wright Road and the Joe Rodota Trail is generally lacking. To improve access, the project will add a pedestrian and bicycle path to connect the existing sidewalk along the project frontage to the Joe Rodota Trail. Bike racks are included as part of the project plan.

The Study further states that sight distance at the project's driveway is adequate, though landscaping should be maintained to ensure continued adequate site lines. The project will have two access driveways: the north for egress only and the south for both ingress and egress. The existing two-way left-turn lane on North Wright Road is expected to serve inbound traffic.

With regard to on-site circulation, the plans provided indicate that the AutoTURN application was used to analyze AASHTO design vehicle types P (passenger car) and WB-50 (intermediate semi-trailer). The two design vehicles were used because the site's main traffic generator is passenger vehicles and the intermediate semi-trailer will be used for delivering gas. Based on the information provided, circulation is expected to be adequate.

The proposed project is not expected to conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy or conflict with an applicable congestion management program. The project is not anticipated to increase hazards due to design features nor result in inadequate emergency access. Public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities in the vicinity are expected to operate acceptably with respect to the proposed project. Staff members from the City's Department of Public Works –Engineering Development Services, including the City's Traffic Engineer, have reviewed the proposal and have not identified any significant issues.

The project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact relative to transportation and traffic.

XVI.(c) No Impact.

The project site is located approximately six miles from the Sonoma County Airport, and is outside of the Airport Land Use Plan planning area. The project site is not located near a public or private airport. The project will not impact air traffic patterns nor will it conflict with adopted policies programs supporting alternative transportation.

Standard Measures:

- The applicant shall pay traffic impact fees to help fund planned future improvements at State Route 12/Fulton Road and road widening on Sebastopol Road.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation required.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR, certified November 3, 2009
- City of Santa Rosa's Geographic Information System Database
- Traffic Impact Study for the Elm Tree Station Project, prepared by Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc., dated July 26, 2013

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

XVII.(a-g) Less than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is located within an urbanized area within the City limits of Santa Rosa. Utilities and services exist or are available through local City services, waste removal, Pacific Gas & Electric and other providers. The project will use some of the existing service capacity. Services and supplies are adequate to serve the project which does not result in the need for new systems or supplies, therefore the impact is considered to be less than significant.

Standard City conditions will require compliance with the Storm Water Mitigation Plan Guidelines, including implementation of conditions of approval requiring use of best management practices, and submittal of storm drainage plans to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Adequate landfill capacity exists at County facilities to support future development.

Standard Measures:

None.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation required.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR, certified November 3, 2009

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

XVIII (a) Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.

The project is not anticipated to degrade the quality of the environment or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Through implementation of Mitigation Measures BR-1 through BR-6, potential impacts to the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, as well as flora and/or fauna on site, are anticipated to be reduced to less than significant.

XVIII (b and c) Less-Than-Significant.



MEMORANDUM

Date: October 23, 2013
To: Chair Cisco and Members of the Planning Commission
From: Jessica Jones, Senior Planner
Copy: Clare Hartman, Supervising Planner
Molly Dillon, Assistant City Attorney
Subject: Elm Tree Station – City Entry and Mitigated Negative Declaration Resolution

Two questions have been raised regarding the Elm Tree Station project located at 874 North Wright Road, one related to the Mitigated Negative Declaration resolution and one related to the City entry at Highway 12. Both questions are addressed below, along with staff's response:

1. There was a question regarding the closing date for comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Specifically, the Initial Study, Public Hearing Sign and staff report all refer to an October 8, 2013 closing date for comments, while the resolution for the Mitigated Negative Declaration refers to October 24, 2013.

Staff Response

To clarify, the closing date for comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration was October 8, 2013, as noted in the Initial Study, Public Hearing Sign and Staff Report. The October 24, 2013 date noted in the resolution refers to the Planning Commission public hearing date.

2. The second question relates to the gas station, carwash, drive-through and market project that was proposed on the subject site, and subsequently denied by the Planning Commission on July 26, 2007. Specifically, concern was raised that the issue of the project being located near a major City entry (Highway 12), which was identified as an issue in 2007, was not discussed in the current staff report.

Staff Response

While the staff report did not specifically address the City entry, the overall auto-oriented concerns raised at the 2007 Planning Commission meeting were addressed. At that time, the Commission identified the site design as an issue because the gas dispensers were proposed at the front of the site with the market building at the rear. The concern was that the design would detract from the visual quality of the major entry route. Staff found that the current proposal addresses this issue locating the proposed market building on the northern side of the site, rather than the rear, generally between the gas dispensers and Highway 12, which is approximately 300 feet to the north. As a result, the gas dispensers would not be as highly visible from the Highway.