

*“Placerville, a Unique Historical Past Forging into a Golden Future”*

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
FEBRUARY 3, 2015 AGENDA**



**PROJECT TITLE:** 1990/2000 Broadway – Site Plan Review (SPR) 2014-05,  
CUP 2014-02, EA 2014-05  
**PREPARED BY:** Andrew Painter, City Planner  
**DATE PREPARED:** January 28, 2015

---

**PROJECT:** Property owner Jerry and Shelley Walls of APN 048-350-58, located at 1990 Broadway (Broadway and Texerna Court), request to construct and operate an 86-unit Senior Housing Complex (84,000 sq. ft.), including parking and landscaping on approximately four acres.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with the Findings and Conditions of Approval contained herein. Further that the mitigation measures identified in the Amended Mitigated Negative Declaration are also Conditions of Approval.

**PROJECT DATA:**

Property Owner: Jerry and Shelley Walls  
Applicant: Ken Fong – TKF & Associates  
Project Location: 1990 Broadway  
Parcel Number: 048-350-58  
Lot Size: 4.4 acres  
General Plan Land Use: Highway-Commercial (HWC), Airport Overlay (AO)  
Zoning: HWC/AO  
Current Use: Vacant. Site contains abandon dwellings  
Adjacent Zoning and Land Use:

	Zoning	Land Use
North:	HWC/AO (Highway Commerical / Airport Overlay)	US Highway 50
East:	R-3 (Multi-Family Residential)	High Density Residential
South:	R1 - 20 (Single-Family Residential)	Low Density Residential
West:	HWC/AO (Highway Commerical / Airport Overlay)	Highway Commercial

Environmental Document: Addendum to previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (an environmental document has been previously prepared for this site for a project known as the Hilton Garden Hotel).

**BACKGROUND:** The subject site is approximately 4.4 acres in area. The topography on the northern 2/3rds site of is flat and absent of significant vegetative cover while the southern 1/3<sup>rd</sup> is moderately sloped and has moderate tree cover predominantly Ponderosa Pine. The subject site is a corner lot at the intersection of Broadway and Texerna Court. The centerline of Texerna Court represents the boundary between the City of Placerville and El Dorado County. The subject site contains several abandoned, multi-family structures, the use of which have a history of nuisance complaints relating to the site and surrounding area.

**GENERAL PLAN LAND USE AND ZONING DESIGNATION:** The subject site has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Highway Commercial and corresponding zoning of HWC (Highway Commercial). The site is also within the Placerville Airport Overlay Zone (AO). The purpose of the HWC designation is to provide for freeway oriented uses, which are necessary and convenient to the traveling public. Uses permitted outright include hotels, motels, retail sales and services and restaurants, etc. Highway Commercial conditional uses include gas stations, fast food restaurants, and automobile sales and services. Additionally, uses contained in Section 10-3-3 and 10-3-4 are also uses allowed in any zone within the City, including the Highway Commercial Zone. The aforementioned code Sections allow health and community care facility as conditional uses in an HWC Zone. A community care facility is generally defined as a use which is maintained and operated to provide non-medical residential care for its occupants and includes a facility where the operator receives compensation for provision of personal services in addition to the provision of housing, including but not limited to protection, supervision, assistance, guidance, training, therapy and other non-medical care. The Development Services Department has concluded that the proposed Senior Living Facility is consistent with this definition.

**DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST:** This request is for approval of 86 unit senior assisted living facility called Placerville Commons. It involves a request to construct a three story, 86 unit facility on the subject site. Other site improvements include parking and landscaping and a semi-active outdoor area on its southern portion. The existing abandoned residences at the lower level will be demolished and in the future, the abandoned four unit apartment complex on the sites upper level may be renovated to a memory care facility (subject to future City review). The project description, attached hereto, suggests that the facility will be licensed by the State and offer a variety of services to its residents, including food services, light entertainment and semi-active outdoor activities.

The total building area for the proposed three story complex is approximately 84,000 square feet. Access to the site is proposed by way of two driveway encroachments accessing Broadway.

**BUILDING AND SITE DESIGN**

**BUILDING ELEVATIONS:** The architectural theme for the proposed Placerville Commons may best be described as contemporary with context appropriate architectural treatments. The proposed elevations may be reviewed on Sheets F and G of the attached submittal and perspective elevations may be reviewed on Sheet K. A color and material board was also provided, a copy of which is attached to this staff report.

The primary building surface is plaster and complimented with various earth tone shades throughout the building elevations-which significantly compliment or reduce the building mass of the elevations. The front elevation is further complimented with the use of stone veneer on the front elevation. Additionally, a porte cochere in the front and trellis components on the front and side elevations are also proposed. Variable roof gables also are incorporated and compliment the general architectural theme.

**PARKING:** City code is silent to parking requirements for senior assisted living facilities. In this regard, staff defaulted to a reference manual and studies provided by the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Parking Generation Manual. Studies contained therein suggest that the parking requirement for a facility with the same characteristics as the proposed Placerville Commons requires 0.25-0.5 parking spaces per unit. The site plan shows 40 parking spaces provided on the site, which when compared to the aforementioned reference will meet or actually exceed the parking demands for the facility. As a reference, the Cottonwood Seniors Facility on Clay Street provides 0.5 parking spaces per unit and it is observed that parking demand is significantly less than that parking that is provide for that facility.

**GRADING:** Previous earth work has rendered most of the subject site relatively flat. A review of the grading plan and grading narrative provided by a geotechnical engineer indicates that it is not anticipated that either import or export of material is anticipated-but instead balance material onsite. Because the site does have a slight northwesterly aspect, it is anticipated that several retaining walls will be necessary on the southerly and easterly portions on the site. The retaining wall between the proposed facility and Texerna would be a maximum height of approximately eight feet. A ten foot retaining wall to the rear of the site is proposed near the base of the existing embankment. For the Placerville area the grading necessary for site is best described as minimal.

Despite minimal grading, some tree removal will be necessary to accommodate the project. Most of the tree removal will occur between the driveway to the existing abandoned structure south of the proposed facility; however, approximately 10 trees in the northerly and northeasterly portion of the site closer to the confluence of Broadway and Texerna will also be removed. An arborist report has been prepared and is available for review in the Planning Division. The arborist report concludes that

approximately 60 trees will need to be removed to accommodate the project. To mitigate this effect and to comply with the City's landscaping criteria, significant landscaping of the site is proposed. A thorough landscaping plan has been submitted and accompanies the plan set. Sheet L1 shows reestablishment of approximately 72 trees and a significant shrub and ground cover list. Staff's review of the proposed tree, shrub and ground cover varieties concludes that the species and placement is consistent with the criteria set forth in the City's Landscaping Regulations.

**LIGHTING:** Exterior lighting for the site proposes both parking lot and wall mount fixtures. Eight contemporary fully shielded parking lot pole light fixtures are proposed and shown on the site plans. The proposed wall-mounted lights are also full cutoff fixtures with a contemporary design as shown on Sheet LP. A photometric plan did not accompany the submittal. A condition of approval addresses this matter which requires the submittal to the City Planner for review and approval of a Photometric Plan that conforms to the Zoning Code.

**TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION:** The proposed 86 unit senior facility is expected to generate approximately 300 daily vehicle trips, which is approximately 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the daily trips generated by the previously entitled Hilton Garden Hotel. In this regard, it is important to note that the daily traffic generation and peak hour traffic characteristics for the proposed senior housing occur outside of normal am and pm peak hour volumes on Broadway, which typically experiences am and pm peak hour traffic in the 7-8 am and 4:30-5:30 pm hours. Given the low traffic volume and distribution characteristics, off-site improvements to nearby intersections and roadways are not warranted. This conclusion is supported by traffic study prepared for the project dated November 10, 2014 and maintained the Planning Division file.

With respect to street improvements the project will be required to provide 30 feet of pavement (two twelve foot lanes with room for future bike lanes on each side) and concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk along Broadway from the west property line extending easterly to the centerline of Texerna Court.

**SUBSEQUENT PHASING:** The application indicates the existing/southerly structure on the site that accesses Texerna Court may be used for a future accessory use to the site such as an Alzheimer or dementia facility. In that this component has not been submitted for entitlements it will be subject to review, approval and subsequent conditions if approved in the future by the Planning Commission.

**HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL LAND USE AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS:** Despite the historic residential use of the subject site, it has been assigned a General Plan Land Use designation and Zoning Map District designation of Highway Commercial since 1990. The Hilton Garden Hotel is the only development project of record for the subject site which was entitled in 2009. While the intent of the Highway Commercial

Designation is to cater to the traveling public, the past use of the site and failure to develop a hotel suggests that it is not well suited for Highway Commercial Uses at least in terms of general real estate market influences. The other disadvantage that this site has is that it is east of the Highway 50/Point View interchange making it somewhat less desirable for Highway Commercial Uses.

The Zoning Ordinances allows for a variety of other uses that are allowed in any zoning designation throughout the community with findings and Conditional Use Permit approval granted by the Planning Commission. Among these uses, a residential care facility such as the Placerville Commons Project is identified as a use allowed with Planning Commission approval. While it is generally recognized that the City's vacant HWC Land Use Inventory is valuable for the City's long term health and service to tourists, it appears that the subject site is not ideal in terms of size, location, and proximity to accessory urban uses such as restaurants and therefore the site use as a residential use for senior housing may be more appropriate.

Furthermore, the proposed senior community for the site is clearly consistent with the recently readopted 2013-2021 Housing Element. The facilitation of senior housing (a type of special needs household) is a Housing Element policy (Policy 3 of Goal B) that helps to meet Goal B of the Housing Element that states:

*Goal B: To Facilitate the Development of Housing for Special Needs Households.*

**PLACERVILLE AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN (ALUCP)**

**CONSISTENCY:** The subject site as indicated is located within the AO Zone (Section 10-5-23). A project within the AO Zone must be determined compatible with the Placerville ALUCP adopted by the City in 2013. New development is evaluated for consistency with the ALUCP and its compatibility policies specific to noise, safety, airspace protection, overflight and any special circumstance contained within the ALUCP.

Staff evaluated the request for compatibility with the following ALUCP policies finding the project consistent:

Noise: Due to its physical location of more than 2,000 feet north of the Placerville Airport, and the site not within the Airport's Noise Contours of concern ( $\leq$  CNEL 55 dB to  $\geq$  70 CNEL dB), the senior living facility use is deemed "Normally Compatible" (Policy 4.2.1 (b) and Table 1 of ALUCP). Normally compatible uses require construction methods to sufficiently attenuate exterior noise to an acceptable indoor CNEL. For a long-term residential use such as a senior living facility, ALUCP Policy 4.2.3(a) requires construction methods so that the maximum aircraft-related interior noise level is CNEL 45 dB. The City has adopted the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC requires development to meet interior noise policies within an adopted ALUCP. Construction of

the project would therefore be evaluated and inspected to meet the CNEL 45 dB during the building permit process, consistent with ALUCP policy.

Safety: The site is shown on the ALUCP Airport Safety Zones Policy Map as located within Safety Zone 6, the Traffic Pattern Zone. New residential development, such as proposed with the Placerville Commons project, per ALUCP Policy 4.3.2 (a)(4) is not restricted for safety compatibility purposes. The request therefore is consistent with ALUCP safety policies.

Airspace Protection: The site is shown on the ALUCP Airspace Protection Zone Map as within the Horizontal Protection Zone. In addition, the highest elevation on the project site is 2,336 feet above sea level. The Placerville Airport elevation is 2,585. Proposed project construction is not within nor would it penetrate the ALUCP's Critical Protection Zones (Primary, Approach or Transitional) located immediately adjacent to the runway. The request therefore is consistent with ALUCP airspace protection policies.

Overflight and Special Circumstances: The site is shown on the ALUCP Overflight Zone Policy Map as within the High Noise/Risk Zone. Per ALUCP Policy 4.6.1, an Avigation Easement dedication shall be required for any proposed development for which a discretionary local approval by the City is required. Policy 4.6.1 specifies the requirements of the easement as follows:

- (c) *The avigation easement shall:*
  - (1) *Provide the right of flight in the airspace above the property;*
  - (2) *Allow the generation of noise and other impacts associated with aircraft overflight;*
  - (3) *Restrict the height of structures, trees and other objects in accordance with the policies in Section 4.4 and the Compatibility Policy Maps: Airspace Protection Zones in Chapter 6 herein;*
  - (4) *Permit access to the property for the removal or aeronautical marking of objects exceeding the established height limit; and*
  - (5) *Prohibit electrical interference, glare, and other potential hazards to flight from being created on the property.*

Staff has conditioned the project to require the recordation of an avigation easement to comply with ALUCP Policy 4.6.1. Staff will prepare the avigation easement document for property owner signature.

**ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:** The California Environmental Quality Act provides that only substantial changes to a proposed project involving new significant environmental effects would trigger a new round of environmental review either via a Negative Declaration or EIR when there is a previously approved environmental

document for what is essentially a similar or like kind project. In fact Public Resources Code section 21166 creates a presumption against preparing another Negative Declaration (EIR) unless certain conditions are present – such as new or more severe impacts than previously studied, changed circumstances surrounding the project that may result in new or more severe impacts, or new information that is made available which suggest that new or more severe impacts will result. With respect to the Placerville Commons Project the record thus far does not contain any evidence supporting any of these conclusions. Therefore in absence of such evidence the City is required to prepare an Addendum to the previously approved Environmental Document not a new Negative Declaration or EIR. The Addendum is attached hereto.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION:** This request is consistent with the City’s Goals and Policy’s of the recently readopted Housing Element and while it may remove acreage from the City’s Highway Commercial inventory it appears that the location of the site and lack of proximity to other highway commercial accessory uses detracts from its market value.

The proposed design of the site and architecture appear contextually appropriate for the site and surrounding area and that the proposed project is clearly consistent with the City’s design standards and policies. Therefore, based upon information contained in the record as a whole, staff recommends that the Planning Commission take the following action to grant the use permit and design review requests with the Findings, Conditions of Approval and Mitigation measures described below:

- I. Make the following findings for the Addendum to Mitigated Negative Declaration 2008-02 prepared for the Placerville Commons Senior Living Facility on the subject site, which tiers off of the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Hilton Garden Inn and adopted in 2009.
  - A. There are no substantial changes proposed by the revised site plan that require major revisions of the existing IS/MND, or preparation of an EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects. As illustrated above, the project involves minor modifications to the previously studied and approved site plan and actually reduces somewhat the intensity of those uses.
  - B. There have also been no changes in the circumstances that would result in new significant environmental effects. The site remains unchanged from that previously analyzed and additional environmental review is not necessary. (CEQA Guidelines, 15162, subd. (a).)

- C. There are no changes to the mitigation measures proposed for adoption and applicable to the Placerville Commons project. These mitigation measures are incorporated into the project as approved in 2009.
- II Receive and file the Addendum to Mitigated Negative Declaration 2008-02 (attached hereto).
- III. Make the following findings for Conditional Use Permit 2014-02.
- A. The proposed senior housing facility is a use which is necessary and desirable for the development of the community and is consistent with the City of Placerville General Plan. Further, this project will not be detrimental to surrounding uses in the vicinity.
  - B. The site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use, and site dimensions, landscaping and other features are consistent with City Code in that the site is approximately 4.4 acres in area and the proposed senior housing facility conforms to local standards including lot coverage, parking and landscape requirements, access and circulation, and community design.
  - C. The proposed use will not increase traffic in the area beyond the capacity of the existing streets and highways in that the proposed use is a low traffic generator and that only a negligible impact will occur, and additional traffic from the project will not alter roadway capacity in the vicinity nor affect existing intersection or roadway levels of service.
  - D. The granting of this request will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety and general welfare, nor injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity and zone in that the site design and proposed mitigation measures ensure that public health, safety and general welfare are maintained.
- IV. Making the following findings for Site Plan Review 2014-05
- A. This request is consistent with the purpose and intent of the City's Site Plan Review regulations, which are intended to maintain property and improvement values throughout the City while encouraging development that recognizes local and regional architectural styles while maintaining the scenic and aesthetic characteristics of the community.

V. Make the following General Plan consistency findings:

- A. This request is consistent with Goal B of the Land Use Element that states, "To provide for decent housing in a suitable living environment for every resident of Placerville while maintaining the rural beauty that is unique to Placerville."
- B. This request is consistent with Goal B of the Housing Element that states, "To facilitate the development of housing for special needs households," in that it would establish a residential living facility for senior citizens (a special needs group) who make up approximately 13% of the City's population (2013-2021 Housing Element).
- C. This request is consistent with the Policies of the Placerville Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as described and analyzed in staff's report.

VI. Conditionally approve CUP 2014-02 and SPR 2014-05, a request by property owner Jerry and Shelley Walls of APN 048-350-58, located at 1990 Broadway (Broadway and Texerna Court), to construct and operate an 86-unit Senior Housing Complex (84,000 sq. ft.), including parking and landscaping on approximately four acres, subject to the following conditions, and the Mitigation Measures adopted under Mitigated Negative Declaration 2008-02:

**CUP 2014-02 & SPR 2014-05 - 1990 Broadway -  
Placerville Commons Senior Living Facility Conditions of Approval**

El Dorado County Fire Protection District

None received as of date of staff report.

Planning Division

1. Any proposed future change to the site or modification to the application beyond what is authorized under this permit shall be submitted to the Development Services Department for a determination of appropriate procedures.
2. Submit a Photometric Plan, which conforms to code, to the City Planner for review and approval.
3. Comply with the Mitigation Measures described in the attached Mitigated Negative Declaration 2008-02.

4. An Avigation Easement shall be filed with the El Dorado County Recorder's office prior to City issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the Placerville Commons project.
5. The parking of vehicles shall only occur within those areas designated for parking as shown on the approved site plan.

Building Division

6. After the Planning Division approval, the applicant will need to submit three complete copies of architectural plans, structural plans, project engineering review, energy analysis documents, and green building code documents to the Building Division with an additional copy of plans to the Fire District, for review and building permit.

Engineering Division

7. This Site Development project shall comply with all pertinent City Ordinances and City standard street cross-section details available at the office of the City Engineer. All remaining Engineering items, except for sewer and water, shall be designed in accordance with the County of El Dorado Design and Improvement Standards Manual, as revised May 18, 1990; the County of El Dorado Drainage Manual, dated March 14, 1995; and the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) 2010 Standard Plans and Standard Specifications. Sewer service will be provided by the City and shall be designed and constructed in accordance with current El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) Design and Construction Standards, except when otherwise directed by the City Engineer. Water service will be provided by EID and shall also be constructed to their current Design and Construction Standards.
8. Appropriate land rights shall be obtained from the affected property owners as necessary to allow any required grading and/or facilities to be installed outside the site plan boundaries. A copy of the written authorization(s) shall be included with the final improvement plan submittal.
9. All improvements required for this site plan and as described in these conditions of approval shall be shown on construction drawings (the final improvement plans) to be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval. An encroachment permit shall be obtained from the City Engineer prior to beginning any work on this site plan within a public right-of-way.
10. All Capital and Impact Fees are to be calculated and paid at time of Building Permit issuance.

11. All improvement plans shall conform to the requirements of these Conditions of approval and shall be signed by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District, El Dorado Irrigation District, the Development Services Director, the Geotechnical Consultant, and the City Engineer.
12. The Applicant shall submit to the Engineering Division a digital copy of “as-built” plans for public improvements when construction is complete.
13. All existing easements within the site plan boundaries shall be revised as appropriate to conform to the new site plan layout at the time the improvement plans are approved. Easements to be abandoned shall be abandoned prior to or concurrent with the improvement plan approval. Abandonment shall be in accordance with the Utility’s and the City’s requirements.
14. The Applicant shall offer to dedicate to the City all drainage easements for improvements such as, but not limited to, drainage swales, ditches, pipelines, etc., consistent with the County of El Dorado Drainage Manual, the Final Drainage Plan, and the final improvement plans. The final improvement plans shall note that said easements “shall be kept free of buildings and obstructions”. The City will consent to the offers, but not accept for maintenance.
15. Where the Applicant is required to make improvements on land, which neither the Applicant nor the City has sufficient title or interest to make such improvements, the Applicant shall make every effort to acquire all necessary land rights prior to the issuance of any permit for grading or construction. If the Applicant is unsuccessful in obtaining those land rights, then, prior to issuance of a permit, the Applicant shall submit to the City Engineer for approval:
  - a) A legal description prepared by a civil engineer or land surveyor of the land necessary to be acquired to complete the off-site improvements.
  - b) Improvement plans prepared by a civil engineer of the required off-site improvements.
  - c) An appraisal prepared by a professional appraiser of the cost of land necessary to complete the off-site improvements.

Prior to issuance of a permit, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement pursuant to government code Section 66462.5 to complete the required off-site improvements including the full costs of acquiring any real property interests necessary to complete the required improvements.

In addition to the agreement, the Applicant shall provide a cash deposit, letter of credit, or other acceptable surety in an amount sufficient to pay such costs including legal costs subject to the approval of the City Attorney.

16. All utilities outside of public roadways shall be in 15-foot wide easements centered on the utility. Easements for drainage swales shall be 10 feet wide centered on the swale. All easements shall be shown on the improvement plans, shall be dedicated by separate instrument, and shall be submitted for approval with the final improvement plans. Easements for sewer shall be dedicated to the City and easements for water shall be dedicated to EID.
17. The Applicant shall dedicate additional right of way and slope easements as necessary along fronting streets at the time of final improvement plan approval.
18. All property corners shall be located prior to beginning construction and permanently established prior to final acceptance of public improvements by the City.
19. Improvements shall comply with Fire District requirements, including locations and spacing of fire hydrants, building sprinkler requirements, fire flows, and traffic and emergency circulation.
20. The required water system, including all fire hydrants, shall be installed and accepted by EID and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District prior to any combustible building material being placed on site.
21. A meter award letter or similar document from EID shall be provided by the Applicant prior to receiving a building permit.
22. A grease interceptor is required due to the kitchen/restaurant being proposed. Location and type shall meet City and EID standards for this type of installation.
23. The City's sewer master plan study completed in 2006 identifies potential capacity problem areas downstream between Wiltse Road and the Spanish Ravine/Main Street intersection. This applicant shall fund, or participate with others to fund, the cost of a sewer capacity study through this approximately 2000 foot section of pipeline to determine what capacity improvements are necessary to adequately serve this project during wet weather flows while still maintaining excess capacity of 20% to serve miscellaneous infill projects. The study shall also determine if additional capacity improvements will be needed at ultimate buildout plus project. If improvements are required, the study shall develop a plan showing how the improvements can be staged to serve project capacity needs as additional levels of development occur within this sewer shed area. This applicant will then be responsible for design and construction of those capacity improvements identified as critical to serving this development. The study will be completed by a consultant hired by the City. The cost of the study and any necessary design and construction of improvements will be

### Item 8.3

reimbursable to the applicant thru credits toward this developments sewer connection fees, and any additional amount would be subject to a reimbursement agreement between the City and the applicant.

24. The sanitary sewer lateral shall connect to the existing City main in Broadway at an existing manhole as shown on the plans and shall be installed by the applicant. A two way cleanout shall be installed at the property line, and the applicant shall be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the lateral upstream of the two way cleanout.
25. All new or relocated on-site utility lines and services shall be constructed underground.
26. Underground existing overhead communication lines across the Broadway frontage. Underground utilities shall be from the existing pole just west of the property on Broadway to a new pole to be set at the corner of this property near the intersection of Broadway and Texerna.
27. A Final Drainage Plan shall be prepared for review and approval by the City Engineer as part of the final improvement plans. Drainage facilities shall be designed and included in the final improvement plan submittal consistent with the Final Drainage Plan. Design and construct drainage and detention facilities as recommended in the final drainage study in order to keep post development flows leaving the site at or below pre development levels. The study shall assume that the Estonia Estates projects final drainage system is complete and in place. The study shall not take credit for any reduction in upstream flow resulting from Estonia Estates detention systems. Changes to historical and existing drainage patterns will not be allowed without specific City approval. All areas of concentrated drainage flow shall be contained in a pipeline or improved channel to a City-approved discharge point.
28. The plans for the Estonia/Placerville Estates subdivision upstream on Estonia Drive by Gene Thorne and Assoc. Inc. show upstream drainage being released into a ditch across this site. This applicant shall coordinate its drainage design with the upstream plans and shall provide the City with an irrevocable drainage easement offer for any portions of the onsite system that will be carrying upstream flows from Estonia Drive across this site. The City will reject these easements until such time as the upstream streets are installed and become public. The applicant shall agree to maintain all on-site storm drain systems in perpetuity.
29. The Applicant shall incorporate Best Management Practices (BMP) for the capture of oil and petroleum products or other hazardous materials leaving the

on-site paved areas. Treatment shall occur before leaving the site and shall be incorporated into the drainage system plans. A maintenance plan shall also be provided to keep the treatment system(s) operational.

30. All drainage inlets shall be marked "Do not Dump - Flows to Creek."
31. Interceptor ditches are required at the top of all retaining walls. Provisions shall be made for discharge to the on-site storm collection system.
32. Drainage facilities along Broadway shall be designed to accommodate flows from a 10-year storm with no static head, and to accommodate 100 year flows while still leaving a minimum of 12 feet of unobstructed roadway travel width in each direction.
33. Overland drainage escape routes from the project area shall be provided. Those not within public right-of-way shall be secured with a drainage easement. Special consideration shall be given to convey overland release from the upstream Estonia/Placerville Estates subdivision.
34. Surface drainage, drainage swales or concentrated lot drainage is not allowed to sheet flow across sidewalks or curbs.
35. Public storm drain pipes shall be RCP, HDPE, or other materials as approved by the City Engineer.
36. Minimum parking lot aisle and driveway width shall be 24 feet wide. Parking and handicap stall widths and turnaround shall comply with City of Placerville Standard Plans.
37. Broadway shall be improved to provide 30 feet of AC pavement, (2-12' lanes with 2' shoulder lane westbound and 4' bike lane eastbound), plus curb gutter and sidewalk from the west property line to the centerline of Texerna Court along the property frontage. As the freeway fence is 8 feet from the existing edge of pavement, all roadway improvements will be within the existing 50 foot right of way, and no additional right-of-way will be required. Existing centerline shall be held as closely as possible to the existing so as not to exacerbate existing restricted sight distance at Texerna Court. This will require 2' plus of the new roadway cross section to be constructed on the freeway side of Broadway, and regrading and construction of drainage improvements along that side of the roadway as necessary. The 2' shoulder lane on the north side shall include pavement markings as a "sharrow" bike lane, matching the cities plans for "sharrow" striping of the planned westbound lane of the future Broadway Bike Lane Project from Point View Drive to Schnell School Rd.

38. Street structural section for Broadway shall be designed based upon a traffic index of 7.0 for collector streets. The existing street section shall be evaluated and given a grind and AC overlay as necessary to meet this standard. At a minimum Broadway shall be given a 1.5" overlay to tie in the widened areas and provide a uniform appearance. A 30 foot radius curb return shall be constructed at Texerna, and the new pavement section shall extend around the return and terminate at the curb return.
39. The main access to the site shall be through the two new driveways on Broadway. Sight distance must meet El Dorado County design standards at each driveway location. Any sight distance issue shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to proceeding with the final site design due to the driveway locations effect on the final site plan.
40. Applicant shall be responsible for coordinating their site improvements along the Texerna (Estonia) frontage with curb and gutter alignment and grades shown on the Placerville Estates plans by Gene Thorne and Assoc. Inc. (which are pending approval). Applicant shall dedicate right of way to 25 feet from the future centerline along Texerna consistent with the Estonia/Placerville Estates Improvement plans. In coordination with said plans, Applicant shall design and construct curb and gutter along their Texerna frontage to the extent that their frontage coincides with the future street alignment plans. A transition between existing Texerna pavement and the new lip of gutter shall be designed and constructed. New pavement shall meet minimum El Dorado County standards for this type of roadway. All site improvements shall be constructed in a manner that is consistent with these plans and that allows for additional curb and gutter, and future street improvements to be completed along the Texerna frontage without additional on site grading and retaining wall work being necessary on this property. Applicant has stated that in the future they may apply for remodeling and a new use of the existing building at the back of this property. Texerna improvements should be designed with this in mind, understanding that a separate application will be required and that additional requirements for Texerna street improvements may be imposed at that time.
41. Applicant shall request to the City to call its street frontage improvement agreement with the adjacent parcel to the west, APN 48-350-31. Should the City Council agree to request those improvements this applicant shall coordinate their alignment and grades on Broadway with those frontage improvement plans.
42. All striping in public right-of-way shall be thermoplastic.

43. Install a street light at each Broadway site entrance driveway. These street light shall be privately owned and maintained, power provided from the electrical service on the Hotel side of the meter, shall be fully shielded to prevent excess glare and light, and shall comply with PG&E standards.
44. All grading shall conform to the City Grading Ordinance and to all other relevant laws, rules, and regulations governing grading in the City of Placerville. Prior to commencing any grading, which includes 50 or more cubic yards, the applicant shall obtain a grading permit from the Engineering Division.
45. Install minimum 42-inch height permanent fencing at the top of all bluffs or cut-and-fill slopes exceeding 10 feet in height, and greater than 2:1 slope and at the tops of retaining walls that exceed 30" in height, or 18" in foot traffic areas.
46. All retaining walls shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction, including material types, colors, and surface finishes. Proposed Keystone and cast in place retaining wall designs shall be approved by a geotechnical engineer and a structural engineer, including any necessary railings or traffic barriers at the tops of walls. Utility lines running under retaining walls shall be placed in a sleeve as approved by the City Engineer.
47. A geotechnical engineering study was not received with this application. Submit a geotechnical engineering study for review and approval by the City Engineer with the improvement plans. The Geotechnical Engineer shall review and sign off on the final grading and improvement plans for conformance to recommendations contained in these studies.
48. The improvement plans shall include an erosion and sediment control plan, which incorporates standard erosion control practices and best management practices, subject to the approval of the City Engineer and Resource Conservation District. The plan shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer or Certified Professional Hydrologist in accordance with the High Sierra Resource Conservation and Development Council Guidelines for Erosion and Sediment Control, and shall be included in an agreement with the construction contractor prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The following measures shall be included:
  - a) Any mass grading shall be restricted to dry weather periods between April 1 and October 31.
  - b) If other grading activity is to be undertaken in wet-weather months, permanent erosion and sediment controls shall be in place by October 15, and construction shall be limited to areas as approved by the City

### Item 8.3

Engineer. A winterization plan must be submitted by September 15 and implemented by October 15.

- c) In the event construction activity including clearing, grading, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation result in soil disturbances of at least one acre of total land area, the applicant shall obtain and provide a Notice of Intent (NOI) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- d) Should a NOI be required, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be provided prior to issuing a construction permit. The SWPPP shall have provisions to provide at minimum monthly monitoring reports to the City during wet weather and to 1 year after completion of construction.
- e) Project less than one acre are exempt from obtaining a NOI unless construction activity is expected to create soil disturbances that could cause significant water quality impairment.
- f) The internet site for information and application on the NOI can be found at  
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/stormwtr/docs/finalconstpermit.pdf>
- g) Sedimentation basins, traps, or similar BMP controls shall be installed prior to the start of grading.
- h) Mulching, hydro seeding, or other suitable revegetation measures shall be implemented. Planting shall also occur on areas of cut and fill to reduce erosion and stabilize exposed areas of later construction phases. All disturbed areas with a slope greater than 5% shall receive erosion control.
- i) Excavated materials shall not be deposited or stored where the materials could be washed away by storm water runoff.

49. The improvement plans shall include a dust control plan, which takes all necessary measures to control dust. This plan shall be implemented by the Applicant during grading as required by the City and the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD). A permit from AQMD shall be submitted to the Engineering Division prior to approval of the improvement plans.

50. Graded slopes shall be limited to a maximum steepness ratio of 2:1 (horizontal to vertical) unless otherwise approved by the geotechnical engineer.

51. Obtain proper permits prior to demolition or grading of any hazardous materials, underground storage tanks, mines, tunnels, shafts, septic systems, water wells, or other existing underground utilities or unforeseen features. Requirement to obtain additional permits shall be clearly stated on the grading plans.

52. The plans do not indicate import or export quantities proposed, and as such it is assumed that this will be a balanced grading project. Should this not be the case, additional conditions of approval may be imposed, including the requirement to obtain approval of any borrow or disposal site from the City Engineer, completion of a Grading Environmental Assessment which must be submitted to the Planning Department for review, comment, and approval, and approval of haul routes. Haul routes utilizing City streets shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval, and may require an assessment of existing street conditions and additional protection measures.
53. Haul routes on City streets and on-site circulation routes shall be swept daily at a minimum and kept free of dirt and debris from construction activity to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
54. City restrictions related to noise and work hours shall be clearly stated on the Cover Sheet for the final improvement and/or grading plans.
55. Existing trees to be protected and the protection measures to be installed or observed during site grading and trenching operations shall be clearly delineated on the final improvement plans.

*Attachments*

1. [Planning Applications and supportive materials including site plans, building elevations, site renditions](#)
2. [Addendum to Mitigated Negative Declaration 2008-02](#)
3. [Mitigated Negative Declaration 2008-02, adopted January 2009](#)



**EXHIBIT A:  
1990/2000 Broadway –SPR 2014-05**

[Project Application](#)

**Supporting Site Improvement Plans**

- 1) [Arborist Report](#)
- 2) [Geotechnical Report](#)
- 3) [Collage of Placerville Commons \(B& W\)](#)
- 4) [Collage of Placerville Commons \(Color\)](#)
- 5) [Enlarge Floor Plan - E](#)
- 6) [Exterior Elevations – G](#)
- 7) [First Floor Plan – B](#)
- 8) [Grading Plan –C-4](#)
- 9) [Preliminary Irrigation Plan – L-2](#)
- 10) [Preliminary Landscaping Plan – L-1 / Color L-1](#)
- 11) [Roof Plan – J](#)
- 12) [Second Floor Plan – C](#)
- 13) [Site Improvement Plan –C-1](#)
- 14) [Site Lighting Plan – L](#)
- 15) [Site Photometric Plan –LP](#)
- 16) [Site Plan – A](#)
- 17) [Site Plan – C-3](#)
- 18) [Third Floor Plan – D](#)
- 19) [Topo Boundary Survey – C-2](#)
- 20) [Utility Plan – C-5](#)
- 21) [North and East Elevations \(Color\)](#)
- 22) [South and West Elevations \(Color\)](#)

**Addendum  
Mitigated Negative Declaration 2008-02  
(Placerville Commons)**

**Introduction**

In January 2009 the City of Placerville Planning Commission approved a project at 1990 Broadway for a 109 unit hotel (Hilton Garden Inn) and accessory facilities, parking and landscaping. Project approval was also accompanied with an environmental document (MND) for which approval was also granted.

Entitlements for the aforementioned hotel project have subsequently expired and a new project has been submitted for a senior health and community care facility that involves 86 studio like self-contained housing units, parking, landscaping, and semi-active outdoor activity area known as Placerville Commons. Minor street improvements are also proposed along Broadway and Texerna Court.

The project for which Negative Declaration 2008-02 was prepared involved on and offsite improvements that are closely mirrored by the Placerville Commons project. For example, similarities between the proposed Placerville Commons project and the Hilton Garden Inn include grading and construction footprint, parking, roadway and street frontage improvements, ingress and egress locations, and tree removal. In fact, the onsite impacts created by the proposed Placerville Commons are lesser in extent and will be discussed below. Under the circumstances described herein, CEQA encourages addenda to approved and adopted environmental documents that have previously undergone environmental review and approval has been granted. Under these circumstances, the environmental review process required by CEQA is established by Public Resources Code Section 2166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164.

The following Addendum was prepared pursuant to CEQA and in response to the proposed resubmitted site plan and associated improvements. CEQA Guidelines section 15164, subdivision (b), provides that [a]n addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred. (CEQA Guidelines, 15164, subd. (b).)

Once an environmental analysis has been performed for a project, no subsequent review is required under CEQA unless the City determines, on the basis of substantial evidence and in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

### Item 8.3

Addendum MND 2008-02

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous negative declaration;
  - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

(CEQA Guidelines, 15162, subd. (a).)

This Addendum relies on the prior environmental analysis prepared for the Hilton Garden Hotel project, including the initial study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) (December 2008).<sup>1</sup> The analysis contained within this Addendum examines only incremental differences in the environmental impacts associated with the proposed minor modifications to the site plans and conditional use

---

<sup>1</sup> This addendum incorporates by reference and relies on the 2008-02 IS/MND.

permit and the mitigation measures proposed by City staff, compared with the approved Hilton Garden Hotel project.

### **Proposed Minor Project Modifications**

In comparing the project descriptions between the Hilton Garden Hotel and the Placerville Commons, the proposed Commons project involves only minor changes to the original project. Summarized, the Placerville Commons project, when compared to the Hilton Garden Hotel involves the following:

- A like-kind of construction footprint for the site; however, the Placerville Commons involves significantly less grading volume and use of fewer retaining walls.
- The Hilton Garden required 109 parking spaces while the Placerville Commons project proposes only 40.
- Tree removal to provide for both projects is comparable and located primarily central to the site and obscured from street view by improvements, once completed. The total amount of tree removal to accommodate the Placerville Commons project is less.
- The Hilton Garden project was expected to generate approximately 920 vehicle trips per day while the proposed Placerville Commons project is expected to generate approximately 300 vehicle trips per day, resulting in insignificant road and intersection impacts.
- Exterior lighting will be parking lot, sidewalks and pathways is less for the Placerville Commons when compared to the Hilton Garden Hotel.
- The environmental setting has not changed in the intervening period. Traffic counts along Highway 50 and Broadway have not changed. No other changes to the project site have occurred.

### **Comparison of Potential Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures of the Hilton Garden Hotel and Placerville Commons**

- a) Land Use and Planning Impacts. The Land Use Element of the City's General Plan designates the project site as a Highway Commercial District in which hotel and other uses targeting highway travelers are allowed by right. The General Plan designation of the site has not changed since the original MND was approved for the Hilton Garden Hotel project in 2009. The City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance also allow other uses provided that they are not detrimental to surrounding properties including health and community care facilities such as that proposed provided that the Planning Commission makes certain findings and grants entitlements including a Conditional Use Permit.

In the original MND the City determined that compliance by the project with the City's design and landscaping requirements and conditions would mitigate any land use conflicts to surrounding uses. This assessment has not changed. Furthermore, there have not been substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken with the application of the City's design, site plan and landscape requirements. The project will still result in less than significant surrounding land use impacts.

- b) Population and Housing Impacts. The original MND contemplated transient tourist housing and did not involved the creation of permanent housing stock such as that proposed by the Placerville Commons project. Housing growth for seniors is contemplated in the Housing Element and the provision of such housing is encouraged and supported by the numerous goals and policies of the Housing Element.

The project is not expected to result in the extension of infrastructure nor other changes that would induce growth either or indirectly in area and therefore the City concludes that there are no significant environmental effects associated with population and housing triggering the need to prepare a subsequent Negative Declaration.

- c) Geologic Problems. The original MND concluded that the Hilton Garden Hotel would not result in significant impacts relating to seismic activity, erosion or soil characteristics that could not be mitigated by compliance with the City's grading, sediment and erosion control regulations. Compliance with mitigation measures contained in the original MND relating to geology remain valid and are required. No new or more severe impacts will occur.
- d) Surface Water Impacts. Pre and Post project surface water hydrology impacts were analyzed in the original MND. The proposed Placerville Commons contains less impervious surface area for the building, walkways, and parking and a greater amount of pervious area. The original MND concluded surface water runoff did comply with the requirements of the City's Engineering Division and best management practices would result in a less than a significant impact. There is no basis for any substantial changes in the assessment of the impact or necessary mitigation, therefore the impact remains less than significant provided that the mitigation measures identified in Section 3-Geology of the original MND are met.
- e) Air Quality Impacts. The original MND for the Hilton Garden Hotel project concluded that the potential risk of air quality impacts associated with airborne dust generated by grading activity and vehicle emissions would result in less

than significant impact. In as much as the potential area designated for grading is approximately 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the extent discussed in the MND the impacts will remain at a less than significant level, therefore no additional environmental review relating to air quality is required.

- f) Transportation and Circulation. The MND prepared for the Hilton Garden was accompanied by a traffic analysis analyzing the 970 vehicle trips created by the 109 unit hotel. The MND identified certain mitigation measures requiring the project to pay its fair share to improvements at the east bound Highway 50 ramps, Broadway intersection, and payment of traffic impact fees as set forth by the City. It is clear that the traffic generated by the proposed Placerville Commons is significantly less than that originally envisioned by the MND and study prepared for the Hilton Garden Hotel. In fact, a traffic analysis was completed (November 2014) for the proposed senior housing project. In as much as the traffic not only less, but has different peak hour characteristics with existing intersections and roadway traffic volumes. The subsequent (2014) analysis document concluded that all study intersections and roadways will operate at level of service C or better during peak hours. Although the off-site contribution in terms of payment of fair share fees described above is not warranted for the Placerville Commons project, the payment of traffic impact fees as set forth by City code is required. The City concludes that no additional impacts occur nor mitigation measures are required, and such impacts remain at a less than significant level.
- g) Biological Impacts. The MND concluded that there were no known endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats at the site or in the immediate project vicinity; however, project tree canopy removal involving approximately 85 trees was noted and that the tree removal would likely disturb animal and bird species. Mitigation was identified relating to the potential impact of tree removal on animal and bird species. Although tree removal in the proposed Placerville Commons is expected to be less (2/3<sup>rds</sup>), the potential impact on the animal and bird species remains similar in terms of impact and the mitigation measure previously identified shall remain applicable.

The MND for the Hilton Garden Hotel concluded that project development would cause the removal of 85 trees, most of which were Ponderosa pine, and that a comprehensive landscaping plan proposed for all disturbed and uncovered portions of the site was a component of project development. The MND concluded that tree removal and subsequent replanting resulted in a less than significant impact. The proposed Placerville Commons project identified 58 trees with greater than seven inches (diameter breast height) within the construction portion of the site. This is less tree removal than discussed in the

MND, further the proposed landscaping plan calls for the planting of 72 trees within the parking and common landscape areas. The ratio of tree removal to tree replacement with the proposed Placerville Commons project is higher than that proposed for the Hilton Gardens Hotel in that the ratio replanted trees was greater than tree removal for the Placerville Commons project.

The MND daylighted that the likelihood that the project would have to comply with the State Forest Protection Act for a conversion to a non-timber growing use of timberland. The State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection has statutory authority for timber harvesting within the State of California. The MND was submitted to the State for comment and it chose not to do so. The MND concluded that the impacts related to biological resources were less than significant and the Placerville Commons project impacts are actually fewer, therefore no additional environmental reviews are required.

- h) Energy and Mineral Resources. The Hilton Garden MND concluded that there would be no impact with regard to energy and mineral resources such as energy conservation plans, renewable resources, or loss of known mineral resources. The site is not in a known State Mineral Resource designated area therefore the like-kind nature of the Placerville Commons project will result with the same conclusion that there is no impact requiring a modification to the environmental document.
- i) Hazards. The original MND for the Hilton Garden project concluded that the project would create no significant hazards or conflict with any applicable emergency response plans based upon the project design and comments from the El Dorado County Fire Protection District as well as the City of Placerville Police Department. This conclusion remains the same and therefore no additional mitigation measures are necessary.
- j) Noise. The MND for the Hilton Garden Hotel identified the impact of construction noise from the site upon the vicinity as potentially significant and incorporated a mitigation measure thereto. Construction noise created by the construction of the Placerville Commons is like-kind in nature; therefore the mitigation measure will remain valid for the Placerville Commons project and shall become effective upon issuance of a building permit for the project. No other noise impacts have been identified and therefore no additional analysis is required.
- k) Public Services. No changes in the identification of public services impacts have been identified between the original project and the proposed Placerville Commons. Both projects have potential effects on the City's fire protection

services, schools and roads and those would be mitigated to a less than a significant level through the implementation of relevant impact mitigation fee programs. The Placerville Commons project would be subject to fee programs, therefore no changes to the level of significance of the impacts or to the mitigation required per the Placerville Commons project have been identified. Similarly, the modification to the project does not trigger the need for supplemental environmental review.

- l) Utilities and Service Systems. The original MND for the Hilton Garden Hotel project concluded that that project would have no significant impacts on power, natural gas utilities, communication systems, water treatment, and water supply systems, as well as the City's storm water system. The MND further daylighted a sewer delivery system constraint located downstream near Blairs Lane and incorporates a mitigation measure directly related thereto. This mitigation measure remains valid for the Placerville Commons project as the impact is like-kind in nature but no greater than the previous project. No additional impacts which relate to utilities and service systems have been identified and therefore no additional environmental analysis is required.
- m) Aesthetic Impacts. The MND for the Hilton Garden Hotel project acknowledges that the project site is within a designated scenic highway corridor; however, the project would result in a less than significant impact provided that applicable design standards relating to site and design review and exterior lighting are met in as much as these are program design standards and that Placerville Commons project is like-kind in nature. No new impact, which relate to aesthetics have been identified and therefore no additional environmental review is required.
- n) Cultural Resource Impacts. The MND for the Hilton Garden Hotel did not identify any known any cultural resources within the project site; however, a mitigation measure is incorporated in the unlikely event that such a resource or human remain is encountered during construction, in which work will cease and qualified professionals consulted relative to discovery. Because the site work for the Placerville Commons project is like-kind in nature there remains the potential that human or cultural resources could be discovered and therefore mitigation measure remains pertinent and applicable to the Placerville Commons project.
- o) Recreational Impact. The MND for the Hilton Garden Hotel concluded there would be no potential significant impacts with respect to recreation and related facilities. The nature of the residences of the Placerville Commons project is such that no impact is expected to occur upon recreation activities and resources and therefore impacts are not expected to occur; therefore no additional environmental impact review is required.

p) Mandatory Findings of Significance:

Neither the original nor the updated analysis identified any potentially significant direct impacts or cumulative impacts resulting from the original or modified project. Therefore, no new or more severe impacts will occur.

**Findings**

There are no substantial changes proposed by the revised site plan that require major revisions of the existing IS/MND, or preparation of an EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects. As illustrated above, the project involves minor modifications to the previously studied and approved site plan and actually reduces somewhat the intensity of those uses.

There have also been no changes in the circumstances that would result in new significant environmental effects. The site remains unchanged from that previously analyzed and additional environmental review is not necessary. (CEQA Guidelines, 15162, subd. (a).)

There are no changes to the mitigation measures proposed for adoption and applicable to the Placerville Commons project. These mitigation measures are incorporated into the project as approved in 2009.

**Conclusion**

The minor alterations to the project proposed under the revised site plan are not substantial and do not require major revisions to the IS/MND. No significant new information or changes in circumstances surrounding the Placerville Commons project have occurred since the approval of the original Hilton Garden Hotel project. An addendum is therefore the appropriate document to update the environmental analysis.

# NEGATIVE DECLARATION

## CITY OF PLACERVILLE

Environmental File No: SPR 08-02 &  
EA 08-02

County Clerk  
County of El Dorado  
360 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

RE: Mitigated Negative Declaration  
FOR: Hilton Garden Inn  
(Project)

Application has been filed with the City of Placerville for approval of the project known as the Hilton Garden Inn

to be located at 1990 Broadway, Placerville, El Dorado Co., CA 95667

Assessor's Parcel Nos. 048:350:52 & 53

The project is briefly described as: 109-unit hotel on approximately 4.4 acres

Reasons the project will not have a significant environmental impact: Potentially significant impacts of the project have been reduced to a less than significant level by the proposed mitigation measures.

In accordance with the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act, State Guidelines, and Placerville's Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, the Environmental Quality Officer analyzed the project and has recommended that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment. Based on this finding, the Department of Community Development hereby files this **DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**.

A period of **thirty (30) days** from the date of filing of this **DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be provided to enable public review of the project specifications and this document prior to action on the project by the City of Placerville. A copy of the project specifications is on file in the Community Development Department, City Hall, City of Placerville.

This document is being filed in duplicate. Please acknowledge filing date and return the acknowledged copy in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

### DATE RECEIVED FOR FILING

PREPARED BY: Steve Calfee, Community Dev. Dir.

FILED BY: [Signature]

DATE: 12.26.2008.

**FILED**

CD-015-P  
1/08

DEC 31 2008

WILLIAM E. SCHULTZ, Recorder-Clerk

By [Signature]

**Exhibit B**

**INITIAL STUDY /  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

1. **Project Title:** Hilton Garden Inn - Site Plan Review 08-02, Environmental Assessment 08-02
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Placerville  
3101 Center Street  
Placerville, CA 95667
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Steve Calfee, Community Development Director  
(530) 642-5252
4. **Project Location:** 1990 Broadway  
Placerville, CA.  
Assessor Parcel Number 048:350:52, 53
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Mackay Organization, Inc.  
2781 Smith Flat School Road  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-9752
6. **General Plan Designation:** Highway Commercial
7. **Zoning:** HWC, Highway Commercial
8. **Description of Project:** Construct a 109-unit hotel (Hilton Garden) on approximately 4.4 acres.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** North: Broadway & US Highway 50; East: single, multi-family residential and concentrated commercial uses along Broadway; South: single family residential; West: motel uses, medical offices, private school.
10. **Other agencies whose approval is required:** None



Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**I. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the Proposal:

- a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (2, 15 )

The project site has a General Plan Land Use designation of Highway Commercial. The site is zoned Highway Commercial (HWC). Permitted uses within the HWC Zone include business and professional offices, eating and drinking establishments, retail sales and hotels and motels. The proposed 109-room hotel and accessory use proposed does not appear to be inconsistent with either the General Plan or the Zoning designation for the site. Consistency with the General Plan and Zoning will be determined by the Planning Commission during the public hearing for the Site Plan Review and Environmental Assessment entitlements.

- b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? (4 )

The proposed construction activity is considered a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), in that the development has the potential to cause an impact to the environment. This project Initial Study shall serve as the City's response as the City's CEQA Lead Agency responsibility. Conflicts with City environmental policies are therefore not anticipated.

- c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? ( 2, 15 )

Existing land use in the project vicinity includes a medical clinic, two motels, a private school, and dispersed single family and multi-family residential located along Broadway, south of US Highway 50. Surrounding uses are permitted by right or by conditional use permit within their corresponding zoning designations. The project's proposed hotel use is permitted under the HWC Zone and General Plan Designation. Therefore the proposed use is expected to be compatible with these existing land uses in the project vicinity. No impact is anticipated.

- d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (2, 6 )

There are no agricultural resources or operations within the City. Due to the project site's Commercial Zoning and Land Use Designation, no agricultural resources are proposed and none exist onsite.

- e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? ( 6 )

No disruption or division of the Placerville community is anticipated due to the infill nature of the project.

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**II. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the proposal:

- a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? ( 2 )

The commercial hotel project does not involve the creation of housing stock. The overnight accommodation facility for transit occupancy is therefore not expected to exceed official regional or local population projections.

- b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area of extension of major infrastructure)? ( 6, 10 )

The project is not expected to result in the extension of major infrastructure such as road, sewer or water systems. Primary vehicle access to the site is from Broadway, an existing "Minor Arterial", as classified per the City's General Plan Transportation Element. An 8" diameter sewer line is located within the Broadway right-of-way. Water service is provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (E.I.D.) from an existing 6" diameter water line located within the Broadway right-of-way, as well as a 6" diameter water line within Texerna Court.

- c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? ( 6 )

The site contains two derelict apartment buildings which have been declared unsafe and unoccupyable. They are scheduled for demolition.

**III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS.** Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

- a) Fault rupture? ( 2, 3 )

No active faults are located on the project site. An inactive geologic fault is located within one mile west of the project site. This pre-Quaternary fault called "Melones" is not expected to involve fault rupture due to its geologic inactivity. In addition, a project geotechnical study was performed by Youngdahl Consulting Group for the project proponent. It concluded, "Due to the absence of a permanent elevated groundwater table, the relatively low seismicity of the area, and the relatively shallow depth to bedrock, the potential for site liquefaction, slope instability and surface rupture/lateral spreading are considered negligible. For the above mentioned reasons, mitigation for these potential hazards is typically not practiced in the geographic region of the project site." Therefore no impacts are anticipated.

- b) Seismic shaking? ( 3 )

Refer to Section III (a) above.

- c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? ( 3 )

Refer to Section III (a) above.

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

(1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

d) Landslides or mudflows? ( 3 )

Refer to Section III (a) above.

e) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? ( 3, 15 )

The site slopes generally from south to north. Elevations range from 2,250' above sea level at Broadway, along the project's northern property boundary, to 2,337' above sea level at the project's southwestern corner. The northern half of the property has a gentle slope that is approximately the elevation as Broadway, the primary access street located north and adjacent to the site. The southern half of the site has a slope of that ranges between 20-30%.

Project improvement plans prepared by CTA Engineering for the project describes that the project will disturb 3.4 acres of the 4.13 acre site. Approximate grading volumes involve 18,000 cubic yards of cut and 22,500 cubic yards of fill. Retaining walls are proposed along both the cut and fill slopes to accommodate site construction of the hotel pad, parking areas and other site improvements. Maximum retaining wall height is 11. Finished grades above the retaining walls are designed to not exceed 2' horizontal to 1' vertical. Over one acre of land is expected to be disturbed with these construction activities. Grading from the building of residential and accessory structures is expected to trigger compliance with the City's Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control regulations, enforceable upon the parameters of subsequent building permit issuance. The project must also comply with the City's Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP). The SWMP outlines best management practices (BMPs) for stormwater runoff, stormwater management, etc. Also, because the site surface disturbance exceeds 1-acre, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that establishes erosion, sediment, and chemical run-off controls for both during and after construction activities is required. Therefore, the project triggers compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board is responsible for approving SWPPPs. These regulations require the inclusion of BMPs that are designed to provide erosion control, sediment control and post-construction control of site and off site surface runoff drainage. Specific BMPs for the project are expected to be finalized based on final engineered plans. They are expected to reduce to less than significant level potential significant impacts in conjunction with erosion from residential related construction. Compliance with the NPDES, the City's Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control regulations and Stormwater Management Plan requirements is expected to reduce potential impacts due to stormwater to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Geology-1.** The applicant or his/her successors, heirs, assigns shall perform all grading activities and placement of fill in accordance with the City's Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations. (1) (A) (B)

**Geology-2.** The applicant or his/her successors, heirs, assigns shall obtain all necessary permits/certifications from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) regarding NPDES regulations and shall show evidence of compliance with the CVRWQCB regulations prior to on site grading activities. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will comply with the City's Stormwater Management Plan. Appropriate BMPs will be implemented throughout the duration of construction activities. (2)(A)(E: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board)

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

(1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Subsidence of the land? ( 1, 2 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No evidence exists that the proposed project would potentially expose people to subsidence due to the lack of well and mining activity on the site. No impacts are expected.

g) Expansive soils? ( 3 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Clay soils were discovered during site subsurface exploration. The findings were described in the geotechnical study prepared for the project. Although limited quantities were discovered, the presence of clay near the surface can expand or swell with the addition of water. This could cause foundations, driveways, and other site development to be structurally compromised. The geotechnical study recommended that during site construction and before structural materials are placed to have the soils verified so that "no concentrated pockets of expansive clays are present." In that expansive clay soils were not found throughout the site, the impact is considered less than significant.

h) Unique geologic or physical features? ( 2 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There are no known unique geologic or physical features present onsite. No impacts are anticipated.

**IV. WATER.** Would the proposal result in:

a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? ( 21 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Pre and post-project hydrology was analyzed for the project submittal. Surface drainage is to be collected into a system of surface rock lined and interceptor ditches, drench drains, drop inlets, and below surface storm drain improvements. The drainage system is designed to convey storm water to existing storm drainage facilities located west of the project at the neighboring medical office use and along Broadway. Due to addition of impervious surfaces from the hotel roof, hardscape walkways, retaining walls and paved parking areas, potential increases in the amount of surface runoff are anticipated. Surface runoff is expected to increase by 5.16 cubic feet per second (cfs) increase from the 10-year storm event and by 6.58 cfs during the 100-year storm event.

A 39-unit single-family residential subdivision (now called Astonia Estates) was tentatively approved for a neighboring property located south and upslope of the project site. The parcel containing Astonia Estates naturally drains northerly into and through the Hilton Garden Inn project site. A final map for this subdivision has not yet recorded. Site improvements for Astonia Estates included a detention basin that was designed with excess storage capacity to accommodate the Astonia Estates runoff as well as downstream areas. The excess detention basin capacity fully mitigates both projects' peak storm water drainage to a net cfs reduction. Potential impacts are therefore considered less than significant.

b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? ( 7 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The project site is designated Zone X, or areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain. Therefore there are no potential impacts from water related hazards.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? ( 1, 6 ) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discharge of surface runoff into surface waters not expected in that the closest surface drainage is Hangtown Creek, located approximately 800 feet north of the site. See Section IV a) above for discussion of storm water drainage. Impacts if any are considered less than significant. This project has been sent to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board for review and comment.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? ( 1 ) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The nearest surface water body is Hangtown Creek located approximately 800' north of the project site. No direct discharge of storm water into this surface water feature is anticipated. Therefore changes in the amount, the course, or direction of surface water in Hangtown Creek are not anticipated.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements? ( 1 ) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See Section IV c) of this Initial Study for discussion of project impacts to water body currents, courses or direction of water movements.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? ( 9, 11 ) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is located within the El Dorado Irrigation District (E.I.D.) water service area. E.I.D. water distribution facilities serve the project site and surrounding area. Individual water wells for water usage are not proposed with this project. Due to the small project area of 4.2 acres, substantial interference with groundwater recharge from the pre-project condition is not expected. No impacts are expected.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? ( 9, 11 ) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See Section IV (f) above for discussion of groundwater.

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

h) Impacts to groundwater quality? (9, 11 )

See Section IV (f) above for discussion of groundwater.

i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? ( 9, 11 )

See Section IV (f) above for discussion of groundwater.

**V. AIR QUALITY.** Would the proposal:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (7 )

The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) has developed thresholds of significance for the size of projects that are likely to generate emissions of ROG (Reactive Organic Gases) and NOx (Oxides of Nitrogen) that would exceed 82 pounds per day. A motel project of 490 rooms or more is estimated by the AQMD to generate ROG or NOx in excess of 82 pounds per day. Project construction involves the building of a new hotel with 109 rooms. Due to the size and scope of the proposed project that is well below the 490 room development threshold, the project is not expected to exceed the AQMD's 82 pounds per day threshold.

In addition, the AQMD considers that a hotel project of 490 rooms or less are considered insignificant from PM<sub>10</sub> (particulate matter) and CO (carbon monoxide) emissions. Therefore the project is not expected to exceed AQMD air quality standards for PM<sub>10</sub> or CO emissions. Impacts if any are considered less than significant.

b) Exposure sensitive receptors to pollutants? ( 6 )

Examples of sensitive receptors include schools, hospitals and convalescent care facilities. The El Dorado Adventist School, a coeducational, kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> Grade, private school is located approximately 800 west of the project site. Project grading is estimated to disturb 3.4 acres of the 4.13 acre site. There is a potential for the temporary generation of fugitive dust during project grading activities to impact the El Dorado Adventist School. This impact is potentially significant due to the proximity of the project to the existing school. Additional analysis is needed to determine the extent of the potential impact, and to generate appropriate mitigation measures to reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level. This Initial Study will be circulated to the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District for comment.

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.
- (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? ( 7 )
- |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project will not likely alter significantly temperature, air movement or climate from its existing condition due to the size and scope of the proposed project on 4.13 acres. Potential impacts if any are considered less than significant.

- d) Create objectionable odors? (7 )
- |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed hotel use as well as project construction activities are not expected to create objectionable odors. There is a potential that vehicle exhaust from construction equipment could create temporary odors. These odors are expected to be temporary in nature and to occur during project construction and therefore are considered less than significant.

**VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.**

Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increased vehicle trips, traffic congestion, or level of service? ( 18, 22 )
- |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The 109 room hotel is expected to generate 972 daily trips. Of these daily trips, 76 are expected during the PM peak hour. The existing 8-unit multi-family use within the project site generates 54 daily trips, of which 5 are expected during the PM peak hour. Project trip generation results in a net increase of 918 daily trips and 71 trips during the PM peak hour. Seven study intersections were identified for evaluation. These included the US 50 ramp intersections at Point View Drive and Smith Flat Road, and the three intersections along Broadway between these two roadways. All intersections currently operate with all approaches at LOS C or better. Queuing along southbound Point View Drive at Broadway is about 70' in the p.m. peak hour. This extends to the Highway 50 Eastbound Ramps intersection. At a "normal" intersection this would be considered a short queue; however, due to the proximity and geometry of the two intersections and the relatively modest traffic volumes the queue does overflow into the adjacent eastbound ramp intersection.

A traffic signal was considered with regard to reducing the queues even though the intersection does not meet peak hour signal warrants. Introduction of a traffic signal will maintain a queue length of 66' at the 95% level. Because of the short length between the two intersections the recommended alternative is the installation of a single roundabout. A review of the FHWA publication, "Roundabouts: An Informational Guide", a single lane roundabout provides adequate capacity for the six leg roundabout. This is based on a worst case scenario of 2025 plus Project p.m. peak hours. Two alternative conceptual plans were considered. The first layout is a circular layout with about a 138' inscribed diameter. This alternative provides a slip lane for eastbound Highway 50 off-ramp traffic to westbound Broadway bypassing the roundabout. A similar layout is provided for westbound Broadway to the eastbound Highway 50 on-ramp. In both locations the slip ramp will exit into its own lane and merge with through traffic outside of the roundabout.

The conceptual layout for the second alternative includes an oval roundabout. The inscribed diameter for this layout is about 100'. This will require less right-of-way, but will likely have a lower overall capacity due to the locations of the approach and departure legs and lower entry speeds. Both alternatives need to be further refined to determine the

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

recommended alternative. The City should program intersection improvements into the Capital Improvement Program.

No additional recommendations are made.

**Existing + Project Conditions.** All intersections will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service, operating with all approaches at LOS C or better. The following mitigations should be undertaken by the project:

**Mitigation Measures**

**Transportation/Circulation-1.** The project shall pay the Traffic Impact Fees as set forth by the City.

**Transportation/Circulation-2.** The project driveways should be designed according to City standards for commercial driveways.

**Transportation/Circulation-3.** The project frontage along Broadway should be completed based on the City's projected street cross section and design guidelines.

**Transportation/Circulation-4.** The project should pay their fair share to install the roundabout at the Eastbound Highway 50 Ramps/Broadway intersection(s). The Caltrans methodology was used in determining fair share costs. This is the project traffic during the peak hour divided by the difference between the future traffic and the existing plus approved/pending projects. The methodology was modified by using Existing traffic as opposed to Existing plus Approved Project traffic as the City may still have the ability to have the approved/pending projects pay their fair share. In addition, since the project involves combining two intersections, the fair share percentage considered the two intersections as one. The project fair share for this intersection is 15.0%. The city of Placerville should be the monitoring agency for this mitigation.

No other mitigations are needed.

**Existing Plus Approved Projects Conditions.** All intersections will continue to operate with all approaches at LOS C or better. Queuing along southbound Point View Drive at Broadway will lengthen to about 77' in the p.m. peak hour. This queue will continue to extend to the Highway 50 Eastbound Ramps intersection. As noted in the Existing conditions a roundabout is recommended to improve the conditions at the intersections. The City may still have the ability for both the Gateway Hotel project and the Lumsden Ranch project to pay their fair shares to install the improvement.

Based on the fair share methodology, the fair share percentage for Lumsden Ranch is 10.0% while for the Gateway Hotel project the fair share percentage is 33.1%

- b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? ( 6 )

The conceptual layout of this project indicates one primary driveway access intersection along Broadway. The project abuts the west side of Texerna Court to the east and a commercial property to the west. The spacing between

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.
- (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Texerna Court and the proposed hotel driveway is about 210' west of Texerna Court, with the project located on the inside of a curve along Broadway.

The sight distance looking from the driveway, in both east and west directions, appears to be about 300' of uninterrupted sight distance. Based on Caltrans Highway Design Manual standards this Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) corresponds to a design speed of 40 mph.

A second sight distance standard employed for minor street traffic accounts for the gap in traffic required for motorists to join the traffic stream without influencing or impeding approaching traffic. This requirement, termed "Corner Sight Distance" (CSD), is documented in Table 405.1A of the Highway Design Manual. This criterion is for public road intersections but is typically not used for private road intersections and urban driveways. The 300' distance corresponds to a CSD of about 27 mph. When restrictive conditions such as right-of-way constraints, extensive excavation, building removal or environmental costs occur, the less restrictive stopping sight distance standards can be used to establish the minimum sight distance requirements.

**Mitigation Measure**

**Transportation/Circulation-5.** Sight distance for access to the project shall be verified in the field at the actual driveway locations based on Caltrans Highway Design Manual standards. Adequate sight distance shall be provided based on these standards. This may include providing low lying landscaping that is no higher than 2 feet and trees that are no lower than 10'.

- c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? ( 6, 11 )

Access to the site is via two new 24' wide commercial driveway encroachments, one to Broadway and a second to Texerna Court. In addition, approximately 60 lineal feet of Texerna Court is to be widened along the project frontage from the centerline westerly to accommodate an 11' wide travel lane, 2.5' wide curb and gutter, and a 4.5' wide sidewalk. Broadway is to be widened along the entire project frontage to accommodate a 12' wide travel lane, 4' wide Class II Bike Lane, 2.5' wide curb and gutter, and 4.5' wide sidewalk. Also, the entire hotel exterior is accessible by emergency access vehicles. Therefore, the project is not expected to create inadequate emergency access to the site or nearby uses.

- d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? ( 15 )

The project site is zoned Highway Commercial (HWC). The proposed hotel use is a permitted use within the HWC zone. City Code Section 10-4-4 (E) sets the minimum number of parking stalls required to serve a hotel use as one parking stall per each rental unit. The project is proposed to have 109 rooms. Parking stalls provided within the project is 113. Therefore, onsite parking requirements appear to be substantially met and therefore impacts if any are considered less than significant.

- e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? ( 6 )

Pedestrian and bicycle street improvements are proposed for the project's Broadway and Texerna Court street frontages. Walkways are provided within the site that serves the proposed parking areas and the pedestrian

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.
- (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
improvements along both Broadway and Texerna Court. Based on project design, hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists are therefore not anticipated.				

f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? ( 20 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project was submitted to the El Dorado Transit for comment. El Dorado Transit had no concerns or issues with the project.

g) Rail or air traffic impacts? ( 7, 20 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Rail service does not serve Placerville. The site is within the Area of Influence, or overflight area for the Placerville Airport.

**VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.**

Would the proposal result in impacts to:

a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? ( 2 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

No known endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats are present on site or in the immediate project vicinity. However, project tree canopy removal involves 85 trees, including 73 Ponderosa pines. This tree removal will likely disturb squirrel and bird species. Raptors such as red tailed hawks, owls and turkey vultures are known to exist within the City. Raptors are protected under federal law. Therefore a potential exists that project construction and tree canopy activities will disturb nesting raptor species that may utilize mature oaks and pines within the project site and adjacent land. The following mitigation measure is expected to minimize potential impacts to nesting raptor species.

**Mitigation Measure**

**Biological-1.** This mitigation measure shall be included on the grading plans prior to grading permit issuance. The breeding/nesting season for raptors is March 1 through August 30. If construction activities take place outside of the breeding/nesting season, no additional measures will be required.

If construction is planned or desired during the breeding season, raptor nest surveys shall be conducted one week prior to tree cutting or grading near mature trees to ensure that active nests are not present. A qualified biologist shall conduct the surveys and prepare a survey report. If no raptor nests are discovered in the trees to be removed, no further mitigation will be required. A written report on the results of the visual surveys shall be submitted to the Planning Division a minimum of 48 hours prior to the beginning of construction activity.

If any active raptor nests are discovered during pre-construction surveys, the biologist shall mark all occupied trees and delineate a no construction activity buffer zone around the nests for the

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.
- (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

duration of the nesting season in accordance with California Department of Fish and Game guidelines for the applicable raptor species.

The construction contractor shall be responsible for construction scheduling. If construction is planned during the breeding season, the construction contractor shall be responsible for ensuring that a qualified biologist performs the raptor nest surveys within 1 week of planned tree removal. Authorization to proceed with construction activity shall be the discretion of the Planning Department.

This mitigation measure is expected to minimize impacts to nesting raptor species to a less than significant level (2) (D).

- b) Local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? ( 2, 15 )

The project proposes the removal of more than ten trees in conjunction with the grading of roads and building envelope development. However the project is a commercial endeavor that does not involve a residential subdivision of land and therefore it is not subject to City Code Section 8-13-4, the City's Woodland Alteration Permit and Plan regulations. There are two General Plan policies contained within the Natural, Cultural, and Scenic Resources that do address vegetative cover within Placerville:

Policy 3 of Goal D: New development shall be sited to protect native tree species, riparian vegetation, important concentrations of natural plants, and important wildlife habitat, to minimize visual impacts and to provide for continuity of wildlife corridors.

Policy 9 of Goal D: The City shall seek to protect and manage Placerville's tree cover to maximize ecological and aesthetic values consistent with the reasonable economic enjoyment of private property. To this end, the City shall adopt and enforce a Historical Tree Ordinance.

Although the project would remove 85 trees, most of which are Ponderosa pines, a comprehensive landscape plan is proposed for all disturbed and uncovered portions of the site. A total of 93 trees are to be planted on site. Tree species planted include Ponderosa Pines, Interior Live Oak, Chinese Pistache, Scarlet Oak, Japanese Red Maple, Aspen, Crape Myrtle, Western Red Cedar and Western Red Bud. Proposed tree planting is expected to mitigate for the project tree removal to a less than significant level.

The project's proposed removal of a timber stand of 85 trees is likely to require adherence with the Z'Berg-Nejedly Forest Protection Act for the single conversion to a non-timber growing use of timberland. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection have statutory review authority for timber harvesting within the State of California. This Initial Study was submitted to the California Division of Forestry for comment.

- c) Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool)? ( 1, 6 )

There are no wetland habitats that are known to exist within the project site. No impacts to wetland habitats are therefore anticipated.

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? ( 2 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

There are no known migration corridors that exist on the site. See Section VII a) above for discussion and mitigation measure regarding raptor disturbance.

**VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES.**

Would the proposal:

a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? ( 10 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Energy conservation plans have not been adopted by the City. New commercial construction will be required to comply with the State of California's energy efficiency standards known as Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations through the building permit plan review and inspection process. Therefore, no potential conflicts with the energy efficiency standards within state statute are anticipated.

b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? ( 7 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Due to the nature of the proposed project, no evidence exists that the project will use non-renewable or mineral resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner.

c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? ( 7 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Refer to Section VIII (b) above.

**IX. HAZARDS.** Would the proposal involve:

a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)? ( 6 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The construction of a new hotel, its operational use, new parking area and landscaping is not expected to create a health hazard, cause an explosion or release hazardous materials. No impacts are therefore anticipated.

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Possibly interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (15 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Project construction involving one hotel building, parking and landscaping is not expected to interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, nor create or result in a health hazard.

c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? ( 12 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Generally, all new commercial construction has the potential to create an environmental fire hazard. An automatic fire sprinkler system is proposed for the hotel along with four on site fire hydrants are be installed. The project was submitted to the El Dorado County Fire Protection District. Impacts if any are considered less than significant.

d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? ( 6 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There are no known existing sources of potential health hazards located on the project site.

e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? ( 6 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Landscaping is proposed within the site along with required automatic irrigation system installation. Increased fire hazards due to flammable brush, grass or trees is not anticipated.

**X. NOISE.** Would the proposal result in:

a) Increase in existing noise levels? (6 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Potentially significant short-term noise impacts are anticipated as a result of the project during site building construction and parking lot improvements.

**Mitigation Measure**

**Noise-1.** To minimize the potential impact of construction noise within the vicinity of the project site, all construction shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction shall be allowed on Saturday or Sunday, unless approved by the City's Building, Planning or Engineering Division. The City's Code Enforcement Division of the Department of Community Development shall monitor this mitigation measure for compliance with its stated intent. This mitigation measure shall become effective upon the issuance of a valid Building Permit from the Department of Community Development for the development pursuant to Site Plan Review 2008-02 (1) (D).

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? ( 6 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Severe noise associated with project construction is expected to be limited to the operation of machinery. This impact is considered temporary. The mitigation measure in Section X (a) above is expected to minimize the potential temporary impact of construction noise to a less than significant level.

**XI. PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

a) Fire protection? ( 12 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The site is located within the El Dorado County Fire Protection District. Anticipated project generated commercial construction is expected to potentially impact the City's fire protection services due to the additional structure and uses as a result of project completion. Standard development procedure requires that concurrently to the issuance of a building permit the project proponent pay El Dorado County Fire Protection District Mitigation Impact Fees to offset impacts to Fire District services. The impact fee as of the date of this Initial Study is \$0.135 per square foot for commercial construction with fire sprinklers. Payment of impact fees is expected to reduce the potential impact to these public services to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

**Public Services-1.** The project applicant or his/her successors, heirs, assigns and agents, etc., shall at time of building permit issuance for site development, pay the El Dorado County Fire Protection District Mitigation Impact Fee in effect on the date of permit issuance.

b) Police protection ( 12 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? ( 6 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

El Dorado County Office of Education has determined that commercial development within their school districts can have an impact on their schools and school districts. The Office of Education has implemented school impact fees for this. Standard development procedure requires that concurrently to the issuance of a building permit the project proponent pay El Dorado County Office of Education Mitigation Impact Fees to offset impacts to the local school district. The impact fee as of the date of this Initial Study is \$0.47 per square foot for commercial construction. Payment of impact fees is expected to reduce the potential impact to these public services to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

**Public Services-2.** The project applicant or his/her successors, heirs, assigns and agents, etc., shall at time of building permit issuance for site development, pay the El Dorado County Office of Education Mitigation Impact Fee in effect on the date of permit issuance.

d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? ( 7, 11 )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The City has a traffic mitigation fee program where a project applicant is required to pay impact fees at the time building permits are issued for new residential and commercial development. It has been the City's past practice to

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

give Traffic Impact Fee credit for previous uses regardless of when they were constructed. A project applicant would therefore be required to pay the difference, if any, between the TIM fees for the site's previous use and the proposed use. The payment of TIM fees is expected to reduce potential traffic impacts to City streets to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

**Public Services-3.** The project applicant or his/her successors, heirs, assigns and agents, etc., shall at time of building permit issuance for site development, pay the City of Placerville Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee in effect on the date of permit issuance, as determined by the City Engineer.

- e) Other governmental services? ( 6 )

**XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- a) Power? ( 6 )

Electric power utility from P.G.& E. serves the project site and the Broadway/Texerna Court vicinity. No new or substantial alteration to the existing electric power utility system is anticipated.

- b) Communications systems? ( 6 )

Telephone service from A.T.& T serves the project site and the Broadway/Texerna Court vicinity. Comcast, a cable television and high speed internet provider also serves the project site and surrounding community. No new or substantial alteration to the existing telephone system is anticipated.

- c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? ( 10 )

Due to the size and scope of the project's 109 room hotel, anticipated wastewater usage for the hotel use is not expected to impact the City's local treatment or distribution facilities. The City has adequate wastewater treatment plant capacity to serve the project.

- d) Sewer or septic tanks? ( 6 )

City sewer currently serves the vicinity of the project site within Broadway right-of-way. Sewer capacity constraints exist westerly of the project site. Downstream sewer main improvements are needed to handle increased flows resulting from this application and from other approved and proposed projects contributing flow to this system. Approximately 2000 feet of existing sewer main is undersized, with portions of this undersized main also needing to be rerouted along a more direct route near the existing Taco Bell restaurant. The old line will be taken out of service and all existing service connections must be rerouted as necessary and reconnected to the new main. A bypass system will not be allowed. Approximately 900 feet of this undersized main is planned to be upgraded in 2009 by the city with its Blairs Lane project. Other proposed developments upstream of this undersized sewer main will be required to participate in completion of portions of this sewer system upgrade.

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.
- (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**Mitigation Measure**

**Utilities and Service Systems-1.** Depending on timing of these other projects and developments, this applicant shall complete any portions of these sewer improvements that are necessary to convey the additional flows from this project. The applicant will receive credit against sewer fees for the cost of work the applicant completes to improve this sewer main, and the applicant may also enter into a reimbursement agreement with the city to recover additional costs above the amount being credited as other properties contributing to the increased flow in this section of sewer main develop.

- e) Storm water drainage? ( 10 )

A Final Drainage Study shall be prepared for review and approval by the City Engineer as part of the final improvement plans. Drainage facilities shall be designed and included in the final improvement plan submittal consistent with the Final Drainage Study. Design and construct drainage and detention facilities as recommended in the final drainage study in order to keep post development flows leaving the site at or below pre development levels. The study shall assume that the Astonia Estates projects final drainage system is complete and in place. The study shall not take credit for any reduction in upstream flow resulting from Astonia Estates detention systems. Changes to historical and existing drainage patterns will not be allowed without specific City approval. All areas of concentrated drainage flow shall be contained in a pipeline or improved channel to a City-approved discharge point. Conformance with the recommendations contained in said drainage study shall be required.

The plans for the Astonia/Placerville Estates subdivision upstream on Astonia Drive by Gene Thorne and Assoc. Inc. show upstream drainage being released into a ditch across this site. This applicant shall coordinate its drainage design with the upstream plans and shall provide the city with an irrevocable drainage easement offer for any portions of the onsite system that will be carrying upstream flows from Astonia Drive across this site. The city will reject these easements until such time as the upstream streets are installed and become public. The applicant shall agree to maintain all on-site storm drain systems in perpetuity.

- f) Solid waste disposal? ( 6 )

Solid waste disposal currently exists for parcels within the City. No new systems or services are anticipated.

- g) Local or regional water supplies? ( 10 )

Due to the size and scope of the project of a 109-room hotel, expected water usage is not anticipated to cause the need for new local or regional water supply. The City has adequate domestic water capacity within its system to serve the project.

**XIII. AESTHETICS.** Would the proposal:

- a) Affect on a scenic vista or scenic highway? ( 15 )

U.S. Highway 50 is a State-designated scenic route and is located 200 feet north of the project site. The site is visible from US 50. Project construction will cause the removal of 85 trees, grading and site disturbance totaling 3.4 acres, involving 18,000 cubic yards of cut and 22,500 cubic yards of fill. Therefore the project has the potential to affect the scenic US Highway 50. The proposed project building elevations, site layout, landscaping, signage and lighting

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

are subject to discretionary review by the Planning Commission per City Code Section 10-4-9 (Site Plan Review), and Section 10-3-1 (C). The Site Plan Review entitlement is processed concurrently with this Initial Study.

- b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? ( 6 )

Building design along with proposed landscaping are expected to enhance the project site from its pre-project condition as a multi-family residential facility. Based on the project design as submitted, a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect is not expected. The project is subject to discretionary review by the Planning Commission per City Code.

- c) Create light or glare? ( )

Building and exterior lighting from the proposed project will introduce light and glare into the area and site. The City of Placerville Exterior Lighting Ordinance applies strict criteria which prohibits the use of fixtures which are not "fully shielded" and requires lighting levels at property lines to be less than 0.03 foot candle. Conformance with the aforementioned ordinance is required and will result in a less than significant impact.

**XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the proposal:

- a) Disturb paleontological resources? ( 6 )

No known paleontological resources are known to exist on the project site. No impacts are anticipated.

- b) Disturb archaeological resources? ( 6 )

No known archaeological resources are known to exist on the project site. No impacts are anticipated.

- c) Affect historical resources? (13 )

There are no known historical resources known to exist on the site. No impacts are expected.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including Those interred outside of formal cemeteries? ( 6 )

There are no known human remains or cemeteries located or identified during the California Environmental Quality Act environmental analysis adopted with the approval of the Astonia Estates Subdivision project. None are expected as a result of project site disturbance activities. However, in the unlikely event cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities the following mitigation measure is expected to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**Mitigation Measure**

**Cultural Resources-1.** In the unlikely event human remains are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the applicant or his/her successors, heirs, or assigns, shall comply with Public Resources Code §21083.2 pertaining to the discovery of human remains. This shall include the applicant or his/her successors, heirs, or assigns, contacting the City Planning Department, cease all work on site in the area of the find, and limited adjacent areas as appropriate; the applicant shall contact the El Dorado County Coroner to investigate and determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the Coroner determines the remains are not of Native American origin, the applicant shall contact representatives from the El Dorado County Pioneers Cemetery Commission and the El Dorado County Museum. The applicant shall coordinate re-interment of burial finds with the Pioneers Cemetery Commission. If the Coroner determines the remains are those of a Native American origin, the coroner must contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. Work on the site will cease to allow for an archaeologist, at the expense of the applicant, to evaluate the finds, coordinate with the City of Placerville and the Heritage Commission for mediation (3) (D)(E).

**XV. RECREATION.** Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? ( 6 )
- 

The project use is expected to facilitate tourists and the highway traveling public due to its location and proximity to US Highway 50. Within the City as well as outside the City but within ½ hour driving time from the hotel, there are regional recreation facilities such as the City's Gold Bug Park, the State Park in Coloma, and United States National Forest lands. This project has the speculative potential to increase the use of these regional recreational facilities caused by an increase in tourist travelers to the City. However, due to the transitory nature of a typical hotel guest and the function of adjacent US Highway 50 as a major east-west highway between California and Nevada, this potential increase cannot be quantified accurately. Impact is therefore considered less than significant.

- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? ( 6 )
- 

Refer to Section XV (a) above.

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:

- (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- 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?
- 

Based on project design and supporting documents provided by the applicant and those referenced within this Initial Study, the project is not expected to potentially degrade the environment.

- b) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
- 

Construction impacts due to noise are anticipated with this project. Refer to Section X (a) for discussion and mitigation measure concerning project noise.

- c) 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.)
- 

Mitigation Monitoring and Sign-off footnotes:  
 (1) Prior to issuance of Building Permit; (2) Prior to onsite grading; (3) During construction; (4) Prior to occupancy.  
 (A) Engineering Division; (B) Developer; (C) Contractor; (D) Planning Division; (E) Other agency.

## Source Citations

1. City of Placerville Topographic Map (1982)
2. City of Placerville General Plan (1990)
3. *Geotechnical Engineering Study for Hilton Garden Inn*, Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. (May 2008).
4. California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines
5. Soil Survey of El Dorado County (1974)
6. Staff Determination/Experience
7. F.E.M.A. Flood Maps Community Panel Number 0757 E, Effective Date: September 26, 2008
8. Public Water
9. California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24, also known as the California Building Standards Code
10. Public Works Consultation
11. Fire District Consultation
12. Police Department Consultation
13. Historic Resource Survey (1982)
14. City of Placerville Emergency Response Plan
15. City Code of Placerville
16. Resource Conservation Service
17. El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District
18. *Trip Generation, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition*, Institute of Transportation Engineers (2003).
19. Placerville Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan
20. El Dorado Transit Consultation
21. Technical Memorandum: Hydrology & Hydraulics: Hilton Garden Inn, Placerville, CA – Smith Flat Engineering, Inc. (January 2008)
22. *Traffic Impact Analysis for Broadway Hilton Garden Hotel* – KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. (July 2008)



City of  
Placerville

Cleve Morris <cmorris@cityofplacerville.org>

---

## Fw: Hearing for Senior Housing 2/3/15

1 message

---

**Patty Borelli** <borellicouncil@sbcglobal.net>  
To: cleve morris <cmorris@cityofplacerville.org>

Tue, Feb 3, 2015 at 3:42 PM

— Original Message —

**From:** Mark ACUNA

**To:** Sent: Monday, February 02, 2015 9:43 PM

**Subject:** Hearing for Senior Housing 2/3/15

Hello:

Did anyone notice that tomorrow nights Planning Commission meeting includes a public hearing for a senior housing project on the former motel site on upper Broadway? Item 8.3 is being recommended for approval, with conditions, by staff to build 84,000 sq. ft., 3 story building.

Staff is recommending allowing senior housing in the existing Highway Commercial Zone. The staff report notes the site has been quiet since the 2007 motel project approval lapsed. It is suggested the lack of motel development on the site justifies the current request for senior housing.

Has anyone heard about this project and who the backers are?

Staff has an obligation to process any application that comes through the door and pays the fees. That said, why would the City place dozens of seniors in a corner of the town with no pedestrian access, facing Highway 50? The staff report is silent to lack of sidewalks off site, does not call for widening Broadway, no left turn lanes into the project are proposed and no bus pullout was noted. (Think of the pedestrian issues from the homeless camp, which was closer to the business district).

I also noted less than stellar design elements and issues with building mass and failure to enhance the site.

Should this group be involved in protecting our limited highway commercial zoning? Should this group question the value of placing a senior living facility in an area of Placerville that will remain isolated from numerous vital services?

Thank you for your thoughts. The reports are nicely posted on the City's website.

Mark

RECEIVED  
FEB 03 2015  
CITY OF PLACERVILLE  
COMMUNITY DEV. DEPT.