



### 3.0 ISSUE SUMMARY

There are several environmental and policy constraint issues that affects the development of this property. Following this discussion, staff will identify specific areas where direction is requested (see Section 6). The most critical issues are briefly described below:

#### 3.1 Request for Rezone and General Plan Amendment

Staff is seeking comment and direction from the Commission which will assist with project analysis and determination of consistency with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The applicant requests a rezone from Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10) to Planned Commercial (CP). The rezone seems appropriate based on the majority of the site that is already designated as Commercial (C) under the current General Plan. Similar commercial zones, land use designations, and commercial uses along this section of Cameron Park Drive surround the site. In addition, a General Plan amendment for this project proposes to redesignate an approximate 2.5-acre strip along the rear property that currently has a High Density Residential (HDR) designation. The amendment would designate this area as Commercial to match the Commercial designation of the remaining 8 acres.

#### 3.2 Tentative Parcel Map, Slopes and Reasonable Use

The project slope map identifies that nearly 15 percent of the 10.54-acre site consists of slopes classified as 30 percent or greater. General Plan *Policy 7.1.2.1* and interim interpretive guidelines prepared for the policy require that newly created parcels have sufficient land area with slopes under 30 percent to accommodate anticipated development. The applicant requests a tentative parcel map to subdivide the lot into two new parcels, and staff would like further direction about ‘reasonable use’ outlined in the interim guidelines. Based on the guidelines for commercial ‘non-residential’ development, there is a greater degree of flexibility and discretion allowed for these types of projects. Staff would typically request a decision about ‘reasonable use’ at a public hearing and instead requests input at this time. The issues that should be considered for ‘reasonable use’ include:

- a) Steepness. The slope map illustrates areas of 30 percent slopes and steeper as one classification. There is no further analysis of slopes in the 40, 50, or steeper percent categories.
- b) Site design and grading techniques. Because of the Cameron Park Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) 7:1 transitional non-building plane, this project would require 430,100 cubic yards of dirt be excavated with most of that cut to be exported off site. The project would also create 1:1 slopes 70 to 90 feet in height with benching as required by the grading ordinance.
- c) Grading ordinance standards. While the project has not been reviewed by County staff to determine whether the project conforms to grading policies or practices, it is expected that the project would meet the standards established by the County’s grading ordinance.
- d) Natural drainage patterns. In anticipated coordination with the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), the project would observe, maintain, and/or design appropriate drainage to address both on- and off-site drainage to meet the County and ACOE standards.
- e) Geologic stability. A preliminary geotechnical investigation prepared in 1988 concludes the site’s geologic stability. This project will be distributed to County staff to ensure site stability based on County standards.

- f) Character of adjacent commercial uses. Most adjacent commercial uses are smaller in scale and less intense than this project. Lowering of the overall site elevation with proper grading would allow the buildings to be more compatible with the surrounding properties and would lessen the visual impacts of the large buildings.
- g) Extent of slopes to be disturbed. The site proposes disturbance of all classified slopes 30 percent and greater.
- h) Conformance with general requirements. The project proposes grading which requires further input about whether such grading meets the intent of the interim guidelines for slope preservation for a 'non-residential' project. Input and direction about the commercial element of the 'reasonable use' discussion should also consider the added site constraint imposed by the 7:1 transitional non-building plane created by the CLUP.

In addition, the applicant would like the Planning Commission to consider the one lot versus a two parcel tentative parcel map for process and direction when considering factors for 'reasonable use'. The one lot option would construct the bowling alley, its accessory uses, and the office building on the existing 10.54-acre site, which may better meet the intent of the interim guidelines. Should this first step be approved by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, the applicant would follow up with the two parcel tentative parcel map application to separate the bowling alley and its accessory uses from the office building.

Because the above process may side step the interim policies, the applicant would like the Planning Commission to consider 'reasonable use' of the project by allowing the tentative parcel map to be processed as a consolidated action with the rezone and General Plan amendment application that is currently on file for this project. Regardless, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors must make a General Plan consistency determination for either process.

### 3.3 Rare Plants

Based on a September 18, 2006, Botanical Study provided by Sycamore Environmental, a survey was conducted during the 2006 bloom period for rare plants. The survey found about 6,800 plants on site, and a majority of these plants would be affected by this project. An additional 1,000 rare plants were discovered on a 60-foot wide access easement that extends off Meder Road and across Bureau of Land Management (BLM) owned property. These 1,000 plants would not be affected because the Department of Transportation will allow vehicular access from Cameron Park Drive.

### 3.4 Oak Woodland Preservation

The project site consists of about 40 to 59 percent of oak woodland tree canopy and is adjacent to the Cameron Park Unit of the Pine Hill Preserve. The applicant believes that the maturity of existing trees supporting such canopy and the types of oaks that exist on the site, including poison oak, may affect the project from preserving the required canopy. Staff has assured the applicant that poison oak is not considered as part of oak woodland canopy.

The General Plan and interim interpretive guidelines for *Policy 7.4.4.4* require 80 percent retention of qualifying oak woodland tree canopy and will require replacement of removed canopy. The current site design would preserve 40 to 50 percent of qualifying oak canopy, which is below the required 80 percent retention standard. The construction of the primary and secondary vehicular access off Cameron Park Drive, to be included in the final design of the project, may further affect the quantity of canopy that may need to be removed. With the absence of Option B for mitigation, the applicant would be required to retain the minimum required canopy and would need to replace impacts on- or off-site based on the interim guidelines.

### 3.5 Grading

The project proposes 430,100 cubic yards of cut, of which 4,450 cubic yards would be redistributed on-site, and 425,650 would be exported to an undisclosed location off-site. The quantity of grading would require that large 1:1 slopes be created near the rear portion the property. This is required given some of the site constraints created by environmental issues and the Cameron Park Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). Staff, however, recognizes that there are some benefits in creating such large slopes on the property. First, the project would meet airport safety standards outlined by the CLUP. Second, tucking large buildings into the slopes would soften the visual effects of the development on the surrounding community, and the buildings would further screen the sloping areas. Third, the physical separation created by such large-scale slopes would provide an added buffer between the Cameron Park Unit of the Pine Hill Preserve and the developed parts of the property.

### 3.6 Site Design/Intensity

As designed, this project proposes a floor area ratio of 22 percent, which is below the maximum 25 percent allowed by the General Plan. Staff would appreciate any comments concerning the site design, parking, and circulation.

## 4.0 General Plan and Policy Consistency

The applicant would like early feedback from the Planning Commission on these issues. At this time, it appears that the project might be consistent with some of the policies of the General Plan, including elements of the slope preservation *Policy 7.1.2.1*, rare plant *Policy 7.4.1.1*, and oak woodland preservation *Policy 7.4.4.4*.

## 5.0 Project and Agency Review

Staff and the applicant have initiated a regular meeting schedule to ensure that the issues raised in this memo can be addressed. Depending on the direction provided to staff from the Planning Commission, this project would be circulated internally to the multi-disciplinary County review team. It would also be forwarded to external agencies including, but not limited to, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G), Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS), and others. These agencies may provide comments and conditions.

## **6.0 Processing**

This conceptual review is meant to allow for early Commission input on this project. Once direction has been given, staff will provide the applicant a letter clarifying processing options. Should it be decided that this project can proceed to a formal public hearing with the current rezone, General Plan amendment, and tentative parcel map application that is on-file, the project would require a Planning Commission recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for a final decision. Staff would schedule the project for a formal review by your Commission after the environmental review has been completed.

### **ATTACHEMENTS:**

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Zone Map
- C. General Plan Land Use Map
- D. Preserve Map
- E. Tentative Parcel Map (Site Plan)
- F. Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan
- G. Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan (7:1 CLUP transitional diagram)