



Staff Report to the Agricultural Policy Advisory Commission

Application Number: **05-0629**

Applicant: Khosrow Haghshenas
Owner: **Khosrow** Haghshenas
APN: 052-271-03

Date: March 15, 2007
Item #: 6
Time: After 1:30 p.m.

Project Description: Proposal to demolish an existing gas station and construct a replacement gas station and convenience store with beer and wine sales, install five gas pumps, construct a car wash, and re-configure the parking lot.

Location: Property located on the east side of Lee Road, immediately west of Highway One, at 200 Lee Road in Watsonville.

Permits Required: Agricultural Buffer Setback Determination, Coastal Zone Permit, Amendments to Commercial Development Permits 75-962-PD, 84-1019-CDP & 94-0395.

Staff Recommendation:

- Denial of Application 05-0629, Agricultural Buffer Determination, based on the attached findings and conditions.
- Forward project to the Planning Commission **for further** review

Exhibits

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| A. Project plans 7/14/06 | E. Zoning map, General Plan map |
| B. Findings | F. Comments & Correspondence |
| C. Conditions (deleted) | G. Site photographs |
| D. Assessor's parcel map, Location map | |

Parcel Information

Parcel Size:	1.078 acres
Existing Land Use - Parcel:	Full service gas station
Existing Land Use - Surrounding:	Agriculture
Project Access:	Lee Road
Planning Area:	san Andreas
Land Use Designation:	CN (Neighborhood Commercial)
Zone District:	CT-W (Tourist Commercial - Watsonville utility prohibition)

Supervisory District: Second (District Supervisor: Pirie)
Within Coastal Zone: X Inside Outside
Appealable to Calif. Coastal Comm. X Yes No

Environmental Information

Geologic Hazards: Mapped floodplain
Soils: Conejo clay loam
Fire Hazard: Not a mapped constraint
Slopes: 0-2 percent slopes
Env. Sen. Habitat: Not mappedno physical evidence on site
Grading: 240 cubic yards cut & fill, balanced on site
Tree Removal: No trees proposed to be removed
Scenic: Mapped resource – Highway One scenic comdor
Drainage: Existing drainage adequate
Archaeology: Not mappedno physical evidence on site

Services Information

Inside Urban/Rural Services Line: Yes X No
Water Supply: city of Watsonville
Sewage Disposal: Septic system
Fire District: Pajaro Valley Fire Service Area
Drainage District: Zone 7 Flood Control/Water Conservation District

Project Description and Setting

The project site is located at 200 Lee Road in Watsonville. The subject property is characterized by flat topography. The only significant topographic change in the vicinity is associated with the Highway one embankments and off-ramps. The parcel is located outside the Urban Services Line and is an isolated tourist/commercial service use located adjacent to agricultural fields and the scenic Highway One comdor. The parcel carries a Neighborhood Commercial (CN) Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan designation and the implementing zoning is (CT-W) Tourist Commercial - Watsonville utility prohibition. Commercial Agriculture (CA) zoned land is located adjacent to the property on the north (the 15.6 acre Redmond Foundation organic farm and site of the historic Redmond House) and to the west (the 84-acre Willoughby vegetable farm), across Lee Road from the site. Another CA zoned property lies to the south (the 12 acre Colendich farm), across the 130-foot wide entrance ramp area at the west end of Riverside Drive.

The proposed project is to demolish an existing full service Chevron gas service station and to construct a replacement facility. The existing service station consists of a 2,128 sf service station and a 1,496sf canopy over two pump islands with 8 fueling stations. The replacement self-service gas station and appurtenant facilities would be substantially larger. The five pump islands (10 fueling stations) would be covered by a 2,948 sf canopy, roughly twice the size of the existing canopy. The proposed 6,550 sf building would be located at the rear of the property and would include a convenience store (with beer and wine sales), a restaurant, and a car wash. A 27-foot wide area is shown at the front of the building. This 2,900 sf area would likely be used for outdoor eating or resting. This building would be more than three times the size of the existing building.

Agricultural Buffers

A reduced agricultural buffer of some type is necessary due to the fact that the parcel is entirely within the 200-foot agricultural buffer setbacks from the two CA zoned properties noted above. The existing and proposed setbacks from the canopy, building and paved area to the Commercial Agricultural land is shown in the following table.

	From Willoughby*	From Redmond - north	From Redmond - northeast
Existing - To canopy	110-feet	80-feet	N/A
Proposed - To canopy	109-feet	50-feet	N/A
Existing - To building	175-feet	65-feet	78-feet
Proposed - To building	217-feet	53-feet	<8-feet
Existing - To pavement	75-feet	6-feet	14-feet
Proposed - To pavement	75-feet	<6-feet	9-feet

* setback includes 75-foot width of Lee Road right-of-way

As can be seen from the table, the proposed canopy remains at about the same distance from the Willoughby property, but it is 30-feet closer to the Redmond property. The site plan also indicates that the width of the canopy facing the Willoughby property will increase from 24-feet to 136-feet. The proposed building exceeds the 200-foot buffer requirement from the Willoughby property but it reduces the existing setback from the Redmond property to less than 8-feet. The portion of the building closest to the Redmond property is the proposed car wash structure. There is virtually no change to the extent of the paved area on the property.

The biggest overall change that will result as a part of the project is the extent and location of the non-agricultural land use on the property. With the existing service station use, the highest level of public use on the property occurs around the fueling stations and at the front of the service station building, within the 100-feet or so of the property adjacent to Lee Road. The areas to the rear and sides of the building are primarily used for parking and vehicle storage. With the proposed facility, the public use of the property will extend throughout the property, with very little inactive space.

Discussion

In order to approve a reduction in the required 200-foot agricultural buffer, specific findings are required that indicate how the reduction in the buffer setback will not adversely impact the agricultural use of the neighboring CA zoned land. There are no topographic changes or existing protected vegetative screens between the commercial use and the agricultural land that would effectively supplant the 200-foot buffer nor does the proposal include the provision of physical barriers other than narrow landscape areas (7-8 foot wide) and 6-foot chain link or wooden fences. Because any use of the property would require some buffer reduction, County Code section 16.50.095(d)(4) states that a *“lesser buffer setback distance may be permitted, provided that the maximum possible setback distance is required, coupled with a requirement for a physical barrier (e.g., solid fencing and/or vegetative screening) to provide the maximum buffering possible.”* [emphasis added]

Staff does not believe that **this** finding can be made for the proposed gas station replacement. First, the proposed project **is** three times the size of the existing service station and includes uses (car wash, restaurant) that significantly change the intensity of use on this property. Second, the placement **of** the building at the rear of the property (with the car wash located behind it) moves the uses closer to agricultural land with little if any physical barrier between the agricultural and non-agricultural uses. Third, the project could be redesigned to increase the separation between the agricultural land (particularly the Redmond property) and the proposed use, and to provide physical screening between the uses.


Recommendation


- Staff recommends that your Commission **DENY, without prejudice**, the Agricultural Buffer Reduction for the proposed replacement gas station from the adjacent CA zoned properties known as APN 052-271-04 and 052-581-09, proposed under Application # 05-0629, based on the attached findings.

Supplementary reports and information referred to in this report are on file and available for viewing at the Santa Cruz County Planning Department, and are hereby made a part of the administrative record for the proposed project.


The County Code and General Plan, as well as hearing agendas and additional information are available online at: www.co.santa-cruz.ca.us

Report Prepared By: Joan **Van** der Hoeven
Santa Cruz County Planning Department
701 Ocean Street, 4th Floor
Santa Cruz CA 95060
Phone Number: (831) 454-5174
E-mail: pln140@co.santa-cruz.ca.us

Report Reviewed By: 
Mark Deming
Assistant Planning Director



RIGHT ELEVATION



COLOR SELECTIONS:

- [illegible]

KEY NOTE:

- [illegible]


EXTENSIONS

0-10-2018-0100304

▶ **PAUL E. ARNOLD & ASSOCIATES**
210 N. BACCHIONO AVENUE, SUITE 300
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611
TELEPHONE: (800) 224-1723

pre5	DRAWING TITLE BY DATE CHECKED BY DATE APPROVED BY DATE PROJECT NO. SHEET NO.	PROPOSED COMMERCIAL BUILDING FOR PAJARO VALLEY CHEYRON JONOSON MACHINERIES, OWNER PAJARO, CALIFORNIA SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	NO.	DATE	REVISION
0	BY _____ DATE _____	PROJECT NO. _____ SHEET NO. _____			

PLANT LIST	
NO.	DESCRIPTION
1	SPRAWLING SPREADER
2	SPRAWLING SPREADER
3	SPRAWLING SPREADER
4	SPRAWLING SPREADER
5	SPRAWLING SPREADER
6	SPRAWLING SPREADER
7	SPRAWLING SPREADER
8	SPRAWLING SPREADER
9	SPRAWLING SPREADER
10	SPRAWLING SPREADER
11	SPRAWLING SPREADER
12	SPRAWLING SPREADER
13	SPRAWLING SPREADER
14	SPRAWLING SPREADER
15	SPRAWLING SPREADER
16	SPRAWLING SPREADER
17	SPRAWLING SPREADER
18	SPRAWLING SPREADER
19	SPRAWLING SPREADER
20	SPRAWLING SPREADER



LANDSCAPE NOTES:

1. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE BY THE CONTRACTOR.

2. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

3. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

4. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

5. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

6. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

7. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

8. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

9. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

10. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

11. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

12. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

13. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

14. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

15. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.


16. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

17. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

18. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

19. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.

20. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SAN JOSE LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS.



LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN

LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN
PAJARO VALLEY CHEVRON
PAJARO, CALIFORNIA

DAVE E. ARRIAGA - ARCHITECT
1000 BROADWAY, SUITE 200
SAN JOSE, CA 95128
PHONE: 408-281-1981

DATE: 10/14/94
DRAWN BY: [Name]
CHECKED BY: [Name]
APPROVED BY: [Name]

PROPOSED COMMERCIAL BUILDING FOR
PAJARO VALLEY CHEVRON
KHOSROU HAGHSHENAS, OWNER
PAJARO, CALIFORNIA - SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
84

1. "The New York Times" - a newspaper published in New York City, USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.
2. "The Washington Post" - a newspaper published in Washington, D.C., USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.
3. "The Los Angeles Times" - a newspaper published in Los Angeles, California, USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.
4. "The Chicago Tribune" - a newspaper published in Chicago, Illinois, USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.
5. "The New York Times" - a newspaper published in New York City, USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.
6. "The Washington Post" - a newspaper published in Washington, D.C., USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.
7. "The Los Angeles Times" - a newspaper published in Los Angeles, California, USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.
8. "The Chicago Tribune" - a newspaper published in Chicago, Illinois, USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.
9. "The New York Times" - a newspaper published in New York City, USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.
10. "The Washington Post" - a newspaper published in Washington, D.C., USA. It is one of the most influential newspapers in the world.




[illegible]

EXHIBIT A


 ③ • LANDMAN SITE
SITE PLAN
 MAP-UG-1-00


PAUL H. ALVARO - ARCHITECT
 4170 N. MACARTHUR AVENUE, SUITE 300
 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60641
 PHONE: 763-1133

PROPOSED COMMERCIAL BUILDING FOR
**PAJARO VALLEY
CHEVRON**
KENDRON MAGUIRE, OWNER
PAJARO, CALIFORNIA SANTA CRUZ COUNTY



Required Findings for Agricultural Buffer Setback Reduction
County Code Section 16.50.095(b)

1. Significant topographical differences exist between the agricultural and non-agricultural uses which eliminate the need for a 200 foot setback; or
2. Permanent substantial vegetation (such as, a Riparian Corridor or Woodland protected by the County's Riparian Corridor or Sensitive Habitat Ordinances) or other physical barriers exist between the agricultural and non-agricultural uses which eliminate or minimize the need for a two hundred (200) foot agricultural buffer setback; or
3. A lesser setback distance is found to be adequate to prevent conflicts between the non-agricultural development and the adjacent agricultural development and the adjacent agricultural land, based on the establishment of a physical barrier (unless it is determined that the installation of a barrier will hinder the affected agricultural use more than it would help it, or would create a serious traffic hazard on a public or private right-of-way) or the existence of some other factor which effectively supplants the need for a two hundred (200) foot agricultural buffer setback.

Finding 1: Not applicable. There is no significant topographic difference between the agricultural and non-agricultural uses.

Finding 2: Not applicable. There are no permanent substantial vegetative or other physical barriers between the agricultural and the proposed non-agricultural uses other than narrow strips of landscaping and standard property line fencing.

Finding 3: The gas station structure is proposed to be set back about 8 feet from the adjacent Commercial Agriculture zoned lands (the 15.6-acre Redmond Foundation organic farm). Also, the use within the rear area of the building consists of a car wash, resulting in higher public activity levels very close to CA land. No physical barriers are proposed to separate the uses other than ordinary chain link fencing and a narrow strip of low level landscaping. This is an inadequate physical barrier to supplant the required 200-foot buffer.

As proposed, the canopy will be slightly closer to the Willoughby property than the existing although the canopy will be over 5 times as wide facing that property. With the 75-foot width of the Lee Road right-of-way, the effective agricultural setback to the 84-acre Willoughby veggie farm would be 109-feet where 200 feet are required. This existing west setback is approximately 110-feet. Because this area is where the existing service station impacts occur and due to the expanse of the Lee Road right-of-way, the proposed improvements in this area are not a concern with regards to the agricultural buffer setback.

This finding cannot be made.

4. The imposition of a 200 foot agricultural buffer setback would preclude building on a parcel of record as of the effective date of this chapter, in which case a lesser buffer setback distance may be permitted, provided that the maximum possible setback distance is required, coupled with a requirement for a physical barrier, or vegetative screening or other techniques

to provide the maximum buffering possible, consistent with the objective of permitting building on a parcel of record.

Finding 4: **This** finding cannot be made because alternatives have not been explored to provide the maximum buffering possible. These alternatives must include a review of site designs and barrier installations to provide the greatest possible setback distance from the agricultural land. As proposed, the service station is located as close to the Redmond organic farm property as possible (less than 8-feet from the agricultural land) with no adequate physical barriers.

5. Required findings for non-agricultural development on commercial agricultural land, County Code section 16.50.095(e).



Finding 5: The subject parcel is zoned CT-W (Tourist Commercial - Watsonville utility prohibition) and carries a Neighborhood Commercial (CN) General Plan designation. **The** parcel is not designated for agricultural production. The parcel is within 200 feet of Commercial Agriculture zoned land, but is not zoned Commercial Agriculture or Agricultural Preserve.

EXHIBIT C





DELETED




Location Map



Legend

-  APN 052-271-03
-  State Highways
-  Assessors Parcels
-  Streets



Map Created by
County of Santa Cruz
Planning Department
October 2005

FOR TAX PURPOSES ONLY

THE ASSESSOR MAKES NO GUARANTEE AS TO MAP ACCURACY NOR ASSUMES ANY LIABILITY FOR OTHER USES. NOT TO BE REPRODUCED. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

© COPYRIGHT SANTA CRUZ COUNTY ASSESSOR 2000

POR. RANCHO BOLSA DEL PAJARO
SECS. 8 & 17, T.12S., R.2E., M.D.B. & M.

Tax Area Code
69-262



52-27

Willoughby

050581-09

*84 acres 91RS4
4/15/96*

*84 acres
4/15/96*



PROJECT LOCATION



EXHIBIT D

Note - Assessor's Parcel & Block
76 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

Assessor's Map No. 52-27
County of Santa Cruz, Calif.
A.M. 2000




Zoning Map



Legend


-  APN 052-271-03
-  State Highways
-  Assessors Parcels
-  Streets
-  COMMERCIAL-TOURIST
-  AGRICULTURE COMMERCIAL
-  SPECIAL USE
-  CITY PROPERTY



Map Created by
County of Santa Cruz
Planning Department
October 2005




General Plan Designation Map



Legend

-  APN **052-271-03**
-  State Highways
-  Assessors Parcels
-  Streets
-  Commercial-Neighborhood (C-N)
-  Agriculture (AG)



Map Created by
County of Santa Cruz
Planning Department
October 2005

EXHIBIT E

C O U N T Y O F S A N T A C R U Z
DISCRETIONARY APPLICATION COMMENTS

Project Planner: Joan Van Der Hoeven
Application No.: 05-0629
APN: 052-271-03

Date: December 29, 2006
Time: 11:57:55
Page: 1

Environmental Planning Completeness Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 18, 2005 BY ROBERT S LOVELAND =====
NO COMMENT

Environmental Planning Miscellaneous Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 18, 2005 BY ROBERT S LOVELAND =====

Conditions of Approval :

1. Submit a soils report (3 copies) completed by a California licensed geotechnical engineer for review.
2. Submit a "Plan Review" letter from the project geotechnical engineer prior to building permit issuance.
3. The project architect or civil engineer must complete the following Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) document prior to building permit approval: "Flood Proofing Certificate for Non-Residential Structures (FEMA Form 81-65)" and submit to Environmental Planning for review.

Long Range Planning Completeness Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 19, 2005 BY STEVE D GUINEY ===== Is proposal consistent with the "W" zoning? Please see County Code sections 13.10.491 st seq.

Long Range Planning Miscellaneous Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 19, 2005 BY STEVE D GUINEY =====
NO COMMENT

Project Review Completeness Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 21, 2005 BY JOAN VAN DER HOEVEN =====
Project is inconsistent with Santa Cruz County Design ordinance 13.11 Provide a sign plan - signs not to be internally lighted. Project lies within the scenic corridor of Highway One. Sign #11, "Thank You" to be placed at the Lee Road exit rather than at the rear property line. Designate trash/recycling area. Parking lot landscaping/lighting plan to show all details. Revise rear Lantana ground cover with taller landscaping to minimize visual impact. Parking lot areas shall be landscaped with one tree per five parking spaces. Use tree wells, at least 5 feet square to break up expanses of paving. Use colored/stamped concrete to direct pedestrian movement. No Canvas awnings are permitted - the area is agricultural and adjacent to historic Redman House - incorporate the use of wooden materials that are more consistent with existing historic development. Canopy is to be wood faced - use neutral earth tones.
===== UPDATED ON MARCH 1, 2006 BY JOAN VAN DER HOEVEN =====
Submit plan of all signs proposed for the site. Design review comments
===== UPDATED ON MARCH 1, 2006 BY JOAN VAN DER HOEVEN =====

Discretionary Comments - Continued

Project Planner: Joan Van Der Hoeven
Application No.: 05-0629
APN: 052-271-03

Date: December 29, 2006
Time: 11:57:55
Page: 2

OPW Drainage issues outstanding - phone 831-454-2160, Carisa Regalado. DPW Road Engineering - Greg Martin. Obtain all required permits from the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District as per the Feb 7, 2006 correspondence.

===== UPDATED ON AUGUST 22, 2006 BY JOAN VAN DER HOEVEN =====

NO COMMENT Address all reviewing agency comments. The project cannot move forward to any public hearing until all comments have been satisfactorily addressed. As per County Code Section 13.10.581h, no illuminated signs are permitted within the Highway one scenic corridor. As per County Code Section 13.11, the parking areas shall be landscaped with large canopy trees to reduce glare and heat from the pavement and to provide visual relief from large expanses of pavement. A minimum of one tree per five parking spaces is required. Tree wells can be used to break up the area. The large area in front of the gas station 25 x 120 feet needs to be made more pedestrian friendly with seating, landscaping etc to offer visual relief and a place to rest a while before heading on down the freeway.

Project Review Miscellaneous Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 21, 2005 BY JOAN VAN DER HOEVEN =====
record an agricultural statement of acknowledgement.

===== UPDATED ON MARCH 1, 2006 BY JOAN VAN DER HOEVEN =====

NO COMMENT

===== UPDATED ON AUGUST 22, 2006 BY JOAN VAN DER HOEVEN =====
NO COMMENT

Dpw Drainage Completeness Comments

LATEST COMMENTS HAVE **NOT YET** BEEN SENT TO **PLANNER** FOR THIS AGENCY

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 21, 2005 BY CARISA REGALADO =====

An engineered drainage plan and stormwater calculations for the site were received and reviewed for completeness of the discretionary development application and compliance with the County Design Criteria and County General Plan policies (g.p.p.). To be approved by this division at the discretionary application stage, all potential off-site impacts and mitigations must be determined; therefore, proposed projects must conclusively demonstrate that (see drainage guidelines):

Please address the following items:

- 1) The existing drainage system on Lee Road has been proposed for use by this project with a partial description given. A complete description of the system including capacity assessment for the drainage basin, identification of downstream restrictions, etc. must be submitted.
- 2) Flood overflow for the corresponding tributary drainage area must also be submitted.
- 3) (g.p.p. #7.23.1 - New Development) Projects are required to maintain predevelopment rates where feasible. Mitigating measures should be used on-site to limit increases in post-development runoff leaving the site. Best Management Practices should be employed within the development to meet this goal as much as possible. Such measures include pervious or semi-pervious pavements, runoff surface spreading,

Project Planner: Joan Van Der Hoeven
Application No. : 05-0629
APN: 052-271-03

Date: December 29, 2006
Time: 11:57:55
Page: 3

discharging roof and driveway runoff into landscaping, etc. As mentioned in the Conclusions of the stormwater calculations by Bowman & Williams, permeable pavements may be possible in the parking stall areas. Please show proposed mitigations on the plans and account for the affects in stormwater calculations.

4) (g.p.p. #7.23.2 - Minimizing Impervious Surfaces) Extensive impervious surfaces are proposed with the majority of runoff being directed to Lee Road. New development is required to limit such coverage to minimize post-development runoff. Consider pervious or semi-pervious type surfaces for driveways and patios.

5) This development is within the Pajaro River floodplain. Please show that the finish floor elevations have provided 300 mm freeboard from the Q100 or flood of record flow for the convenience store / restaurant.

6) The increase in impervious area shown on the plans, sheet C1, does not agree with a check on the difference between the existing and proposed impervious surfaces listed just above. Please clarify.

7) The existing and proposed impervious surfaces shown on the stormwater calculations do not match those shown on the plans, sheet C1. Please clarify.

For your information:

8) Construction activity resulting in a land disturbance of one acre or more, or less than one acre but part of a larger common plan of development or sale must obtain the Construction Activities Storm Water General NPDES Permit from the State Water Resources Control Board. Construction activity includes clearing, grading, excavation, stockpiling, and reconstruction of existing facilities involving removal and replacement. For more information see:
<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/stormwater/constfaq.html>

9) A source for BMP style mitigation methods can be found in the following publication: START AT THE SOURCE. Design Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Protection, 1999 Edition. Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association. Forbes Custom Publishing.

A free copy may be obtained:
<http://www.mcstoppp.org/acrobat/StartattheSourceManual1.pdf>

A bound version may be ordered: <http://www.basmaa.org/>

Until further information is submitted addressing the above comments, a thorough review of this application cannot be completed. Once submitted, additional items may need to be addressed before the application can be deemed complete.

This application is for development in the Santa Cruz County Flood Control and Water Conservation District - Zone 7A; therefore increases in impervious area will be assessed a drainage fee. The fees are currently \$0.90 per square foot.

All subsequent submittals for this application must be done through the Planning

Discretionary Comments - Continued

Project Planner: Joan Van Der Hoeven
Application No.: 05-0629
APN: 052-271-03

Date: December 29, 2006
Time: 11:57:55
Page: 4

Department. Submittals made directly to Public Works will result in delays.

Please call or visit the Dept. of Public Works. Stormwater Management Division, from 8:00 am to 12:00 pm if you have any questions. ===== UPDATED ON MARCH 3, 2006 BY CARISA R DURAN =====
Revised civil plans, drainage calculations, and letter from Bowman and Williams dated January 20, 2006 were-received

Although this parcel is in a FEMA designated zone AO, the Q100 water surface elevation at this site is still required. Please submit.

Calculations have been accepted as submitted. Please see Miscellaneous Comments for additional notes to be addressed at the building application stage.

After submittal of information addressing the above comment, additional items may need to be addressed before the application can be deemed complete. ===== UP- DATED ON AUGUST 21, 2006 BY CARISA R DURAN =====
A letter from Architect Frank E. Areyano dated July 24, 2006 was received regarding flood plain comments. This letter does not address outstanding review items.

In addition to FEMA and County Code regulations, this development is subject to the County of Santa Cruz Design Criteria (latest edition was approved by the County Board of Supervisors in June 2006). See Section D of Stormwater Management for reference of previous comments. Furthermore, elevation of non-residential structures above the 100-year flood level is also required by County Code, Section 16.10.070. Per the Code, floodproofing is only allowed when elevation is not feasible.

Comments from review #1, item # 5 (Oct. 21, 2005) and review #2 (Mar. 3, 2006) are outstanding and must be addressed before this application can be considered complete.

Please note: After submittal of information addressing the above comment, additional items may need to be addressed before the application can be deemed complete.

Dpw Drainage Miscellaneous Comments

LATEST COMMENTS HAVE **NOT** YET BEEN SENT TO PLANNER FOR THIS AGENCY

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 21, 2005 BY CARISA REGALADO =====
No comment. ===== UPDATED ON MARCH 3, 2006 BY CARISA R DURAN =====
Please address the following items at the building application stage:

- 1) Existing, proposed, and total site areas still do not match between the plans and drainage calculations. Please correct.
- 2) For the civil engineer's consideration, the runoff coefficient, 'c', can be adjusted for the proposed semi-pervious pavement area and applied within the composite 'c' value. This may result in lesser detention storage requirement. =====
UPDATED ON AUGUST 21, 2006 BY CARISA R DURAN =====
No comment.

Discretionary Comments - Continued

Project Planner: Joan Van Der Hoeven
Application No. : 05-0629
APN: 052-271-03

Date: December 29, 2006
Time: 11:57:55
Page: 5

Dpw Driveway/Encroachment Completeness Comments

===== REVIEW ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2005 BY RUTH L ZADESKY =====
Show driveway plan view and centerline profile.
Show existing ground and driveway elevations on profile.
Sight distance minimum 250 feet, traffic engineer may be required.
===== UPDATED ON JANUARY 26, 2006 BY RUTH L ZADESKY =====

Dpw Driveway/Encroachment Miscellaneous Comments

===== REVIEW ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2005 BY RUTH L ZADESKY =====
Driveway to conform to County Design Criteria Standards.
Encroachment permit required for all off-site work in the County road right-of-way.
===== UPDATED ON JANUARY 26, 2006 BY RUTH L ZADESKY =====
Driveway to conform to County Design Criteria Standards.
Encroachment permit required for all off-site work in the County road right-of-way.

Dpw Road Engineering Completeness Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 20, 2005 BY GREG J MARTIN =====
Show existing striping on Lee Road. The curb return for the driveway to the car wash is less than the 15 foot minimum required. Show an irrigation and landscaping plan. Show the existing and proposed site plans on separate sheets. Show the saw cut line a minimum of 2 feet from the lip of gutter. Clearly show right-of-way on both sides of Lee Road and easements. Show a typical section for Lee Road. Show a section for the parking lot and driveway on site.

If you have any questions please call Greg Martin at 831-454-2811. ===== UPDATED ON FEBRUARY 14, 2006 BY GREG J MARTIN =====
Show existing striping on Lee Road. Show a typical section for Lee Road. Additional comments may-be made once this information had been provided.

If you have any questions please call Greg Martin at 831-454-2811. ===== UPDATED ON AUGUST 21, 2006 BY GREG J MARTIN =====
Previous comments addressed satisfactorily.

Dpw Road Engineering Miscellaneous Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 20, 2005 BY GREG J MARTIN =====
===== UPDATED ON FEBRUARY 14, 2006 BY GREG J MARTIN =====
===== UPDATED ON AUGUST 21, 2006 BY GREG J MARTIN =====

Environmental Health Completeness Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 5, 2005 BY JIM G SAFRANEK =====
===== UPDATED ON FEBRUARY 9, 2006 BY JIM G SAFRANEK ===== A review of the septic file shows that this parcel applied for but never received a septic final in 1969. The septic system will need to be upgraded under permit through EHS. Contact Ruben Sanchez of EHS at 454-2735 for onsite sewage disposal permitting reqs.
===== UPDATED ON AUGUST 14, 2006 BY JIM G SAFRANEK ===== Previous comments still apply.

Discretionary Comments - Continued

Project Planner: Joan Van Der Hoeven
Application No.: 05-0629
APN: 052-271-03

Date: December 29, 2006
Time: 11:57:55
Page: 6

Environmental Health Miscellaneous Comments

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 5, 2005 BY JIM G SAFRANEK =====

Hazardous materials or hazardous waste are to be used, stored or generated on site: contact the appropriate Hazardous Material Inspector in Environmental Health at 454-2728 for permitting requirements prior to submitting building plans.

Applicant must obtain approval for an Environmental Health Plan Review prior to submittal of building plans. Applicant must obtain Environmental Health Plan Check approval, a construction inspection final and a Food Establishment Health Permit prior to opening. Contact Roger Houston of Environmental Health at 454-2734.

===== UPDATED ON FEBRUARY 9, 2006 BY JIM G SAFRANEK ===== Both of my previous comments still apply.

===== UPDATED ON AUGUST 14, 2006 BY JIM G SAFRANEK ===== No change in comment.

NO COMMENT

Pajaro Valley Fire District Completeness Comments

LATEST COMMENTS HAVE NOT YET BEEN SENT TO PLANNER FOR THIS AGENCY

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 18, 2005 BY COLLEEN L BAXTER =====

DEPARTMENT NAME: PAJARO VALLEY FIRE Note on the plans that these plans are in compliance with California Building and Fire Codes (2001) as amended by the authority having jurisdiction. The job copies of the building and fire systems plans and permits must be onsite during inspections. Note on these plans the occupancy load of each area. Show where the occupancy load signs will be posted. SHOW on the plans a public fire hydrant, meeting the minimum required fire flow for the building, within 150 feet of any portion of the building. This information can be obtained from the water company.

Fire hydrant shall be painted in accordance with the state of California Health and Safety Code. See authority having jurisdiction.

NOTE on the plans that the building shall be protected by an approved automatic fire sprinkler system complying with the currently adopted edition of NFPA 13 and Chapter 35 of California Building Code and adopted standards of the authority having jurisdiction.

NOTE on the plans that an UNDERGROUND FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM WORKING DRAWING must be prepared by the designer/installer. The plans shall comply with the UNDERGROUND FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM INSTALLATION POLICY HANDOUT. Building numbers shall be provided. Numbers shall be a minimum of 4 inches in height on a contrasting background and visible from the street. additional numbers shall be installed on a directional sign at the property driveway and street.

NOTE on the plans that the roof covering shall be no less than Class "B" rated roof. Show the location of Knox Box.

The access road shall be 16 feet minimum width and maximum twenty percent slope. All Fire Department building requirements and fees will be addressed in the Building Permit phase. Plan check is based upon plans submitted to this office. Any changes or alterations shall be re-submitted for review prior to construction. 72 hour minimum notice is required prior to any inspection and/or test.

Note: As a condition of submittal of these plans, the submitter, designer and installer certify that these plans and details comply with the applicable Specifica-

Discretionary Comments - Continued

Project Planner: Joan Van Der Hoeven
Application No.: 05-0629
APN: 052-271-03

Date: December 29, 2006
Time: 11:57:55
Page: 7

tions. Standards. Codes and Ordinances, agree that they are solely responsible for compliance with applicable Specifications. Standards. Codes and Ordinances, and further agree to correct any deficiencies noted by this review, subsequent review, inspection or other source. and. to hold harmless and without prejudice, the reviewing agency.

Pajaro Valley Fire District Miscellaneous Comments

LATEST COMMENTS HAVE **NOT YET** BEEN SENT TO PLANNER FOR THIS AGENCY

===== REVIEW ON OCTOBER 18, 2005 BY COLLEEN L BAXTER =====

