8.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Section 8 is organized as follows:

8.1 Introduction

8.2 Format of the Response to Comments: This section describes the format and organization of the comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the responses to those comments.

8.3 Index of Comments Received: This section provides a list of the comments received on the Draft EIR by a member of the public, agency, company, or organization, and lists the unique number for each commenter.

8.4 Response to Comments: This section provides individual responses to comments provided in letters and oral testimony.

8.5 Public Comments Received After the Close of the Comment Period: This section provides comment letters received after the 45-day public comment period for the Draft EIR for informational purposes. No response to comments are required by CEQA; however, the City has provided for these letters as a courtesy.

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Comments received during the 45-day public comment period for the Draft EIR, ending May 26, 2016, included written comments from nine individuals, one agency, as well as the Applicant. Oral testimonies were received from three individuals, along with the Applicant and four Planning Commissioners during a public workshop held on May 17, 2016. In accordance with 2016 CEQA Statute and Guidelines, this section provides a written response to each of these received comments, and describes any revisions to the EIR due to accepted comments and suggestions as well as reasoned analysis in response to specific comments and suggestions that were not accepted. In addition, five written comment letters and emails were received by individuals after the close of the public comment period on May 26, 2016. Comment letters that were received after the close of the formal public comment period have been also included at the end of this section.

8.2 FORMAT OF THE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comments received on the Draft EIR are organized by written comments, then oral testimonies. Each comment letter or e-mail, and testimony is assigned a unique number with each comment individually numbered as well. Individual comments and issues within each comment letter or e-mail are numbered individually along the margins in Section 8.3. For example, Comment 2-1 is the first substantive comment in Comment Letter 2; “2” represents the commenter; the “1” refers to the first comment in that letter.
8.3 INDEX OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

Table 8-1 lists all agencies, organizations, companies, and individuals that provided written and oral comments on the Draft EIR. As described above, each comment letter was assigned a unique number.

Table 8-1. Index of Comments Received on the Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter Number</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Comment and Response to Comment Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Brubaker, Jeff – San Luis Obispo Council of Governments</td>
<td>8-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Albert, Colleen</td>
<td>8-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bachmann, Anne</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Clift, Warren</td>
<td>8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ingham, Doug</td>
<td>8-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Jones, Daniel</td>
<td>8-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Joralemon, Gary</td>
<td>8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lori (no last name provided)</td>
<td>8-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Schmidt, Marilyn</td>
<td>8-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Zammit, Kent and Sue</td>
<td>8-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>C.M. Florence, AICP Agent, Oasis Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>8-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Testimonies at Public Hearing (May 17, 2016)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Commissioner John Mack</td>
<td>8-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Commissioner Terry Fowler-Payne</td>
<td>8-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Commissioner Glenn Martin</td>
<td>8-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Commissioner John Keen</td>
<td>8-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Osty, Linda</td>
<td>8-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>C.M. Florence, AICP Agent, Oasis Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>8-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Bennett, Minetta</td>
<td>8-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Gibson, Shirley</td>
<td>8-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Comments Received After the Close of the Comment Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Austin, Don and Joanne</td>
<td>8-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Hedderig, Bruce</td>
<td>8-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Keating, Linda</td>
<td>8-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Nichols, Ann</td>
<td>8-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Osty, Linda and Kent and Sue Zammit</td>
<td>8-57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

The following pages contain copies of the comment letters. Presented first is a copy of the comment letter with vertical lines indicating the extent of specific numbered comments, and on the subsequent pages are the corresponding numbered responses to individual comments.
8.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

8.4.1 Organizations

Pujo, Julia

Subject: FW: East Cherry Avenue Specific Plan EIR

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeff Brubaker <JBrubaker@slcog.org>
To: jfrickerbach <jfrickerbach@slcog.org>
Cc: Rich Murphy <RMurphy@slcog.org>
Sent: Mon, May 23, 2016 6:22 pm
Subject: East Cherry Avenue Specific Plan EIR

John,

Related to the subject DEIR, SLOCOG’s 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) includes the following projects:

- STH-RORS-1401: Traffic Way / Fair Oaks Ave. intersection operational improvements

SLOCOG has also programmed discretionary funding to the City of Arroyo Grande for the preliminary engineering phase of operational improvements at Fair Oaks Ave. and Orchard Ave.

The RTP also includes STH-MHWY-1403 – South Traffic Way / Fair Oaks Ave. extension – new interchange construction; however, this project is listed as “unconstrained” (i.e. not expected to be funded/implemented within the next 20 years).

The 2014 RTP can be found here: http://www.slcog.org/programs/regional-planning/2014-rtp.aspx

Jeff Brubaker, AICP
Transportation Planner
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG)
1114 Marsh St. | SLO, CA 93401
805-788-2104
Commenter 1 – Jeff Brubaker, San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG)

Comment Response 1-1: Comment noted and identification of related transportation projects included in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan is much appreciated. Edits have been made to Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic, to incorporate these planned projects into the impact discussion. See pages 3.10-22 and 3.10-29.
8.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

8.4.2 Individuals

Pujo, Julia

Subject: FW: Cherry Ave. project

From: Colleen Albert <albert589@icloud.com>
Date: May 23, 2016 at 4:02:20 PM PDT
To: jfrickenbach@aol.com
Subject: Cherry Ave. project

I am all for progress, but I suspect it will set a precedent if there is a project that features one cultural group. Please drop the Japanese influence and make project for everyone. Thanks,

Colleen
Commenter 2 – Colleen Albert

Comment Response 2-1: Comment respectfully noted; however, the commenter addresses the Project rather than the adequacy of the EIR. The substance of this comment will be considered by City decision-makers as they consider potential Project approval.
Pujo, Julia

Subject: FW: Development on East Cherry

-----Original Message-----
From: Anne Bachmann <anne@loorchids.com>
To: jtrickenthal <jtrickenthal@apl.com>
Sent: Tue, May 24, 2016 11:56 am
Subject: Development on East Cherry

We live just down the way on Branch Mill Road and this proposed development is way too much for this area. Subarea 1, which is a three story hotel, will be higher than any building in AG and so out of character for a housing area. Then Subarea 2 with 58 homes. Have you considered the traffic problems you would have with the addition of that many homes plus a hotel. Even if a traffic light was put in, you have all the entering traffic from Hwy 101 going north that would have only one block before it hits a traffic light. Then you have all the traffic from the current homes in this area and also the Amroyo Grande High school. The congestion will be even greater than it is currently. It is too much.

Subarea 3 would better fit this area and not add that much to traffic or congestion. I would be all for it but definitely not the other two proposals. To go from agriculture land to this huge development, even though it is at the southern end of town, does not make sense. If you would monitor the amount and type of vehicles that use East Cherry now, you would understand the problem.

Anne Bachmann
955 Branch Mill Rd
Amroyo Grande
Commenter 3 – Anne Bachmann

Comment Response 3-1: Thank you for your comment. Regarding the height of the hotel within Subarea 1, while the hotel could have a maximum height of up to 36 feet, the design, height, massing, and character of the hotel would be required to comply with Arroyo Grande’s Design Guidelines and Standards for Design Overlay District Traffic Way and Station Way (D-2.11), which state that buildings shall have a small to moderate scale with horizontal massing, and shall have an architectural character that transitions to the historic character within Arroyo Grande. Further, the hotel as well as the entirety of the Project would be subject to review by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to ensure that the Project would be consistent with the design guidelines and the character of the surrounding area.

Comment Response 3-2: Please refer to Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic and Appendix K regarding traffic associated with 58 residences and the hotel. The traffic analysis found that while traffic operations on East Cherry Avenue and the northbound Highway 101 ramp would slightly increase, impacts would not exceed City level of service (LOS) thresholds within the General Plan and would be less than significant. Please note that the proposed traffic signal at Fair Oaks Avenue/Traffic Way was found mitigate significant impacts and is estimated to reduce delay from existing conditions, from 34.6 seconds to 16.4 seconds in AM peak hour and from 26.9 seconds to 24.9 seconds (see Tables 3.10-2 and 3.10-7).

Comment Response 3-3: Your comments in support of the proposal for Subarea 3 and in opposition to Subareas 1 and 2 have been acknowledged. Please see Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources regarding the conversion of agricultural land to developed uses, and Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic, regarding Project-generated traffic.
Debbie Weichinger

From: Warren Clift
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2016 3:02 PM
To: Debbie Weichinger
Cc: Jim Hill; Tim Brown
Subject: Cherry Lane Development

Not another sell out to Nick Thompkins and his buddies again!

That’s good ag land (see food!) and water is too precious and scarce now.

This is on your very own website; http://www.think2onow.com/

Thanks Warren Clift
Commenter 4 – Warren Clift

Comment Response 4-1: Thank you for your comments and your opposition to the Project has been noted. Section 3.2, *Agricultural Resources*, describes impacts to agricultural lands within the Project site and Impact UT-3 with Section 3.11, *Utilities and Public Services* describes water usage resulting from the Project.
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East Cherry Avenue Specific Plan EIR
City of Arroyo Grande

Name: Doug Ingham  Date: 5/17/2016  Address: 1111 Flora Road  Arroyo Grande

Comment:
1. Smaller project size is preferable.
2. Stop sign at NB 101 off ramp.
3. No spur to S.B. property at unity road south.
4. Spur road to Franklin property south should be made prominently in your future EIR.
5. Access concerns about traffic way.
6. Traffic sign at S.B. 101 on ramp in front of gas station if project goes forward to slow traffic on/off of freeway.
7. Stop sign at traffic and cherry lane.
8. No restaurant I expect to a restaurant unless confined to hotel 1st floor.

Please submit to:
City of Arroyo Grande
Attn: John Rickenbach
300 East Branch Street
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
Email: jfrickenbach@aol.com

Comment period closes on May 26, 2016 @ 5:00 PM.

THANKS

Doug Ingham
Commenter 5 – Doug Ingham

Comment Response 5-1: Your preference for a smaller Project size is acknowledged.

Comment Response 5-2: Your comments on traffic and transportation have been noted. For further detail on transportation issues and Project impacts, please refer to Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic.

- Please note that U.S. Highway 101 northbound off-ramp onto Traffic Way is not proposed to be stop sign controlled. However, MM TRANS-5a recommends a circulation study that would further study traffic conditions to reduce potential impacts.

- Please note a road is proposed leading to the property to the south of the Project site as this is proposed as part of the update for the City of Arroyo Grande General Plan, Circulation Element. However, this road is not proposed to be connected to Trinity Avenue under the Project.

- Thank you for your suggestion. This road is already included as part of the Project.

- Project trip generation and distribution onto Traffic Way is described within Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic, and Appendix K.

- Please note that U.S. Highway 101 southbound on-ramp does not proposed to be stop sign controlled. However, MM TRANS-5a recommends a circulation study that would further study traffic conditions to reduce potential impacts.

- Please note that East Cherry Avenue at Traffic Way is already stop sign controlled.

Comment Response 5-3: Your opposition to the restaurant, unless confined to the hotel 1st floor, has been noted in this EIR. Thank you for your comment.
Pujo, Julia

Subject: FW: East Cherry Ave Specific Plan EIR - Comment Card

From: Dan <danpacificsun@aol.com>
Date: May 26, 2016 at 2:19:20 PM PDT
To: <jfrickenbach@aol.com>
Cc: <jhill@arrowogrande.org>, <bharmon@arrowogrande.org>, <tbrown@arrowogrande.org>, <jauthrie@arrowogrande.org>, <jbarniech@arrowogrande.org>

Subject: East Cherry Ave Specific Plan EIR - Comment Card

City of Arroyo Grande
Attn: John Rickenbach

Subject: East Cherry Project "Comment Card"

Hi John,

I read the article in the SLO Tribune Tuesday; due to today's deadline for community input I am emailing my response.

I have resided on Allen Street for the past 33 years and am employed in local agriculture. I have served as past President of the Arroyo Grande Lions Club and also as co-chair of the Arroyo Grande Teen Commission.

I live about a block distance away from the project and will be impacted by whatever development goes in.

I am against this project as proposed; mainly because of the residential density, meager available water resources and concerns over traffic safety.

Subarea 1

Although a 3 story hotel meets the current height limits and would be suitable downtown, I think it would stand out in stark contrast to the other building elevations on Traffic Way. I think the ordinance should be revised to restrict elevations to 24 feet, instead of 30 feet, along Traffic Way.

Also, I don't believe the City is presently restricting water consumption at the hospital or hotels; allowing new, unrestricted construction while restricting residents seems rather unfair.

Subarea 2

The developers are aiming high by proposing 60 residential lots; this density would be unprecedented in the city and appears to be roughly 25% more than the surrounding neighborhoods. I would prefer to see a maximum of 45 lots.

I object to the proposed increased water consumption for the same reason previously stated.

6-1
6-2
6-3
6-4
6-5
Traffic safety is a big concern. Presently the Traffic Way/East Cherry intersection is barely functional. I believe that this project will create a dangerous situation and the developers should be required to pay for a signal; otherwise I think the City taxpayers will get stuck with dealing with it in the future.

Subarea 3

I have no objections to Japanese Cultural Center as proposed and think that it would be an asset to our community.

Sincerely,

Daniel Jones
315 Allen Street
Arroyo Grade, CA 93420
Commenter 6 – Daniel Jones

Comment Response 6-1: We appreciate your comments and feedback on the Draft EIR. We also acknowledge your opposition to the Project. Please see comment responses below regarding project density, water resources, and traffic safety.

Comment Response 6-2: Thank you for your comment. Regarding the height of the hotel within Subarea 1, the hotel could have a maximum height of up to 36 feet, and has been evaluated in regards to current and applicable zoning height regulations. The design, height, massing, and character of the hotel would be required to comply with Arroyo Grande’s Design Guidelines and Standards for Design Overlay District Traffic Way and Station Way (D-2.11), which state that buildings shall have a small to moderate scale with horizontal massing, and shall have an architectural character that transitions to the historic character within Arroyo Grande. Further, the hotel as well as the entirety of the Project will be subject to review by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to ensure that that project would be consistent with the design guidelines and the character of the surrounding area.

Comment Response 6-3: Comment noted. The Project’s water consumption is described in detail within Impact UT-3, Section 3.11, Utilities and Public Services. As described in this section, agricultural land uses within the Project site currently use an estimated 34.86 acre-feet per year (afy) of water, with a historic long-term water use of 41.34 afy. The Project was calculated to result in a water demand of 36.22 afy. Overall, the Project would result in a slight net decrease from historic water use, which accounts for cyclic variations in water use typical for agricultural operations by approximately 5.12 afy and would therefore not result in a net increase upon City water supplies. Additionally, as described in Section 2.0, Project Description, the Project would incorporate low water fixtures and appliances and drought tolerant landscaping in order to conserve water.

Comment Response 6-4: Thank you for your comment and your preference for less residential lots has been noted. This EIR analyzes a Project alternative that would potentially reduce the number of lots within Subarea 2 (see Section 5.4.2.2, Reduced Development Alternative).

Comment Response 6-5: Comment noted. Please see Comment Response 6-3.

Comment Response 6-6: Thank you for your comment. Traffic safety is a priority for the City and the intersection of Traffic Way/East Cherry Avenue was analyzed for traffic safety issues; see Impact TRANS-5 within Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic. MM
TRANS-5a recommends a circulation study to study circulation of vehicles from Project access points to Traffic Way and East Cherry Avenue, which would further study traffic conditions and provide recommendations to reduce potential safety impacts.

Comment Response 6-7: Thank you for your comments and your support of the Japanese Cultural Center has been noted in this EIR.
-----Original Message-----
From: gary joralemon <gjoralemon@gmail.com>
To: fjriekenbach <fjriekenbach@aol.com>
Sent: Wed, May 25, 2016 6:15 pm
Subject: East Cherry Proposed Development

Good Evening Mr. Riekenbach.

As a 30 year home owner in Arroyo Grande, I am writing in regards to the proposed development at the end of East Cherry.

I think the Japanese cultural garden, senior housing, farm stand and historic orchard would make an appropriate addition to our city. However, I have strong reservations regarding the remaining portions of the three phase proposal. In particular, I am strongly opposed to the addition of a large hotel in that area for the same reasons I did not support the hotel in the village.

First, we simply do not have sufficient water at this time for such a project. Visitors tend to have little or no interest in local water woes and can't reasonably be counted on to conserve. Second, a two lane road in and out of the area is simply insufficient for additional businesses and housing, and would create traffic problems for the residents of the area. Finally, for a town our size, I believe we have sufficient hotel rooms at present, and to further build hotels is repetitive and not in keeping with our present “small town” ambiance.

Thank you for your consideration,

gary Joralemon
852 Willow Lane
Arroyo Grande
441-0485
Commenter 7 – Gary Joralemon

Comment Response 7-1: Thank you for your comments. Your opinions of the Japanese cultural garden and hotel are duly noted in this EIR.

Comment Response 7-2: In regard to the comment on water supply, a detailed analysis of Project water demand is included within Section 3.11, Utilities and Public Services, and in particular, impacts to the City’s water supply are discussed in Impact UT-3. Water conservation measures are also included as part of the Project (see Section 2.6.4) which include low water fixtures and appliances, and drought tolerant landscaping.

In regard to comments on circulation and ingress/egress onto East Cherry Avenue, Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic, and Appendix K analyze circulation issues in depth. In particular, Impacts TRANS-5 addresses ingress/egress from the Project site onto adjacent roadways and found impacts to be less than significant. In addition, a recommended mitigation measure, MM TRANS-5a, recommends a circulation study to study circulation of vehicles from Project access points to Traffic Way and East Cherry Avenue, which would further study traffic conditions and provide recommendations to reduce potential safety impacts.

Lastly, in regard to comments on the hotel and keeping present with the “small town ambiance,” this EIR analyzes changes to visual character resulting from the Project within Section 3.1, Aesthetic Resources. The character of the hotel would be required to comply with Arroyo Grande’s Design Guidelines and Standards for Design Overlay District Traffic Way and Station Way (D-2.11), which requires buildings to have an architectural character that transitions to the historic character within Arroyo Grande. Further, the hotel as well as the entirety of the Project would be subject to review by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to ensure that that Project would be consistent with the design guidelines and the character of the surrounding area.
From: Lori <lorbro7@gmail.com>
Date: May 23, 2016 at 6:52:39 PM PDT
To: jfrickenbach@aol.com

AG traffic and Cherry development. I am against any kind of hotel in this area and large numbers of residential units. I think the senior development is needed but please limit housing to 1/4 acre each so the rural feel isn't taken away. No apartments or hotels please even if you try to compromise with a park.

8-1
Commenter 8 – Lori (no last name provided)

Comment Response 8-1: Thank you for your comments. Regarding your comment on Arroyo Grande traffic, please refer to Section 3.10, *Transportation and Traffic* and the Traffic Impact Analysis within Appendix K, which includes a detailed analysis of transportation and traffic impacts generated by the Project. Your opposition to the hotel and residences included in the Project has been duly noted in this EIR, as well as your opinion on the senior housing within Subarea 3. For further analysis on impacts to the “rural feel” or agricultural character of the Project site, please refer to Section 3.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources.*
Pujo, Julia

Subject: FW: Development off Cherry Street

-----Original Message-----
From: Marilyn <mamoop@charter.net>
To: trickenbach <trickenbach@aol.com>
Sent: Mon, May 23, 2016 9:22 pm
Subject: Development off Cherry Street

Are you kidding us Arroyo Grande residents? You think anyone in A.G. thinks a three story hotel and cramped housing is a good thing? Why three stories high!!! You force us to let our lawns die because we are desperate for water, you fine us if we don’t. Yet you think it’s great to bring in hundreds of tourists along with their 45 minute showers is just fine!! This developer sure has someone’s ear? Recently the Hotel in our Village was approved. This area is where the locals have been without a grocery store since JJ’s left us. You think this is really a great thing for the locals? No way. Just keep bringing in the tourist dollars and keep causing the local tax payers to suffer the traffic and water rationing. Why do you want to turn us into a Santa Barbara wanna-be town. Quit with only looking at tax dollars and maybe stop and think about the town of Arroyo Grande as a place for the LOCALS to live, NOT just for tourists who come and go. We intend to attend meetings to voice our displeasure on this proposed development on Cherry Street.
Marilyn Schmidt

Sent from my iPad
Commenter 9 – Marilyn Schmidt

Comment Response 9-1: Thank you for your comments. Your opinions on the proposed Project have been duly noted in this EIR. It is noted that the commenter largely addresses the Project proposal rather than the adequacy of the EIR, and comments should be directed to City decision-makers. Please note that the current zoning for Subarea 1 (where the proposed hotel would be located) allows a maximum height of 36 feet, or three stories with a conditional use permit. Regarding water demand for the proposed Project, Section 3.11, Utilities and Public Services contains a detailed analysis of impacts to City water supply and found impacts to be less than significant. Also see Comment Response 6-3.
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Pujo, Julia

Subject: FW: Comments to Cherry Ave Development

-----Original Message-----
From: Zammit, Kent <KKEZAMMIT@epri.com>
To: [TRICKENBAECH@AOL.COM]
Cc: Zammit, Kent <KKEZAMMIT@EPRI.COM>; suezammit <SUZAMMIT@GMAIL.COM>
Sent: Mon, May 23, 2016 4:41 pm
Subject: Comments to Cherry Ave Development

Dear Mr. Rickenbach,

My name is Kent Zammit, and I live at 3880 Santa Domingo Road, off Huasna Road. I have watched with some interest the plans to develop the subject properties, and I do have some concerns.

1) By far my biggest concern is the increased traffic all of these projects will bring to the intersection of Cherry and Traffic Way. I witness close calls at this intersection all the time, and have also seen how difficult it can be to exit from Cherry onto Traffic Way at peak traffic times. This has only gotten worse in the 10 years I have lived in AC, as additional housing is built. It is especially difficult at peak times, including school start/stop times. Unless there are plans for traffic control (stop signs or lights) – this will create a real problem especially for those trying to turn south on Traffic Way to enter 101 South.

2) The addition of yet another hotel in that area would further degrade the residential character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

3) A three story hotel is out of character for that area AND Arroyo Grande in general. The scale of that building should match the surrounding community. Where else does AC have 3 story buildings?

4) The addition of a restaurant there does not make sense, since there are limited feed roads for the increased traffic. It seems to me that restaurants should be located on major feeder roads, like Grande and in the Village, places where traffic management and parking support such high volumes and turnover.

5) Water concerns – when we are experiencing high drought conditions for multiple years, why are we allowing high density development like hotels and such?

6) Parking – many current residents of Cherry use street parking for their vehicles. There appears to be no provision for where those cars would park once these parcels are developed. Parking is already a difficult issue on Cherry. If you are visiting any of the residences on the north side of the street, unless they happen to have a large enough driveway to accommodate multiple cars. How is this going to be addressed in the new plans?

I think the idea of the Japanese Community Center and Gardens fits well with the character of this community and the local neighborhood better than the other two proposals, and would support that effort.

Thank you for your consideration,
Kent and Sue Zammit
805-481-7349
KKEZAMMIT@EPRI.COM

1
Commenter 10 – Kent and Sue Zammit

Comment Response 10-1: Thank you for your comments on the EIR. In regard to traffic issues, Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic, contains a detailed analysis on circulation and traffic at the intersection of East Cherry Avenue/Traffic Way and Traffic Way/U.S. Highway 101 ramps. The Transportation Impact Analysis within Appendix K of this EIR found that while the Project would add trips to these intersections and would result in slightly longer intersection delays (e.g., less than 5 seconds during peak hour traffic), traffic would not exceed City LOS thresholds within the General Plan and would be less than significant. In addition, Impact TRANS-5 analyzes ingress/egress from the Project site onto East Cherry Avenue and Traffic Way. A recommended mitigation measure, MM TRANS-5a, is also included while would require an additional circulation study to guide ingress/egress from Subarea 1, which would identify potential measures to further reduce traffic and circulation impacts.

Comment Response 10-2: The hotel’s impact on visual character of the vicinity is discussed in Section 3.1, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, and found impacts to be less than significant. Further, the hotel as well as the entirety of the Project would be subject to review by the ARC to ensure that that Project would be consistent with the character of the surrounding area. The hotel within Subarea 1 would serve as a transitional use from commercial and highway commercial uses along Traffic Way to residential uses along East Cherry Avenue. In accordance with the Design Guidelines and Standards for the Design Overlay District D-2.11, the hotel design would include an architectural character that would transition to the historic character within Arroyo Grande. In addition, buildings shall have a small to moderate scale with horizontal massing, and shall have an architectural character that transitions to the historic character within Arroyo Grande. In addition,
proposed design guidelines specific to the Specific Plan area would be implemented, which would ensure a high quality character compatible with the surrounding village character.

**Comment Response 10-4:** Your comment has been noted. However, as Subarea 1 is zoned TMU, the restaurant is already a conditionally allowable use that could be developed within the Subarea 1 site regardless of whether the East Cherry Avenue Specific Plan is approved. Traffic issues associated with the proposed restaurant are included within the analysis of this EIR within Section 3.10, *Transportation and Traffic*.

**Comment Response 10-5:** The Project’s water consumption is described in detail within Impact UT-3, Section 3.11, *Utilities and Public Services*. As described in this section, agricultural land uses within the Project site currently use an estimated 34.86 acre-feet per year (afy) of water, with a historic long-term water use of 41.34 afy. The Project was calculated to result in a water demand of 36.22 afy. Overall, the Project would result in a slight net decrease from historic water use, which accounts for cyclic variations in water use typical for agricultural operations by approximately 5.12 afy and would therefore not result in a net increase upon City water supplies. Additionally, as described in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, the Project would incorporate low water fixtures and appliances and drought tolerant landscaping in order to conserve water.

**Comment Response 10-6:** Please note that street parking along East Cherry Avenue would be provided to accommodate approximately 24 spaces and is planned as part of the roadway improvements. Please see Section 2.6.5, *Circulation and Parking*, and Figures 2-5 and 2-6. For proposed residences within the Project site, parking would include two spaces per unit within an enclosed garage as well as street parking along proposed residential interior streets.

**Comment Response 10-7:** Thank you for your comments and your opinions on the Japanese cultural gardens and proposals for Subareas 1 and 2 have been noted within this EIR.
8.4.3 Applicant

26 May 2016

Ms. Teresa McClish, Director of Community Development
Mr. John Rickenbach, Contract Planner
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE
300 East Branch Street
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

RE: APPLICANT’S COMMENTS TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR) – EAST CHERRY AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN, SCH # 201501067,
CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE, CALIFORNIA

Dear Teresa and John,

On behalf of SRK Hotels, MFI Limited, and the Arroyo Grande Valley Japanese Welfare Association, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the East Cherry Avenue Specific Plan DEIR. We have read, with interest, the document, and feel that we have been appropriately involved with the process to date. Consensus from the applicant team is that the document does a suitable job of presenting and analyzing the project and related CEQA issues. Based upon our assessment of the document, our collective comments are not of a substantial nature, but are intended to provide additional clarity. Thank you, in advance, for your review and acceptance of these comments.

**Page 2 – 2** Table 2.2
Please correct the spelling of Margaret IKEIDA.

**Page 2-19, Table Subarea 3**
Please correct the section on the table called Existing Use to read solely “undeveloped” and eliminate the description of agricultural row crops.

**Page 2-28, Figure 2.7 and Page 2.29 bulleted narrative description**
The residential interior street with and without linear park graphics and description have been recently revised to reflect the City Engineer’s comments. The revised vesting tentative tract map now reflects those modifications. See attached 11” x 17” plan reductions.

**Page 3.1-13, Figure 3.1-3 and Page 3.1-15, Figure 3.1-4**
The simulation depicts a two-story unit on E. Cherry Avenue. The applicant has agreed to designing and constructing one-story units for the alley loaded lots 1 – 24. Is it necessary to change these simulations in the DEIR, accordingly?

**Page 3.1-20, Subarea 3 Impacts line 4**
Modify “removal of several larger trees” to “removal of a few larger trees”.

**Page 3.2-23 thru 29 AO 2, MM AO 2a & 2b**
The DEIR has defined the project’s long-term operational emissions impacts (unmitigated) to be **significant and unavoidable.** Should the City Council decide to approve the various entitlements, they will be asked to make a finding of overriding considerations. Based upon that potential, it would seem appropriate to underscore the following:

- The threshold exceedance levels for ROG + NOx and PM2.5 are described as “marginally” significant (i.e., 28% and 93% over the threshold levels, respectively), and
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- Although the applicants are committed to incorporate mitigation measures from the ACPD Air Quality Handbook into their respective projects, many of these measures are unquantifiable in the CalEEMod model, thereby perhaps misrepresenting that the projects’ emissions are truly over the established threshold levels.

Page 3.3 33 thru -36/AQ-5, MM AQ-5a

The DEIR has determined that the projects are in non-conformance with the 2001 Clean Air Plan (assuming that this is inclusive solely of Subarea 2 and Subarea 3, since Subarea 1 is incorporated into the City’s General Plan as Traffic Mixed Use). Although, the DEIR conversely states that the projects are consistent with the land use strategies in the Clean Air Plan (i.e., compact communities, mixed land use, jobs/housing balance, circulation management, etc.).

Given the age of the Clean Air Plan, the fact that a comprehensive assessment of the City’s growth patterns has not been analyzed (i.e., has there been strict adherence to the General Plan project build out and a determination that the City’s overall growth patterns since 2001 and the CAP are inconsistent?), there does not appear to be a definitive nexus between the projects’ impacts, the CAP, the City’s growth patterns, and an acknowledgement that other measures may have decreased the projections in the CAP.

Again, the City Council will be asked, if project entitlements are approved, to make a finding of overriding consideration for this significant and unavoidable impact. The DEIR or City staff would wise to bring this “potential” for significance to the decision-makers, as its basis can be questioned.

With regards to MM AQ-5, would it be possible for the City, in coordination with SLORTA or SCT, to determine the need for a transit stop and the related costs associated with such an improvement now? How would the “fair share” contribution be determined, as this seems open ended at this juncture.

Page 3.6-3, Figure 3.6-1

The map has a label – Man-made Drainage Culvert that appears to be pointing to the existing ditch at the toe of the hillside above Subarea 2 and Subarea 3. Please revise, accordingly.

Page 3.10-26 MM TRANS:3h

The following mitigation measure language was modified by the applicant and subsequently, reviewed and accepted by the City. It is important to note, that even with mitigation, the existing traffic/transportation systems are deficient, and unless and until improvements are implemented, this is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. The applicant would request that the DEIR reflect this revised mitigation measure.

East Grand Avenue/West Branch Street: The Applicants shall pay a fair share portion of the design and construction costs for transportation improvements that would provide an acceptable LOS consistent with adopted City policy, in order to mitigate the Project’s long-term impact on the cumulative condition, using the Equitable Share Responsibility Formula from the 2002 Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies.

Applicants shall fund a fair share of the estimated costs for construction of two roundabouts at the intersection of east Grand Avenue/U.S. Highway 101 northbound ramps and the intersection of East Branch Street and Traffic Way.
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The Applicants shall submit payment of their fair share of funding for the above mitigation prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits. The City shall determine the amount of payment of fair shares for each Applicant commensurate with metrics that demonstrate the relative level and intensity of proposed development (e.g., square footage, land use type, trip generation, etc.). The City shall establish a separate East Grand Avenue/West Branch Street traffic mitigation fund to accept the Applicant’s payment(s).

Page 3.11-14 UT 3

The applicants concur with the conclusion that the implementation of the project would result in an overall decrease in water demand compared to historic water demand. However, in addition to the applicant’s Water Use Assessment (RRM, November 2015) the Public Works Supervisor, Shane Taylor has provided water use calculations with the conclusion that “the proposed project will increase the City water supply by 7 acre feet/year (emphasis added) after a 3-year period in which metered use can be used to determine actual use”. This important information should be included in the DEIR and attached for reference.

Page 5.5, 5.4.2.1 No Project Alternative, para 2, lines 3 & 4

Subarea 3, while currently zoned Agriculture, has never been cultivated, therefore, please modify the sentence “...ongoing agricultural production would continue in Subareas 2 and 3, with associated water use...” to reflect that only Subarea 2 may continue the ag operations.

Page 5.6, 5.4.2.2 Reduced Development Alternative

The reduced development alternative (RDA) is being characterized as the environmentally superior alternative and makes the assumption that it will continue to meet the project’s objectives. CEQA clearly defines alternatives to a proposed project as a “range of reasonable alternatives which would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project”. While the RDA is a requirement under CEQA, there are other considerations that, on balance, would point to the potential infeasibility of the proposal. This warrants highlighting some additional considerations and implications not made clear in the EIR.

- Housing, in general and meeting the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is an important goal in the City’s General Plan. The City is responsible for creating a regulatory environment in which the private market can build units affordable to very low, low, moderate, and above moderate households to meet the City’s allocation. This includes the creation, adoption, and implementation of General Plan policies, development standards, and/or economic incentives to encourage the construction of various types of units.

- In that vein, the RDA suggests that forty (40) home sites will be environmentally superior, however, from the applicant’s perspective, not economically feasible (fully recognizing that CEQA, in and of itself, does not consider economic feasibility). The cost associated with infrastructure, municipal processing costs, consulting professional costs, and fees paid to the City are typically prorated over the number of housing units, ultimately translating into a “marketable” project. For example, the proposed residential project includes twenty-four (24) lots/units that can be considered “affordable by design” (i.e., average 1700 square foot, single-story homes) with the balance of the lots accommodating homes in the 1600 – 2800 square foot range. With a reduction of lots to forty (40), as suggested in the RDA, home prices could substantially increase to the $300,000 to $500,000 price range – clearly not considered “affordable” with the real potential for slow absorption rate.

- It is also noteworthy that the residential components of the Specific Plan will be contributing to the City’s affordable housing via the in-lieu fee, thereby making important contributions to that fund.
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- Subarea 1 has been long recognized in the City’s General Plan for projects that would accommodate appropriate (i.e., in character and appearance) and revenue generating development. The design guidelines and standards for the Traffic Way/Station Way include special considerations that anticipated auto retail uses,visitor serving uses, and shared parking. Meeting or exceeding these standards is certainly in compliance with the City’s goals and objectives. From an environmental perspective, infill development, ala the proposed hotel and restaurant, is superior and encouraged.
- The reduced development alternative, while minimizing impacts to Fair Oaks Avenue/Traffic Way intersection, would also eliminate the requirement for signalization at that intersection. The applicants find that the design and construction of the signal to be of great benefit to the community/neighborhood, so its elimination is not a “fair trade” for reducing the development, as defined.
- The proposed RDA may be mischaracterized as “environmentally superior” due to a nominal reduction in vehicular traffic and the resultant potential to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and elimination of the need for the signal at Fair Oaks Avenue/Traffic Way, while other CEQA issues were found to be “similar” or slightly “less”.

On balance, the three projects have been carefully and considerately designed, reviewed by staff, the EIR consultant, and the public, and modified accordingly. While the applicants wholeheartedly believe in their respective project designs, they also look forward to engaging the decision-makers. While committed to their projects, the applicants remain open, adaptable, and interested in working with the Planning Commission and, ultimately, the City Council to create projects that both satisfy their vision and the goals and objectives of the City, the community, the neighbors, and those underrepresented (i.e., the home buyers, the customers, the visitors, and the culture seekers) who will ultimately benefit from these projects.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the East Cherry Avenue Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Respectfully,

OASIS ASSOCIATES, INC.

C.M. Florence, AICP Agent
SRK HOTELS
MFI LIMITED
ARROYO GRANDE VALLEY JAPANESE WELFARE ASSOCIATION

Attachments – Vesting Tentative Tract Map, rev. 16 May 2016
Water Use Assessment, RRM, November 10, 2015
Water Use Calculations, Shane Taylor, Public Works Supervisor, 24 February 2016

c: M. Puchal/SRK
A. Mangan/MFI
M. Ikeda/AGVJWA
15-0024
15-0219
Commenter 11 – C.M. Florence, AICP Agent, Oasis Associates, Inc.

Comment Response 11-1: Thank you and we appreciate your comments on the EIR. Please see comment responses below.

Comment Response 11-2: The spelling has been corrected on page 2-2.

Comment Response 11-3: Text has been corrected on page 2-19 to reflect the current setting where Subarea 3 is undeveloped and is not cultivated with row crops. However, the change does not modify the analysis or conclusions included in the Draft EIR.

Comment Response 11-4: Figure 2-7 and text on page 2-29 has been edited to reflect the slight changes to the proposed interior roadway cross sections. However, the change does not modify the analysis or conclusions included in the Draft EIR.

Comment Response 11-5: Text has been added to Section 2.6.3.2 of the Project Description to clarify that lots 1 through 24 would be designed to be one story, while lots 25 through 58 could be up to two stories. In addition, a footnote has been added to Figures 3.1-3 and 3.1-4, and to page 3.1-20 to indicate that while simulations depict residences up to two stories in height along East Cherry Avenue (as originally proposed), Project design has been modified to reduce the height to one story for residences along East Cherry Avenue. However, the change does not modify the analysis or conclusions included in the Draft EIR.

Comment Response 11-6: Please note that the change on page 3.1-20 was made to replace “removal of several larger trees” to “removal of some larger trees”. However, the change does not modify the analysis or conclusions included in the Draft EIR.

Comment Response 11-7: Comment noted and clarifying text has been added to page 3.3-29 to indicate that some of the listed measures under MM AQ-2b do not have quantifiable air quality emissions reductions. Please note that Impact AQ-2 accurately characterizes that mitigated Project emissions for ROG + NOx would be marginally over the APCD threshold; however, the EIR found that PM2.5 emissions would continue to be decisively over the threshold after mitigation. Further, while is accurate to state that many measures included within MM AQ-2b do not have quantifiable reductions in air quality emissions, particularly when estimating with CalEEMod, it may be inappropriate to state that the Project’s true emissions may be below the thresholds. The methodology used to determine Project air quality emissions is consistent with the guidance within APCD’s CEQA Air Quality Handbook and found emissions to be over the APCD thresholds.
Comment Response 11-8: As the commenter identifies and EIR states, the Project does embody land use planning strategies such as mixed use development, improving the jobs/housing balance, and compact communities which are mentioned within the 2001 Clean Air Plan; however, consistency with the Clean Air Plan was determined using the methodology outlined in the guidelines in the APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. Based on a strict interpretation of the APCD’s criteria, the Project was found to be inconsistent with the 2001 Clean Air Plan. However, it is noted that the 2001 Clean Air Plan does not include population or growth projections beyond the year 2015, and does not account for the City’s more recent growth patterns nor would it accommodate any growth beyond 2015. Given these limitations, it is acknowledged that Criteria 1, which states, “Are the population projections used in the plan or project equal to or less than those used in the most recent Clean Air Plan for the same area?” is very restrictive.

Regarding MM AQ-5a, as stated in the mitigation text, the City shall determine the appropriate actions required, and/or fair share of payment for funding the additional transit stop. The timing of this measure would occur prior to the issuance of land use permits or CUPs. Regarding fair share payment, the exact metrics of determining payment or a particular dollar amount need not be included in the EIR mitigation measure. As stated in the EIR, the City would determine a fair share payment amount that would be commensurate to the size and intensity of the Project’s impact.

Comment Response 11-9: Figure 3.6-1 has been edited accordingly. However, the change does not modify the analysis or conclusions included in the Draft EIR.

Comment Response 11-10: Edits to MM TRANS-3b have been made as requested. It is noted that these edits further clarify and define the mitigation and do not change the intent of the mitigation or its ability to mitigate the impact, nor do they modify the conclusions of the analysis included in the Draft EIR. See page 3.10-26.

Comment Response 11-11: Thank you for your comments, and calculations performed by Public Works Supervisor, Shane Taylor, are included as Appendix N. Edits were made to Section 3.11, Utilities and Public Services, to reflect the fact that Subarea 1 has been historically irrigated although this parcel is currently fallow, and that the long-term water need for the site is 41.34 afy (see pages 3.11-4, 3.11-15 and 3.11-16). These edits were made in recognition that long-term historic water use within the Project site is an indicator of average agricultural water demand and accounts for cyclic variations in irrigation patterns due to weather, rotation of crops and the temporary fallowing or resting of soils. Please note that while the commenter asserts that the Project will increase water supply by
7 acre-feet per year (afy), these calculations do not account for the estimated 2.7 afy of projected water demand for Subarea 3. As such, the EIR has been amended to reflect that the project would result in an approximate 5.12 afy increase in water supply. Further, as Subarea 1 is currently fallow, the analysis also conservatively reflects current water use for the site and estimates that water demand would also increase approximately 1.36 afy from current conditions. However, this updated information does not modify the analysis or conclusions included in the Draft EIR.

**Comment Response 11-12:** Text has been corrected and edited accordingly on page 5-5.

**Comment Response 11-13:** Thank you for your comments. It is noted that the Reduced Development Alternative would meet some but not all of the Project objectives, including the provision of housing and economic feasibility. The commenter also notes that the Reduced Development Alternative may not be in line with the City’s development goals for housing, housing affordability, and anticipated retail/commercial uses. However, as the commenter correctly recognizes, economic feasibility is not typically assessed under CEQA and selection of the environmentally superior alternative is based solely on the alternative’s ability to reduce environmental impacts identified in the EIR. This EIR finds the Reduced Development Alternative to be the environmentally superior alternative as this alternative would slightly reduce impacts to many resources areas analyzed within the EIR, and may reduce significant air quality impacts to a less than significant level after mitigation. This alternative was designed to reduce traffic impacts on Traffic Way/Fair Oaks Avenue to a less than significant level so that signalization of this intersection would no longer be required; however, as the commenter points out, without signalization, improved LOS at this intersection would not be fully realized. However, neither the Project nor Reduced Development Alternative would reduce traffic impacts to a level that would be less than significant; therefore, each would require the adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations. City decision-makers will decide if the proposed Project better meets the needs and goals of the City, particularly when non-environmental factors are considered.
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Oral testimony was received for the Project on May 17, 2016 at a public workshop held before the City of Arroyo Grande Planning Commission, where members of the Planning Commission provided comment, followed by comments from the public. Summarized below are the comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to comments, followed by the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Planning Commission Comments

Commenter 12 – Commissioner John Mack

Comment 12-1: Pismo Clarkia – This is a seasonal species, are additional biological surveys needed to look at seasonal species on the hillside area?

Comment 12-2: Water Demand - 36.22 AFY for the site, is this broken down by Subarea?

Comment 12-3: Night Lighting – how was night lighting analyzed?

Comment 12-4: Traffic...is there an interim solution?

Comment Response 12-1: The Biological Resources Assessment identifies suitable habitat for sensitive species and assesses the potential for such species to occur within the Project vicinity, even if none were found during field surveys. The Biological Resources Assessment ultimately concluded that the Project site does not support suitable habitat for any special status plant species, including Pismo clarkia. While no known occurrences of Pismo clarkia have been within the Project site, the Biological Resources Assessment found that this species has been found within 5 miles of the Project site (see Figure 5 of Appendix F). In addition, Sage Institute, Inc. conducted a walking field survey on June 2, 2016 where special attention was given to the identification of Pismo clarkia within the Project vicinity. No Pismo clarkia was identified within the Project site and the survey concluded that soils onsite do not support Pismo clarkia. Findings of the field survey are included within Appendix F, Biological Resources Assessment Addendum, Pismo Clarkia Rare Plant Survey Report for the East Cherry Avenue Specific Plan Project, City of Arroyo Grande, CA.

Comment Response 12-2: Yes, Section 3.11, Utilities and Public Services includes a breakdown of water demand by subarea. See Table 3.11-5, Projected Water Demand.

Comment Response 12-3: The Project design is conceptual and at the time of EIR analysis, no lighting plan is available. However, it is reasonably assumed that the Project
could introduce new light sources on a site where none currently exist. Nighttime lighting is analyzed within Section 3.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources*, Impact VIS-4 (pages 3.1-24 through 26).

**Comment Response 12-4:** Near term traffic conditions are analyzed in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) within Appendix K, which represents a scenario where approved and pending transportation projects are assumed to be constructed. This scenario is representative of conditions within the foreseeable future. Tables 3.10-4 and 3.10-5 within Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic, demonstrate the Project’s impacts within this near-term scenario.

**Commenter 13 – Commissioner Terry Fowler-Payne**

*Comment 13-1:* Traffic and circulation in the village – Traffic is currently not good and the village did not anticipate this level of growth in the area. Traffic analysis focuses on circulation on Traffic Way, was Garden Street analyzed? Garden Street could be a potential shortcut.

**Comment Response 13-1:** Omni-Means prepared a supplemental memorandum within Appendix K that addresses traffic and operational issues that may result from Project trips on local roadways, particularly those that may be used for shortcuts to avoid the village core. Garden Street, as well as other local roadways are expected to distribute a small percentage of Project-generated trips. The traffic supplemental memorandum conservatively assumes 7 percent of trips could use local roadways such as Garden Street; however, this would only equate to approximately 3 AM and 4 PM peak hour trips, which would not result in a significant increase of new traffic on this roadway.

**Commenter 14 – Commissioner Glenn Martin**

*Comment 14-1:* Parking - Is there enough or too much? Ensure that an appropriate amount is provided for the given uses. Estimates in the EIR may not reflect real parking needs. Does EIR cover the outside envelope? Subarea 1 is the big concern.

**Comment Response 14-1:** Parking for the Project is described within Section 2.6.5, *Circulation and Parking*. As the EIR analyzes a conceptual design for Subarea 1, parking for this subarea is assumed to comply with the provisions of the City of Arroyo Grande Municipal Code for the purposes of analysis within this EIR. This includes at least 122 parking spaces in Subarea as well as proposed street parking. City planning review of future
entitlement requests for Subarea 1 would address parking requirements to ensure with city zoning and parking regulations.

**Commenter 15 – Commissioner John Keen**

*Comment 15-1:* Good job on the EIR. One of the best ever seen.

*Comment Response 15-1:* Thank you for your comments on the EIR.

**Public Oral Comments**

**Commenter 16 – Linda Osty**

*Comment 16-1:* Prefers Reduced Development Alternative.

*Comment 16-2:* Opposes two story homes, this is not in the character of the village. The lot sizes are too big, smaller houses would be more in keeping with the village theme.

*Comment 16-3:* Traffic on East Cherry Avenue will be a concern.

*Comment 16-4:* Questioned if enough parking is proposed for the hotel.

*Comment 16-5:* Questioned if adequate ingress/egress exists on East Cherry Avenue to the property.

*Comment 16-6:* Against the traffic signal proposed for Fair Oaks/Traffic Way; this may cause circulation issues.

*Comment Response 16-1:* Thank you and we appreciate your comments. Your support of the Reduced Development Alternative has been noted.

*Comment Response 16-2:* In regards to your comment opposing proposed residences up to two stories, please note that the Applicant has modified the proposal so that 40 percent of the units would be designed and constructed to only be one story. This includes lots 1 through 24 shown in yellow on Figure 2-3, which are along East Cherry Avenue and the alley-loaded lots to reduce the size and massing of these residences. Second stories on the remaining lots would be either partially visible, or would not be visible from East Cherry Road and Traffic Way. Further, the proposed East Cherry Avenue Specific Plan Guidelines to ensure that residence have appropriate setbacks, second story stepbacks and architectural design that reduces the overall size and massing.

*Comment Response 16-3:* Roadway traffic on East Cherry Avenue was assessed within Section 3.10, Transportation and Traffic and within the TIA in Appendix K, and found
that while the Project would result in increases in traffic along East Cherry Avenue and slightly longer delays at the East Cherry Avenue/Traffic Way intersection, impacts would be below the City’s thresholds in the General Plan and would be less than significant.

**Comment Response 16-4:** Regarding parking adequacy within Subarea 1, as stated within Section 2.0, *Project Description*, the amount of parking spaces provided for the hotel and restaurant use would be required to comply with Chapter 16.56 of the City of Arroyo Grande Municipal Code. City planning staff would ensure that that parking is compliant prior to the approval of a CUP for the hotel and restaurant.

**Comment Response 16-5:** Regarding ingress/egress issues on East Cherry Avenue, please refer to Impact TRANS-5 within Section 3.10, *Transportation and Traffic*.

**Comment Response 16-6:** Regarding comments addressing the traffic signal proposed for Fair Oaks/ Traffic Way, additional traffic analysis was performed for the intersection of Fair Oaks/ Traffic Way and for the intersection of Allen Street/ Traffic Way. This analysis is contained within Appendix K. The TIA found that existing LOS and queueing at these intersections are currently deficient. However, after implementation of Project mitigation, including installation of the traffic signal at Fair Oaks/Traffic Way, intersection operations would be improved to LOS C or better. See Appendix K.

**Commenter 17 – C.M. Florence, AICP Agent, Oasis Associates, Inc.**

*Comment 17-1:* The commenter noted that she is available to answer questions during the public hearing. No comment response need.

**Commenter 18 – Minetta Bennett**

*Comment 18-1:* Density of the development is too much and will cause congestion on Allen Street and Traffic Way.

*Comment 18-2:* Traffic and parking are concerns – particularly parking on both sides of East Cherry Avenue.

*Comment 18-3:* Increased traffic in the area will create more hazards for pedestrians crossing the street.

**Comment Response 18-1:** Regarding comments associated with potential congestion at the intersection of Allen Street and Traffic Way, additional traffic analysis was performed for the intersection of Allen Street/ Traffic Way. This analysis is contained within Appendix K. The traffic analysis found that existing LOS and queueing at Allen Street and
Traffic Way are currently deficient. However, after implementation of Project mitigation, including installation of the traffic signal at Fair Oaks/Traffic Way, intersection operations would be improved to LOS C or better. See Appendix K. This would improve current queueing and congestion within the Allen Street/ Traffic Way intersection.

**Comment Response 18-2:** In regards to comments on parking along East Cherry Avenue, please note that street parking along East Cherry Avenue would be provided to accommodate approximately 24 spaces and is planned as part of the roadway improvements. Please see Section 2.6.5, *Circulation and Parking*, and Figures 2-5 and 2-6.

**Comment Response 18-3:** For analysis on traffic hazards and pedestrian safety issues, please see Section 3.10, *Transportation and Traffic* as well as in the TIA within Appendix K.

**Commenter 19 – Shirley Gibson**

*Comment 19-1:* The density is too much.

*Comment 19-2:* Why is there no study of Allen Street and Traffic Way? Circulation is already poor and dangerous intersection. Pacific Coast Railway and Allen Street needs to be looked at.

**Comment Response 19-1:** Thank you for your comments and your opinion on the proposed density of the Project has been noted. While density in of itself is generally not considered a CEQA issue, this EIR indirectly analyzes the proposed density of the Project as it relates to traffic trip generation and congestion (see Section 3.10, *Transportation and Traffic*), change in visual character (see Section 3.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources*), and demand on public services and utilities (see Section 3.11, *Utilities and Public Services*).

**Comment Response 19-2:** Regarding comments pertaining to traffic along local neighborhood streets including Allen Street, Pacific Coast Railway Place, and Mason Street, additional traffic analysis was performed for these roadways and is contained within the traffic supplemental memorandum in Appendix K. This analysis includes Project trip distribution, and found that a small portion of Project trips may use these roadways to reach East Branch Street; this includes an estimated 3 AM peak hour trips and 4 PM peak hour trips and is not considered a significant impact to the neighborhood streets. See Appendix K.
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ACTION MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MAY 17, 2016
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 EAST BRANCH STREET
ARROYO GRANDE, CALIFORNIA

1. CALL TO ORDER
Vice Chair Keen called the Regular Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL
Planning Commission: Vice Chair John Keen, Commissioners Glenn Martin, Terry Fowler-Payne, and John Mack were present. Chair Lan George was absent.

Staff Present: Community Development Director Teresa McClish, Planning Manager Matt Downing, Associate Planner Kelly Heffernan, Planning Intern Sam Anderson, Contract Planner John Rickenback, and Secretary Debbie Weichinger were present.

3. FLAG SALUTE
Vice Chair Keen led the flag salute.

4. AGENDA REVIEW
None

5. COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS
None

6. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
The Commission reviewed the following material after preparation of the agenda:
   1. Email dated May 17, 2016 from Warren Clift regarding Agenda Item 9.a.

7. CONSENT AGENDA
   7.a. Consideration of Approval of Minutes.
       Recommended Action: Approve the minutes of the Regular Planning Commission Meeting of May 3, 2016 as submitted.

Action: Commissioner Mack moved to approve the minutes of the Regular Planning Commission Meeting of May 3, 2016, as submitted. Commissioner Martin seconded, and the motion passed on a 4-0 voice vote.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS
   8.a. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION OF APPEAL TO PLANNING COMMISSION 16-002; ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW 15-011 AND MINOR EXCEPTION 16-001; ONE FOOT (1') REDUCTION OF SIDE YARD SETBACK AND A TWO FOOT (2') REDUCTION OF FRONT YARD SETBACK FOR A NEW TWO-STORY RESIDENCE AND ATTACHED SECONDARY DWELLING UNIT; LOCATION – 308 SHORT STREET; APPLICANT – CINDY NOTT; REPRESENTATIVE – MICHAEL FISHER

Planning Intern Anderson presented the staff report and recommended that the Planning Commission adopt a Resolution denying Appeal 16-002 and approving Architectural Review 15-011 and Minor Exception 16-001.
Planning Intern Anderson responded to questions from the Commission regarding the proposed project, including setback for the garage and column size.

Vice Chair Keen opened the public hearing.

Dave Frazier, appellant, Short Street, spoke against the proposed project and expressed his concern with the street facing garages, the setback of the stairs along with the landscaping to mask them, and drainage.

Cindy Nott, applicant, explained the location of the garage.

Greg Solo, architect, explained the setbacks and responded to questions from the Commission on the proposed project, including parking and the size of the columns.

Individual Commissioners expressed the following comments on the proposed project: concern with the location of the stairs, guest parking, front loading garage, does not want the garage to be converted into two single car garages, additional landscape and screening will help, suggested tandem parking, stated ARC concluded that the project met the Design Guidelines, and asked about undergrounding utilities.

Michael Fisher, contractor, explained the parking.

Planning Manager Downing stated the utilities will be required to be placed underground and responded to questions from the Commission regarding parking.

Upon hearing no further comments, Vice Chair Keen closed the public hearing.

Action: Commissioner Mack moved to adopt a resolution entitled “A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE DENYING APPEAL CASE NO. 16-002 AND APPROVING ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW 15-011 AND MINOR EXCEPTION 16-001; LOCATED AT 308 SHORT STREET; APPLIED FOR BY CINDY KNOTT; APPEALED BY DAVE FRAZIER”, with the following modification to add Conditions of Approvals for: 1) The garage shall be prohibited from constructing a wall separating the garage space for occupancy by the studio. 2) Provide sufficient landscaping and height to screen the stairs and deck area on the north side of the structure. Commissioner Martin seconded and the motion passed on the following roll call vote:

AYES:  Mack, Martin, Keen
NOES: Fowler-Payne
ABSENT: George

9. NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

9.a. WORKSHOP TO TAKE PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE E. CHERRY AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN

Vice Chair Keen stated that the Commissioners met individually with representatives of Oasis to discuss the proposed project.

John Rickenbach, Contract Planner, JFR Consulting, and Julia Pujo, Deputy Project Manager, AEC Foster Wheeler made the presentation on the East Cherry Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR,
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dated April 2016 and responded to questions from the Commission regarding the drought, Pismo
Clarkie, lighting plan, and traffic circulation in the Village.

Vice Chair Keen invited public comment.

Linda Osly, East Cherry Avenue, spoke in support of the reduced development alternative in the
Draft EIR and expressed concern with the number of parking spaces for the 100 room hotel.

Manetta Bennett, Allen Street, and Shirley Gibson, Halcyon, expressed their concern with the high
density and need for the traffic study to consider the area of Allen Street and Traffic Way and
Pacific Coast Railway and Allen Street.

Individual Commissioners expressed concern with parking for the commercial area and traffic
circulation on Garden Street coming out on Cherry Avenue.

Nate Stong, Omni-Means, addressed issues raised regarding the traffic study and stated the
comments will be taken into consideration.

Community Development Director McClish stated that additional questions or comments can be
provided to staff or the consultant by May 26, 2016.

10. NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS SINCE MAY 3, 2016
This is a notice of administrative decision for Minor Use Permits, including any approvals,
denials or referrals by the Community Development Director. An administrative decision must be
appealed or called up for review by the Planning Commission by a majority vote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TUP 16-005</td>
<td>Pastor Robert Burnett - New Hope Church</td>
<td>900 N. Oak Park Blvd</td>
<td>Temporary placement and use of two (2) 600 square-foot tents (20'x30') for regional conference.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P. Holub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUP 16-007</td>
<td>Rev. Ray Berrier - Gospel Lighthouse Church</td>
<td>710 Huasna Rd., 1026 E. Grand Ave, 1188 W. Branch St., 400 Traffic Way</td>
<td>Temporary sale of cherries at four locations as a fundraiser for Gospel Lighthouse Church.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P. Holub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR 15-013</td>
<td>Joyce Baker</td>
<td>159 Bracco Road</td>
<td>Demo existing residence and construct two new two-story duplexes.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S. Anderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In answer to Commissioner Mack, Community Development Director McClish stated that the two
new units meet the density and are allowed for PPR 15-013.

In answer to Commissioner Keen, Community Development Director McClish stated that the
cherries are sold at the entrance of 1188 W. Branch Street for TUP 16-007.

11. COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS
None

12. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS
None
13. ADJOURNMENT
On motion by Commissioner Martin, seconded by Commissioner Mack and unanimously carried, the meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

ATTEST:

DEBBIE WEICHINGER  LAN GEORGE, CHAIR
SECRETARY TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

(Approved at PC Meeting June 21, 2016)
8.4.5 Public Comments Received After the Close of the Comment Period

Pujo, Julia

Subject: FW: East Cherry Avenue Project

Dear Mr. Mayor, City Council, and Mr. Frickerbach,

We would like to know the long term plan for water use in Arroyo Grande. Also, how it fits into the water restrictions currently in place.

Our household has decreased water consumption dramatically by installing one gallon flushing toilets, 1 1/2 GPM shower heads, and efficient sprinklers to go along with the drip system already in place. We cut our water use to five units for the last two month period (we were allowed 10 units). The previous billing cycle we were allowed 11 units and used six.

We are disappointed that while doing our part to ease the water situation we see plans for more building. We believe continual building will negatively impact the quality of life in our community by more having traffic, congestion, and decline in the road conditions. When towns grow too much it causes more problems such as crime, the need for more police and fire services, and more crowding of free spaces.

Is continuous building the answer for our community? Or do you think our neighbors in Pismo Beach are forward thinking by still not allowing any new building permits?

Please don’t say new builds use less than older homes. It doesn’t fly when you know Lopez is running out of water.

Most of the East Cherry Avenue project needs to be scrapped. We like all of Subarea 3 and would like to see that on the 16.3 acres.

Take a look at the photo below. Visualize Lake Lopez, where we get our water.

Sincerely,
Don and Joanne Austin
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Commenter 20 – Don and Joanne Austin

**Comment Response 20-1:** Thank you for your comments. The Project’s water consumption and effect on City water supply is described in detail within Impact UT-3, Section 3.11, *Utilities and Public Services*. As described in this section, agricultural land uses within the Project site have a historic long-term water use of 41.34 afy. In general, agricultural land uses usually have higher water demands than residential uses. The Project was calculated to result in a water demand of 36.22 afy. Overall, the Project would result in a net decrease of 5.12 afy from historic water use, which accounts for cyclic variations in water use typical for agricultural operations and would therefore not result in a net increase upon City water supplies. Additionally, as described in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, the Project would incorporate low water fixtures and appliances and drought tolerant landscaping in order to conserve water. In addition, we acknowledge your support of the Subarea 3 proposal.
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Pujo, Julia

From: John Rickenbach <jrickenbach@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2016 2:06 PM
To: Pujo, Julia
Subject: Fwd: E. Cherry Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: <brucedhederig@yahoo.com>
Date: June 2, 2016 at 5:18:11 PM GMT-2
To: "jrickenbach@aol.com" <jrickenbach@aol.com>

John: I appreciate being able to send my comments on the proposed Cherry Ave development. I realize the city wants more tax revenue but its seems to me that the water issue is more important at this time. I and many other residents have spent thousands converting our yards and save water in buckets just to comply with the mandatory water restrictions. Now comes a hotel (maybe two hotels) in AG that don't have to comply with the same restrictions. How much do we think hotel guests care about our water problems.

I understand that property now uses well water but will convert to city water. It’s hard to believe the developers when they say the new development will use the same amount of water.

Frankly I resent being forced to conserve when others will be allowed to use what they want.

In addition I feel for the nearby residents that will have to put up with trying to get out Cherry Ave.

Thanks
Bruce Hedderig
Sent from Windows Mail
Commenter 21 – Bruce Hedderig

**Comment Response 21-1:** Comment noted. The Project’s water consumption is described in detail within Impact UT-3, Section 3.11, *Utilities and Public Services*. As described in this section, agricultural land uses within the Project site currently use an estimated 34.86 acre-feet per year (afy) of water, with a historic long-term water use of 41.34 afy. The Project was calculated to result in a water demand of 36.22 afy. Overall, the Project would result in a slight net decrease from historic water use, which accounts for cyclic variations in water use typical for agricultural operations by approximately 5.12 afy and would therefore not result in a net increase upon City water supplies. Additionally, as described in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, the Project would incorporate low water fixtures and appliances and drought tolerant landscaping in order to conserve water.
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Linda Keating

From: Linda Keating <lkeating@ijtechnical.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 2, 2016 10:00 AM
To: jfrickenbach@aol.com
Subject: Cherry Lane Development

TO: John Rickenbach via e-mail: jfrickenbach@aol.com
CC: Arroyo Grande Planning
RE: Cherry Lane Development

The Project as defined has several issues. With this correspondence, I’m only addressing the shared private driveway aka Residential Alley. As proposed, a 650 ft by 20 ft Residential Alley will serve 24 (54 ft by 102 ft) lots. The issues and solution are listed below.

Average Lot size deceptively inflated.

Because the developer has proposed using a Residential Alley in place of a Residential Interior Street, the Alley is included in the lot size. This means that 540 sf of each lot is shared with the other lots abutting the alley making the “useable” lot only 4968 sf. If a Street is used instead of an Alley, the lot size would be reduced even further to only (54*102) - (54*26) =4101. This a 25% reduction!

Violation enforcement.

According to a representative from the AG Police department, AGPD has no authority to enforce illegal parking in a shared private driveway.

In 2014, I built a house at 313 Myrtle Drive in Arroyo Grande. This house shares a private driveway with two other properties. Even with no parking postings, service people working at adjacent properties continually park in the driveway. When a vehicle is parked in the driveway across from my garage, it is impossible to back out of the garage—even with a multiple point turning effort.

In my case, I was told that the only alternative would be to have the Alley declared a fire lane, paint the curbs red and then the no-parking law could be enforced.

Evacuation.

In the event of an emergency requiring evacuation, having a driveway of this length, serving 24 homes, would be chaotic. With adjacent garages, both occupants cannot back out at the same time.

Security.

Because the Alley is considered private property, it’s unlikely that this would be included in standard patrol rounds. Without proper lighting, it will evolve into an attractive location for illegal entry into the homes sharing the driveway.

Turnarounds and Guest Parking
The plan does not provide any guest parking or turn arounds in the proposed Alley. While the city can encourage garage only parking in practice this doesn’t happen. A quick look at East Cherry Lane on a weekend is evidence of this. Also, maneuvering emergency vehicles in this area would be extremely difficult.

**Household Services and Repairs**

Many common household services require access to the garage area of the house. These include water softener and bottle delivery, cleaning services etc. And, many repair people need access through the garage. Any parking (even short term) in a Private Access Driveway is illegal and restricts the access of the other users of the driveway. So, to provide basic services to these homes this leaves no viable alternative.

**What do other local cities do?**

Attached is the code section from San Luis Obispo. Common driveways are limited to serving only 4 residences. These should be the minimal standards applied to this development. Additionally, Arroyo Grande should incorporate code similar to SLO into their own building codes. If these codes were in effect when my house was built, I would not be in the difficult position I now find myself.

**Solution.**

Reduce the lots in this area by 4.

The total size of the area is 132,192 sf. -- \(102 \text{ (lot depth) } \times 54 \text{ (lot width) } \times 24 \text{ (number of lots)}\)

Area required for Residential Interior Street (without linear park) is 33,696 -- \(54' \text{ (lot width) } \times 12\text{(number of lots)} \times 52' \text{ (street width)}\)

Area remaining with public street is individual lot size for 20 lots = 4924.8 sf

In addition to providing proper and protected access to the homes, reducing the lot count would somewhat lessen the "ticky-tacky little boxes" view along Cherry. The additional frontage space could be used for planting.

I sincerely hope that the City of Arroyo Grande will consider the importance of the wellbeing of the residents who will occupy these homes, over the pocket book of the developer.

Linda Keating
313 Myrtle Drive
Arroyo Grande, CA
Commenter 22 – Linda Keating

Comment Response 22-1: Comment respectfully noted; however, the commenter addresses the Project design rather than the adequacy of the EIR, and comment will be considered by City decision-makers in that context.

Comment Response 22-2: Please note that while the residential alley would not provide public parking, street parking along East Cherry Avenue would be provided to accommodate approximately 24 spaces and is planned as part of the roadway improvements. Please see Section 2.6.5, Circulation and Parking, and Figures 2-5 and 2-6. For proposed residences within the Project site, parking would include two spaces per unit within an enclosed garage as well as street parking along proposed residential interior streets.

Comment Response 22-3: Regarding emergency home evacuation concerns and adequate access and egress via residential alley, the Project is subject to review and approval by the City and the Five Cities Fire Authority (FCFA) to ensure adequacy of Project site designs related to emergency ingress and egress.

Comment Response 22-4: Comment noted. No additional data was provided by the commenter to support the conclusion of increased crime rates with regards to the proposed alley. The Project will be reviewed to ensure adequate lighting to prevent visual resource impacts while ensuring security of the Project area.

Comment Response 22-5: For responses to comments addressing guest parking, please refer to Comment Response 18-2. Emergency vehicles could access East Cherry Avenue or the proposed residential interior streets within the Project site to access units within the Project site. In addition, the Project, including roadways would be subject to review by the FCFA.

Comment Response 22-6: For guest parking, including those performing household services, please see Comment Response 18-2.

Comment Response 22-7: Comment noted. However, the comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR.

Comment Response 22-8: Thank you for your suggestions. However, the comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, and comment should be directed to City decision-makers.
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ann Nichols <ann.nichols@lunusd.org>
Date: June 5, 2016 at 12:59:02 AM GMT+2
To: John Rickenbach <jfrickenbach@aol.com>
Cc: jpu@arroyoegrande.org, bharmon@arroyoegrande.org, tbrown@arroyoegrande.org, kbarneich@arroyoegrande.org
Subject: East Cherry Project

Hello,

This email is in response to the SLO tribune article two weeks ago. My response has been delayed due to the fact I entered your email addresses incorrectly the first time), about the new project to expand and compact the number of structures in the Arroyo Grande village.

I have lived in the Arroyo Grande village area for 41 years. I have raised my children here, taught in the Lucia Mar school district for 25+ years, and feel a tremendous sense of comfort and pride in my community. My husband has also owned and operated a business in this community all this time. We have watched Arroyo grow, become stronger, and develop as a community to be watched. However, bigger and more does not make us better.

First, let me say that although I have not always been a regular at city council and/or city planning meetings, I am very concerned about the future of the village. The project in question has offered opportunities for community input in the past, but it has never been presented to the community as it recently was in the paper and that was rather after the fact. The project has changed drastically and now includes a 3 story hotel!

**Subarea 1**: While the 3 story motel meets the height limits, it will block views of the hills as one exits and enters Arroyo. The hills have always supported our namesake, Arroyo Grande, Big Ditch, by enclosing the village in gently rolling hills. The proposed motel would be a large structure that cannot be found anywhere else in the city. Cities need to ease into their grandness by slowly building "strength" rather than present something of greater structure right off that can appear offensive and grandiose. Bigger is not always better! Are we trying to build our town so it can support the Strawberry Festival or do we want to build our town to support its community?

**Subarea 2**: This area proposes 69 residential lots, more dense than any other area in the village. For one, the traffic is already fully impacted on Traffic Way and Branch as current residences try to get the work. I cannot understand why the city would want to present a greater problem to the area. Another concern I have for this number of residences is our water shortage. Until we can adequately supply the residences we have, shouldn’t we be conservative in our numbers as we consider additional housing?

**Subarea 3**: I am in full support of the Japanese Cultural Center as it has been presented. It supports our community, creates an area for all, enlightens the community and visitors of our heritage, and presents a visually pleasing transition between one area of housing to another.

---

Pujo, Julia

From: John Rickenbach <jfrickenbach@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 05, 2016 9:42 AM
To: Pujo, Julia
Subject: Fwd: East Cherry Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flogged
Thank you for taking my thoughts into consideration. I am very proud of this community but am concerned we are moving away from who we are, first and foremost, a farming community.

Sincerely,
Ann Nichols
592 Hillside Court
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
Commenter 23 – Ann Nichols

**Comment Response 23-1:** Thank you and we appreciate your comments. Please see comment responses below.

**Comment Response 23-2:** Thank you for your comment. For a discussion of analysis relating to the height of the hotel in relation to the hills in the background, please see Section 3.1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources*. The EIR found impacts to visual resources such as distance views of the Santa Lucia Mountains to be less than significant after mitigation.

**Comment Response 23-3:** Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Section 3.10, *Transportation and Traffic* and the TIA in Appendix K regarding traffic associated with proposed residences within Subarea 2. Please refer to Section 3.11, *Utilities and Public Services* for a discussion on Project water usage.

**Comment Response 23-4:** Your comments in support of the proposal for Subarea 3 have been acknowledged within this EIR.
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Pujo, Julia

From: Debbie Weichinger <dweichinger@arroyogrande.org>
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Pujo, Julia; ‘John Rickenbach’
Subject: FW: Cherry Ave and Traffic Way Project

See attached.

Debbie Weichinger
Community Development Department
Administrative Secretary
City of Arroyo Grande
805 473-5429

From: Linda Osty [mailto:linda@ostyinsur.com]
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2016 12:19 PM
To: Dianne Thompson, Debbie Weichinger
Subject: Cherry Ave and Traffic Way Project

Dear Dianne, Debbie and our Planning Commissioners,

Please forward my thoughts to our Planning Commissioners.

I would like to forward you a letter I received from Kent Zammit in regards to the Cherry Ave proposed project.

In addition, currently my biggest concern, there are 3 ingress/egress streets proposed, the two on Cherry make sense, however, I am extremely concerned with the one going up by the church. I feel we are opening ourselves up to future traffic. We will have 58 additional home, a hotel and restaurant, with the 3rd street, we may have traffic from the church and surrounding neighborhood and from possible future Fredericks property development.

I also have concerns about a three story hotel and 4000 square foot restaurant and parking. Currently we do not have any three story buildings in Arroyo Grande, it is just way to large and too tall, not in keeping with our town. Perhaps two story and 75 rooms would be more in keeping. Also a smaller restaurant, which would both require less parking and traffic.

Thank you for you time.

Yours in Service,

1
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Linda Osty

My name is Kent Zammit, and I live at 3880 Santa Domingo Road, off Huasna Road. I have watched with some interest the plans to develop the subject properties, and I do have some concerns.

1) By far my biggest concern is the increased traffic all of these projects will bring to the intersection of Cherry and Traffic Way. I witness close calls at this intersection all the time, and have also seen how difficult it can be to exit from Cherry onto Traffic Way at peak traffic times. This has only gotten worse in the 10 years I have lived in AG, as additional housing is built. It is especially difficult at peak times, including school start/stop times. Unless there are plans for traffic control (stop signs or lights) – this will create a real problem especially for those trying to turn south on Traffic Way to enter 101 South.

2) The addition of yet another hotel in that area would further degrade the residential character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

3) A three story hotel is out of character for that area AND Arroyo Grande in general. The scale of that building should match the surrounding community. Where else does AG have 3 story buildings?

4) The addition of a restaurant there does not make sense, since there are limited feed roads for the increased traffic. It seems to me that restaurants should be located on major feeder roads, like Grande and in the Village, places where traffic management and parking support such high volumes and turnover.

5) Water concerns – when we are experiencing high drought conditions for multiple years, why are we allowing high density development like hotels and such?

6) Parking – many current residents of Cherry use street parking for their vehicles. There appears to be no provision for where those cars would park once these parcels are developed. Parking is already a difficult issue on Cherry, if you are visiting any of the residences on the north side of the street, unless they happen to have a large enough driveway to accommodate multiple cars. How is this going to be addressed in the new plans?

I think the idea of the Japanese Community Center and Gardens fits well with the character of this community and the local neighborhood better than the other two proposals, and would support that effort.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kent and Sue Zammit

805-481-7349
kerammit@epri.com
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Linda Osty
Osty Insurance

License # OB43847
805-489-3020 Office

Ostyinsur.com

Free Quote! Click Here!

Click here for an Anthem Blue Cross Health Quote

Travelling? Click here for travel insurance!

Like us on Facebook!

The information contained in this email pertains to City business and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If the reader of this message is not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient and you have received this message in error, please advise the sender by reply email or phone and delete the message. Please note that email correspondence with the City of Arroyo Grande, along with attachments, may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and therefore may be subject to disclosure unless otherwise exempt by law.
Commenter 24 – Linda Osty, Kent and Sue Zammit

Comment Response 24-1: Thank you for your comment. Please note that the roadway leading to the hillside to the south of the Project site is only a stubout for a future connection and the Project does not include the extension of this roadway to any connecting road network to the south (see Figure 2-5). Future growth facilitated by this stubout is described within Section 4.2.4, Extension of Infrastructure.

Comment Response 24-2: Regarding the height of the hotel within Subarea 1, while the hotel could have a maximum height of up to 36 feet, the design, height, massing, and character of the hotel would be required to comply with Arroyo Grande’s Design Guidelines and Standards for Design Overlay District Traffic Way and Station Way (D-2.11), which state that buildings shall have a small to moderate scale with horizontal massing, and shall have an architectural character that transitions to the historic character within Arroyo Grande. Further, the hotel as well as the entirety of the Project will be subject to review by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to ensure that that project would be consistent with the design guidelines and the character of the surrounding area.

Regarding parking adequacy within Subarea 1, as stated within Section 2.0, Project Description, the amount of parking spaces provided for the hotel and restaurant use would be required to comply with Chapter 16.56 of the City of Arroyo Grande Municipal Code. City planning staff would ensure that that parking is compliant prior to the approval of a CUP for the hotel and restaurant.

Comment Response 24-3: Please see Comment Response 10-1.

Comment Response 24-4: Please see Comment Response 10-2.

Comment Response 24-5: Please see Comment Response 10-3.

Comment Response 24-6: Please see Comment Response 10-4.

Comment Response 24-7: Please see Comment Response 10-5.

Comment Response 24-8: Please see Comment Response 10-6.