



November 16, 2017

Sam Miller
Lewis Management Corporation
9216 Kiefer Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95826

Subject: Determination of Incompleteness of Development Applications for Sycamore Crossing Project, including:

- **CEQA Initial Study #17-02;**
- **General Plan Amendment #17-02;**
- **Zoning Designation Change #17-02;**
- **Final Planned Development Plan #17-02;**
- **Design Review Permit #17-04;**
- **Conditional Use Permit # 17-04; and**
- **Vesting Tentative Tract Map #XXXX.**

Dear Mr. Miller,

Thank you for submitting the above listed applications, which the Hercules Planning Division received on October 16, 2017. The project site is bounded by Sycamore Avenue, San Pablo Avenue, and Tsushima Street in the City of Hercules, and identified by the Contra Costa County as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 404-020-057 and 404-020-058. The project includes a request to construct 29,613 square feet of commercial space and a 62,531-square-foot hotel, and to subdivide 4.89 acres of the total 12.88 total acres into 67 single-family residential units, with 2.8 acres of open space.

The City has reviewed the application and materials submitted to date and conducted a Development Review meeting on November 6, 2017, to consider comments from internal departments and external agencies with purview over or related to the proposed project. **Based on the comments received from these departments and agencies, the City has determined that the following additional items are required in order to deem the project applications complete:**

1. Preliminary title report dated within last 60-days.
2. Authorization/approval for Sycamore Crossing Land Developers LLC to represent Hercules Hospitality LLC/Hampton Inn.
3. Geotechnical report.
4. Initial Study, including the following project-specific supporting documents:
 - a. Transportation assessment.
 - b. Biological report.

- c. Phase I/II environmental hazards report.
 - d. Acoustic report.
 - e. Utility “will-serve” letters.
 - f. Air quality/greenhouse gas analyses.
- 5. Vesting Tentative Tract Map number (assigned by Contra Costa County)
- 6. Plan indicating all existing and proposed easements.
- 7. Plan indicating locations of proposed retaining walls and fences, including minimum and maximum heights.
- 8. Demonstrated compliance with Fire District access requirements, e.g., AutoTURN analysis.
- 9. Funding and maintenance plan for creeks, open space, and parks.
- 10. Table summary demonstrating compliance with 10% landscaping requirement for Planned Commercial–Residential districts.
- 11. Building cross sections.
- 12. Commercial roof plan.
- 13. Utility cross-sections including joint trench, including:
 - a. Utility agency clearance requirements;
 - b. Maintenance considerations for deep utilities adjacent to proposed buildings.
- 14. Preliminary invert elevations for sewer and storm drain and locations of major above-ground utility appurtenances, including backflow prevention devices and transformers (C-4.0 & C-4.1).
- 15. Lighting plan, including locations of proposed street and parking lights.
 - a. More detailed lighting plan may be required as a condition of approval.
- 16. Dimensions (both interior and exterior) of residential garages.
- 17. Details of hotel siding (similar level of detail as those shown for residences on AR-4.10 & AR-4.11).
- 18. Color names/specs and roof material details, e.g., 40-year rated, heavy architectural, etc. (Color schemes – AR-5.10).
- 19. Material sample board.
- 20. Findings as required per the Hercules Zoning Ordinance (Sheet T-2.0 describes design goals but does not address required findings).
- 21. Justification for reduced Ohlone Creek setback, including:
 - a. Demonstrate infeasibility of 50-ft setback from top-of-bank; and
 - b. Provide analysis of the reduced setback by a qualified biologist indicating the reduction would not result in a significant impact to nearby riparian areas and/or sensitive species or their habitats.

Corrections/Clarifications

1. Incorporate consistently throughout all plans the proposed fire access driveway at northeast corner of hotel (as shown on AH-1.0).
2. Include palette material info from AC-5.1 and legend on each shop elevation page.
3. Clarify whether cars shown on Tsushima Street are included in parking space count.
4. Confirm whether residential area is 2.67 acres (AR-1.10) or 2.65 acres (C-2.0).
5. Correct parking space inconsistencies on pp. T-0.1, T-4.0, and C-5.0.
6. Clarify break-down of residential parking spaces: garage vs. driveway vs. on-street.
7. Indicate minimum setback distances from Ohlone Creek top of bank.
8. Correct inconsistent labeling of riparian areas and wetlands (C-4.0 and C-6.2).
9. Explain transition from San Pablo Avenue sidewalk cross section B to cross section C (C-8.1).
10. Identify feature in middle of “A” street at intersection with Tsushima Street.
11. Correct cross references on pp. T-3.0 & L-1.0:
 - a. Change L-4.5 to L-3.6
 - b. Change L-4.4 to L-3.5
 - c. Change L-4.3 to L-3.4
 - d. Change “gatway” to “gateway”
 - e. Change L-4.2 to L-3.3
 - f. Change L-3.0 to L-4.0
12. Correct commercial density/FAR appears to be 0.20 (not 3.42) (Project summary on T-4.0).
13. Show site materials & images on park plan page (L-4.0) and/or cross reference to L-1.2.
14. Indicate all setback distances and label/explain dead-end dog leg extending south of hotel pool area (AH-1.0).
15. Show placement of bike racks/lockers.
16. Indicate sufficient path width at rear corner of electrical room and explain four squares shown outside patio area. Configuration and access do match overall site plan. (AC-2.2).
17. Add table summary of types and numbers of trees to be removed and/or replaced (tree removal plan: C-6.2).
18. Include Sheet AR-2.11 (Plan 1–Alt Elevations & Roof Plan) on Sheet AR-0.0 (Index Sheet for Residential)
19. Provide details for trash enclosure(s).

Requirements

1. Address insufficient hotel parking: 126 required, but only approximately 100 provided (plans inconsistently indicate 98–101 spaces, ~80% of the minimum required). Additionally, compact spaces are limited to 40% of those provided, yet plans show 46–50% of parking spaces as being compact.

2. Geotechnical engineer needs to confirm feasibility of 2:1 slopes specified in numerous locations (C-4.0 & C-4.1).
3. Demonstrate 10% minimum landscaping for each final parcel, plus minimum useable open space for each residence (100 sq. ft./residential unit; 50 sq. ft./live-work unit).

Comments & Suggestions

1. Replace single-family residences along Sycamore Avenue and near corner of Tsushima St./San Pablo Ave. with mixed-use and/or multi-family housing (e.g., townhouse, live-work units, etc.). Traffic on San Pablo Ave. may have potential noise impacts on residences at corner of Tsushima St./San Pablo Ave. but may be an opportunistic location to relocate and reuse one of the City's historic buildings for commercial and/or civic purposes, which would also provide a buffer between residences and San Pablo Ave. May need to modify existing parking district to accommodate additional residential parking needs.
2. Consider presenting different architectural styles of buildings given context of existing buildings.
3. Provide more visibility into (walls with minimum 15% glazing) and articulation of pharmacy along street frontages; make commercial buildings more outward facing.
4. Relocate, visually minimize, and/or reduce length of drive-through for pharmacy.
5. Separate commercial/retail parking from sidewalks with minimum 10-ft. front setback area (per Planned Commercial-Residential zoning regulations).
6. Hotel elevations (AH-3.1 & AH-3.2): Front (west) façade at 1st and 2nd floor, left (north) side of main entrance, is confusing and asymmetrical.
7. Reposition residential units nearest San Pablo Avenue to minimize sound impacts and provide better visitor access.
8. Include windows on all sides of residences.
9. Relocate park to more visible, central location.
10. Explain difference between AR-3.20 (Plan 2) and AR. 3.21 (Plan 2 ENH).
11. Proposed San Pablo Avenue geometry is inconsistent with previously submitted preliminary improvement plans.
12. Provide parking, bike lanes, and bus stops on both sides of Tsushima Street.
13. Provide sidewalks on both sides of all public streets, with 4-ft. planting strip between sidewalk and curb on all interior streets.
14. Incorporate traffic calming measures (e.g., bulb outs) and other means to discourage traffic from hotel cutting through residential neighborhood.
15. "C" Lane appears offset from "A" Street (Common Street).
16. Revise Cross Section C (C-8.2) for "A" Street (Common Street) to include 12-ft. travel lanes. Extend cross section configuration (parking and sidewalks on both sides of street) full length of "A" Street.
17. Provide directional curb ramps.
18. Work with WestCAT to determine appropriate bus stop locations and design.
19. Revise public street cross sections to provide crowned streets (C-3.0).

20. Proposed sewer outfall will not be permitted under bio-retention facility (C-4.0).
21. Trash enclosure seems too far from shops. Need accessible path to trash enclosure(s) (AC-1.1).
22. Provide details of green screens on shop elevations.
23. Potential conflict between entrance and drive-thru at Pad 1 and cars backing out of parking next to patio at Building 1.
24. Porch spaces on some residences (e.g., Plan 3) are too small.
25. Reduce alley lanes from 24 to 20 ft. wide but increase adjacent setback area on both sides from 3 ft. to 10 ft. (C-3.0).
26. Relocate and align hotel parking lot entrance with “B” Street.
27. Remove dead end of “D” Lane and modify street to provide turn-around ability and meet City’s cul-de-sac standards.
28. Provide parking on both sides of “A” Street and “B” Street (at opposite ends of center block of residences).
29. Consider palm trees or other prominent vertical elements to draw attention to retail patios.

Once the City has received the required items above and within 30 days of deeming the applications, the City must determine, in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, whether an Environmental Impact Report, Negative Declaration, or use of a previously-prepared EIR or Negative Declaration will be prepared for your proposal. **The City has initially determined that your proposal will be relying on the previously-approved EIR and possibly drafting an Addendum incorporating previously adopted mitigation measures, as the project has far fewer anticipated impacts than considered in the previously certified environmental documents.**

Applicants are expected to attend the Planning Commission and City Council public hearings. Please telephone me at (510) 799-8248 or email me at reber@ci.hercules.ca.us if you should have any questions regarding the processing of your permits.

Sincerely,

Robert Reber
Adjunct Planner, AICP

cc: Holly Smyth, Planning Director
Patrick Tang, City Attorney
Dan Doporto, City Attorney
Mike Porto, Planning Consultant (SP2)
Jerry Haag, Planning Consultant (SP2)