

**E.I.A No.2005-21 / SITE PLAN REVIEW NO. 2005-12**  
**APPLICATION BY JOHN ROUSH**

**A. General Information:**

1. Planning Review: January 9, 2006
2. Owner: John Roush  
8500 Graves Creek Road  
Atascadero, CA 93422  
(805) 461-1372
3. Engineer: Uesurgi & Associates  
870 Market Street, Suite 505  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 781-4141
4. Location: 400 Follett Street
5. Property Description: Assessor Parcel # 020-042-022
6. Site Area: Approximately 30,000 square feet
7. Existing Use: Movie Cinema
8. Proposed Use: Four (4) additional movie screens
9. General Plan Designation: Central Commercial (CC)
10. Zone District: CC (Central Commercial)

**B. Project Location & Description:**

The applicant proposes to construct four (4) additional movie auditoriums consisting of 434 new seats over 8,209 square feet of area within the existing Lemoore Stadium Cinema location at 400 Follett Street. Before the additional auditoriums can be built an existing block building on the southeastern corner of the project site and the grass area on the northeastern portion of the project site will be removed. The existing movie theater consists of six (6) auditoriums containing 895 seats over 22,092 square feet of area. The main entrance/exist to the new theaters will be from the existing lobby

Properties to the south, east and west of the subject site are zoned CC, while property to the north is zoned CS (Service Commercial).

## 2. Compliance with Downtown Revitalization Plan

The exterior elevations and site plan were taken before the Architectural Design Review Committee on December 12, 2005. In order to be in compliance with the Downtown Revitalization Plan, the Committee required several modifications be made to the exterior elevations, as well as modifications to the type of parking lighting being used so that it would match the adjacent Depot parking, modifying the trash enclosure to blend with the surrounding architecture using a brick facade to match the Depot, adding 6 additional trees in the parking lot, and modifying a few other tree types in the parking area (while being sensitive to future lighting/security needs). Once these modifications are made (as shown on the attached approval of the Architectural Design Review Committee Exhibit B) the proposed expansion will be in conformance with the Downtown Revitalization Plan.

## 3. Ingress/Egress, Internal Circulation, and Traffic:

The ingress/egress will be from "E" and Follett Streets. A 25' wide two-way access will continue to be open from Follett Street. Two 25' wide two-way access driveway will provide access from "E" Street once the parking area is completely paved as required by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

## 4. Parking:

A total of 123 asphalt parking stalls are proposed in the existing gravel area due north of the existing building. Once the entire parking area is properly paved, striped, and landscaped, the proposed 123 parking stalls will meet the City's requirement for the addition.

In a comment letter from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, the District has received many complaints regarding the dust being generated from the Lemoore Stadium Cinema parking lot. The District has requested that prior to granting the theater permission to expand that the City require the owner to pave the parking area before the expansion or at least set a deadline for the paving to take place. Therefore, staff recommends that the parking lot be built prior to the final occupancy being given for the new four auditoriums or no longer than 1 year from this Site Plan approval date, whichever comes first.

## 5. Building Setbacks:

There are no setback requirements for a central commercial piece of property surrounding by commercially zoned uses.

## 6. Utilities:

The various utilities are located in the alley adjacent to the site and already serve the existing building.

## 7. Fire Safety:

apart on local streets. One street light exists on a wood utility pole on the northside of "E" Street near Armstrong. Therefore, the existing pole street light shall be replaced and a new street light shall be installed next to the parking lot entrances along "E" Street and shall match the downtown street light style.

Onsite lighting is proposed at each building entrance and exit point which blends in with the building architecture. Lighting in the parking area is required to match the Depot lighting per the approval of the Architectural Design Review Committee and spaced in a manner similar to the Depot and avoid glare towards the nearby residential properties.

#### 8. Streetscape and landscape:

The addition of the new four auditoriums will remove the existing grass area located on the northeasterly portion of the sight. However, eight new street trees and landscaping are proposed along "E" Street abutting the proposed parking lot area and additional trees and landscaping areas will also be added adjacent to Follett Street. Such landscaping will need to be able to provide a screening buffer between the parking lot and City streets as required in the Downtown Revitalization Plan. The Architectural Design Review committee required that 1) some of the trees along "E" Street be changed to Chinese Pistache so that two different tree species will exist, 2) required that many of the parking lot trees be changed to Bradford Pears to provide for shade as required in the Downtown Revitalization Plan, 3) entrance trees be changed to the decorative Crepe Myrtle tree, and 4) that six additional trees be planted in the parking area to meet the Downtown Revitalization Plan requirements. The proposed landscaping provides approximately 6,240 square feet of landscape space to the site, approximately 1,290 square feet short. Therefore, additional landscape areas will need to be added as shown in Exhibit A to be in conformance with the General Plan.

#### 9. Trash Enclosure:

The site does not currently contain any trash enclosures onsite, and current trash bin is located where auditorium 9 will be located. Therefore, a trash enclosure shall be proposed to be built within the improved parking area. The Architectural Design Review Committee required that the enclosure blend with the surrounding architecture, therefore the enclosure shall incorporate a brick facade to match the depot and the gates will be upgraded to match the style of the area.

#### 10. Fences:

The existing block building on the southeastern portion of the project site acts as a fence line between the Auto Parts store and the movie theater. With the removal of the block building the property to the east will lose a portion of their fencing which screens and separates the two uses. Therefore, a new screened fence will need to be installed to separate the two properties. Because this area will not be visible from "D" Street, the Architectural Design Review committee did not feel that it was necessary to require a decorative block wall feature be built and that a screened fence of some type should be adequate as decided by the property owner.

#### 11. Design:

The plan will need to meet the approval requirements by the Architectural Design Review Committee for the exterior design, colors and minor modifications which were approved on December 12, 2005.



### 13. Signs:

Signs were not part of the submittal and any new signage will have to submit a separate sign application before new signage is ordered or installed.

#### **D. Comments from Other Agencies/Departments:**

Referrals were made to various agencies and City Departments who may be impacted by the project. Comments were received from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and Fire Department and have been considered in the preparation of this report and recommendations.

#### **E. Environmental Assessment:**

A preliminary environmental impact assessment of the project has been completed by the staff. It was determined that the project will not have any significant effect on the environment and a Negative Declaration should be filed under the CEQA Guidelines so long as the paving of the parking area as proposed is carried out within the above listed deadlines.

#### **F. Conditions of Approval:**

Site Plan Review No. 2005-12 for John Roush is approved with the following conditions and shall be valid for one-year until January 9, 2007, within which time a building permit shall be pulled and construction started.

1. The construction plans shall be submitted in conformance with the modifications required by the Architectural Design Committee approval given December 12, 2005 as shown in Exhibit B.
2. The parking area shall be properly paved with asphalt to City Standards to accommodate the proposed 123 parking stalls and improvements shall include landscaping, decorative parking lights to match the Depot, and a decorative trash enclosure as shown in Exhibit B. Such parking shall be in place prior to occupancy being given or by January 9, 2007, whichever occurs first.
3. One fire hydrant shall be installed within the landscape area closest to the new auditorium 8 north of "E" Street and shown on Exhibit A as required by the fire department to provide adequate fire service.
4. One street light on an existing wood utility pole shall be replaced and one new street light installed along "E" Street next to the two driveway entrances to match those in the downtown area as approved by the Planning and Public Works Departments.
5. Additional landscaping shall be added to the parking area as outlined in Exhibit A.
6. The design of the exit hallways on the east side of the new auditoriums shall be altered to avoid safety hazards listed in the staff report as coordinated with the Planning, Public Works and Police Departments.
7. In accordance with City Council Resolution 2005-24 adopted on June 7, 2005, the Council has

Approved

# ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

## FOR THE CITY OF LEMOORE

1. Project Title: Site Plan Review No.2005-12
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Lemoore, 210 Fox Street, Lemoore California 93245
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Holly Smyth (559) 924-6740
4. Project Location: East side of Follett Street, west of the "E" Street dead-end and south of the Trailroad Tracks
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: John Roush, 8500 Graves Creek Road, Atascadero, CA. 93422
6. General Plan Designation: Central Commercial
7. Zone District: CC (Central Commercial)
8. Description of Project: To construct four additional movie auditoriums consisting of 434 new seats over 8,209 square feet of area within the existing Lemoore Stadium Cinemas located at 400 Follett Street.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Residential to the north, commercial to the east, west and south.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: \_\_\_\_\_

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

(The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### DETERMINATION - On the basis of this initial evaluation:

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

- XX I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- \_\_\_ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- \_\_\_ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- \_\_\_ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to project like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effect from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

### I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:

- |   |  |  |    |
|---|--|--|----|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?   |  |  | XX |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock, outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |  |  | XX |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?   |  |  | XX |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                     |  |  | XX |

### II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

(Note: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the *California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model* (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in



**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:**

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to *Division of Mines & Geology Special Publication 42.*)
  - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
  - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
  - iv) Landslides?
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:**

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment Through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident Conditions involving the release of hazardous materials Into the environment?
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or.

			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX

wildlands area adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				XX
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted.)?				XX
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				XX
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				XX
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				XX
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				XX
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				XX
h) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				XX
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				XX
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				XX
<b>IX. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> - Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?				XX
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the				XX

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

			XX
--	--	--	----

**XI. NOISE - Would the project result in: (cont.)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generations of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				XX
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				XX
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				XX
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				XX
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				XX

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:**

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by processing new homes and Businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure?				XX
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				XX
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				XX

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical Impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?				XX
ii) Police protection?				XX
iii) Schools?				XX
iv) Parks?				XX



**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:**

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		XX	
			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX
		XX	
			XX

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections.)?
- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:**

			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to the serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history?
- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)?
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			XX

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

### **EXPLANATION OF OTHER THAN “NO IMPACT” RESPONSES**

- Item IIIb. Once the parking lot is paved, the dust problem that was created and sited by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District will be resolved.
- Item XVa. The project is anticipated to generate an additional 196 trips during the peak period on a Saturday in addition to the approximately 528 existing during the same peak period (totaling 724 trips). With the completion of the parking lot, vehicles will be able to access the theaters from “E” Street (a local street) connecting to Follett Street (a collector street) which is able to accommodate the peak traffic. The general plan designates that Follett Street will ultimately connect to Cinnamon Drive (another collector street) across the railroad which will lessen the impact to “D” and “E” Streets.
- Item XVf The proposed parking lot of 123 parking stalls, once properly paved and improved, will provide adequate parking for the facility when combined with surrounding parking.