

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER
FROM: JOHN R. McCARTHY, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF REMOVAL OF BOLLARDS IN LARKFIELD PLACE CONNECTION BETWEEN TRACT 1632-6 (PRISKE-JONES) AND TRACT 1832 (ERSKINE)
DATE: MAY 18, 1999

Needs: For the City Council to reconsider bollard installation that limits vehicle access between Tract 1632-6 and Tract 1832.

- Facts:**
1. This item was continued from May 4, 1999 to may 18, 1999 at the request of Tom Erskine.
 2. In January 1989, Tract 1632 (Priske-Jones, formerly Rider), the Meadowlark Farms development, was approved requiring the developer to install Larkfield Place (near Larkfield and Oriole) to its westerly boundary.
 3. In February 1990, Tract 1832 (Erskine) was approved with the condition that Larkfield Place would be constructed to its easterly boundary to connect to that portion of Larkfield built with Tract 1632. (see attached exhibit)
 4. In 1994, the developer of Tract 1632 (Rider) filed an amendment to revise the phasing of his tract. The road alignments were left the same, only sub phasing of construction was requested.
 5. The developer of Tract 1832 (Erskine) requested at the January 19, 1999, City Council meeting that the Larkfield Place connection be delayed until the last phase of construction of Tract 1632. Mr. Erskine felt that this was the original intent of the Planning Commission when the amendment for phasing was approved.
 6. Emergency Services Staff recommended against bollard placement concluding that Larkfield Place should be opened as access to both tracts to serve property owners with appropriate emergency service needs.
 7. The City Council at the meeting of January 19th approved Mr. Erskine's request for placement of bollards.
 8. Some citizens of the area spoke against the bollards requesting removal at the April 20 Council meeting.

Analysis and

Conclusion: The connection of Larkfield to the adjacent subdivision has been a planned component of the area circulation system for many years. It would seem prudent to require that Tract 1632 and 1832 be connected with the completion of Larkfield Place to serve the property owners with emergency services.

The Council may wish to consider the removal of the bollards for reasons of emergency services response, otherwise the bollards will remain and be removed with the last phase of the Meadowlark Farms development. Time frame for that completion is unknown at this time.

Policy

Reference: Adopted City Street Standards

Fiscal

Impact:

\$200 to remove bollards and patch street. Funds to come from budgeted Public Works Street budget.

Options:

- A. That the City Council require the removal of the bollards that physically separate vehicular traffic from Tract 1632-6 and 1832 immediately.
- B. That the City Council require the removal of the bollards that physically separate vehicular traffic from Tract 1632-6 and 1832 in July 1999 when the homes in Tract 1632-6 are complete.
- C. That the Council allow the existing bollards to remain and be removed with phase 7 of the Meadowlark Farms subdivision.
- D. That the City Council amend, modify, or reject the above options.

COPY

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER

FROM: JOHN R. McCARTHY, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: LARKFIELD PLACE CONNECTION BETWEEN TRACT 1632-6
(PRISKE-JONES) AND TRACT 1832 (ERSKINE)

DATE: JANUARY 19, 1999

Needs: For the City Council to evaluate the request to limit vehicular access between Tract 1632-6 and Tract 1832 with the construction of Larkfield Place.

- Facts:**
1. In January 1989, Tract 1632 (Priske-Jones, formerly Rider), was approved, which required the developer to install Larkfield Place to be constructed to its westerly boundary to connect to future tract.
 2. In February 1990, Tract 1832 (Erskine) was approved with the condition that Larkfield Place would be constructed to its easterly boundary to connect to that portion of Larkfield built with Tract 1632. (see attached exhibit)
 3. In 1994, the developer of Tract 1632 (Rider) filed an amendment to allow him to revise the original phasing of his tract. The road alignments were left the same, only sub phasing of construction was requested.
 4. The amendment was granted by the City Council based on the following conditions:
 - a. Condition #7 allowed the developer to develop his tract out of numerical sequence except for phase 7 (i.e. homes in phase 7 would be built last.)
 - b. Condition 3h required the developer to connect with Larkfield to the west (Tract 1832) with phase 4 development.
 - c. The phasing map attached to the adopted resolution shows Larkfield connecting with Phase 7A.
 5. Phase 4 of Tract 1632 is currently under construction.
 6. The developer of Tract 1832 (Erskine) is requesting that the Larkfield Place connection be delayed until the last phase of construction of Tract 1632. Mr. Erskine feels that this was the original intent of the Planning Commission when the amendment was approved as shown in the Phasing maps referenced above in 4c.

7. The current developer of Tract 1632 (Priske-Jones) has met with the potential buyers of lots within his tract and discussed delaying the street connection. These future homeowners prefer that the street connection be made at this time, however, they are willing to allow the closure for the time being.
8. Emergency Services Staff has reviewed the proposal and they have concluded that Larkfield Place should be opened as access to both tracts in order to serve property owners with appropriate emergency service needs.

**Analysis
and**

Conclusion: The City has a policy that dead end streets be limited to a maximum of 1,200 feet before a secondary access for emergency purposes is required.

Tract 1832 currently has one point of access (off Oriole) and with a "dead end" street of 1000 feet with 43 lots.

Without connection to Tract 1832, Tract 1632-6 would have one point of access with a "dead end" street of 1500 feet with 27 lots.

It would seem prudent to require that Tract 1632-6 and 1832 be connected with the completion of Larkfield Place to serve the property owners with emergency services.

As a compromise to both parties, Emergency Services and Engineering are agreeable to limiting vehicular access with break-away bollards between the two tracts. This would prevent day to day vehicular access but still allow access during an emergency. The bollards would be removed at phase 7A development of Tract 1632.

Policy

Reference: Adopted City Street Standards
Resolution No. 94-040
Resolution No. 90-12

Fiscal

Impact: None

- Options:**
- A. That the City Council require the physical connection of Tract 1632-6 and 1832 but install removable bollards to the satisfaction of the Department of Emergency Services to allow access during an emergency.
 - B. That the City Council amend, modify, or reject the above options.

Attachments: (2)

- 1) Location Maps
- 2) Conditions of Approval, Tract 1632


120-4

14-4

ASSOCIATED PROFESSIONALS, INC.

1

TRACT 1632/PD BECC'S



CLARKFIELD

MEADOWLARK FARMS

PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
OCTOBER 24, 1994

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Banakis, Crawford, Ferravanti, Johnson, Nemeth, Warnke

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ABSENTS: Dakin

STAFF BRIEFING: No changes

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. REPHASING OF TRACT 1632 - It was requested by Paso Robles Partners to create sub-phases of phases 6 and 7 of an approved residential subdivision located North of Meadowlark Road, west of Airport Road and east of Oriole Way at the terminus of Larkfield Place.

Public Testimony: Mike Rider
Gary Boatman
Tom Erskine

Action: A motion was made by Commissioner Ferravanti, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve Option 1 subject to additional conditions by developer on himself, then only after full completion of Phase 3 (all its subphases), but the motion failed for lack of a majority vote of 3-3 (Commissioners Banakis, Crawford, and Nemeth dissenting; Commissioner Dakin absent) .

A motion was made by Commissioner Crawford, seconded by Commissioner Nemeth, to approve Option 2, but failed for lack of a majority vote of 2-4 (Commissioners Banakis, Ferravanti, Johnson, and Warnke dissenting; Commissioner Dakin absent).

A motion was made by Commissioner Crawford, seconded by Commissioner Warnke, and passed 5-1 (Commissioner Nemeth dissenting and Commissioner Dakin absent) to approve Option 1 with the contingency that Phase 7 be developed last.

B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 94011 - It was requested by the Defenders of the Faith Church to establish a church within 1800 square feet of a mixed use retail/office center at 715 - 24th Street.

Public Testimony: Alberto Toribio

Action: A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Ferravanti, and passed 6-0 (Commissioner Dakin absent) to approve.

RESOLUTION NO. 94-040
A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
TO AMEND THE PHASING OF TENTATIVE TRACT 1632
(PASO ROBLES PARTNERS)
APN: 09-757-07,08 and 11

WHEREAS, Paso Robles Partners has filed an application to modify the phasing for phases 6 and 7 of Tract 1632, located on the north side of Meadowlark Road, east of Oriole Way, and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on August 22, 1994, September 12, 1994, September 26, 1994 and October 24, 1994, to consider facts as presented in the staff report prepared for this project, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed amendment to Tract 1632, and

WHEREAS, a Negative Declaration was adopted by the Planning Commission at the time the tract was originally approved, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and

WHEREAS, the re-phasing does not affect the circumstances under which the Negative Declaration was issued for this project, therefore, no additional environmental review is required, and

WHEREAS, the applicant in a letter to the Planning Commission, dated October 24, 1994, has volunteered to pave a connecting access between phase 7B and Airport Road with the development of phase 7B to address circulation concerns, and to develop Airport Road in conjunction with sub-phases which have frontage on Airport Road, and

WHEREAS, based upon the facts and analysis presented in the staff report, public testimony received and subject to the conditions of approval listed below, the Planning Commission makes the following findings as required by Government Code Section 66474:

1. The proposed tentative subdivision map in conjunction with final Planned Development approval is consistent with the adopted General Plan for the City of El Paso De Robles.
2. The design of lots, streets, open space, drainage, sewers, water and other improvements in conjunction with Planned Development approval is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance;
3. The site is physically suitable for the type of development proposed;

4. The site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development;

5. The design of the subdivision is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and unavoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat;

6. The design of the subdivision and types of improvements proposed are not likely to cause serious public health problems;

7. The design of the subdivision and the type of improvements proposed will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed subdivision.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso De Robles does hereby grant an amendment to phasing of tentative Tract 1632 subject to the following conditions:

1. The Final Subdivision Map shall be in substantial compliance with the tentative subdivision map for phasing (Attached as Exhibit A; full size copies are on file in the Community Development Department).
2. Resolution 93-073 which created sub-phases for phases 3 through 5 of the project shall be superseded by this resolution. The conditions of that resolution have been incorporated herein.
3. All conditions within Resolution 89-02 shall remain in full force and effect (Attached as Exhibit B) except as modified or clarified for improvements for phases 3 through 7 as follows:

PHASE 3

a. Phase 3B will need to be redesigned for drainage should it be a separate phase. Stormwater from the east and south are tributary to the area of this phase. Additional storm drain work beyond this phase may be required, pending further engineering analysis.

b. Phase 3C will require completion of the 48" storm drain to the south and the construction of Meadowlark Road between this phase and Summit Ridge(Phase 3A).

c. Phase 3D will be a "fill in" phase that will require no changes to the proposal.

d. Original condition # 38 will apply to Phase 3C

e. Meadowlark Road shall be constructed with Phase 3C from Airport to Summit Ridge.

PHASE 4

f. Phase 4A is contiguous to the existing improvements and should prove logical for a phased development. Some flexibility should be granted to the applicant for grading onto other phases as needed to complete earthwork as needed.

g. Phase 4C needs to loop the water system to the west for connection through 4D phase.

h. Phase 4D will complete the road circulation with the tract to the west.

1. Original condition # 44 shall apply to Phase 4C.

PHASE 5

j. Phase 5C will need to complete the drainage system to the east tract boundary and need to complete a paved turn around for fire vehicles.

k. Phase 5D will need to construct a paved turn around for fire vehicles.

l. Original condition #47 shall be modified as stated in condition 4 of this resolution.

PHASE 6

m. Phase 6A and 6B are served with sewer and water as part of improvements for Phase 7G and certain sub-phases in Phase 3 and 4. Therefore these improvements must first be constructed prior to development of these phases.

n. Condition #60 of Resolution 89-02 is modified such that a drainage study is required as part of Phase 6A or 6C whichever development is first.

o. A looped water system is required as part of Phase 6B and 6D development.

p. Applicant shall provide a secondary access road as part of Phase 6B and 6D development.

PHASE 7

q. Phase 7A is contiguous to the existing improvements of an adjacent tract to the west and may be constructed independent of any other phases or sub-phases for this tract, upon first completing previous numerical phases.

TR. 1632 Condition of Approval

r. Applicant shall provide a secondary based access road to connect to existing Airport Road at the northerly tract boundary as part of Phase 7B and 7C development.

s. Phase 7G is served with its sewer and drainage from certain phases in Phase 3 and 4. Therefore, these improvements must first be constructed prior to its development.

t. A looped water system is required as part of Phase 7B, 7C, 7E, 7F, and 7G development.

u. Condition #65 of Resolution 89-02 is modified such that a drainage study is required as part of Phase 7B development.

v. Applicant shall provide a secondary paved road to existing Airport Road as part of Phases 7E and 7F development.

w. Ultimate drainage improvements must be constructed as part of Phase 7B, 7C, 7E, and 7F whichever phase is first developed.

x. A 32 foot wide paved access road, connecting to Airport Road, shall be improved at the time of development of phase 7B in an alignment and manner to be approved by the City Engineer.

At the time of development of each sub-phase that has frontage on Airport Road, the following shall be required to be improved:

- a. For the portion of Airport Road that is adjacent to the respective sub-phase: 32 feet of paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, landscaping and soundwall shall be improved;
 - b. Off-site paving of 32 feet shall be installed to the nearest paved road to provide two points of access as approved by the Fire Chief;
 - c. All landscape medians within Airport Road are to be constructed (in addition to items listed under 4a) currently with the development of the respective sub-phases located to the east of Airport Road;
5. All transition and supporting improvements beyond phase boundary lines shall be constructed at the direction of the City Engineer.
 6. The applicant shall agree in a manner acceptable to the City Attorney to pay impact mitigation fees as may be established through a resolution adopted by the City Council. The agreement shall be entered into before recordation of the final map.


7. The development of phase seven (7) of this tract, as shown on the attached exhibit A, shall not commence until such time that all other numerical phases (1 through 6) have been completed. With the exception of phase 7, all other phases may be developed out of numerical sequence, in accordance with the conditions established through this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 24th Day of October, 1994 by the following Roll Call Vote:


AYES: CRAWFORD, WARNKE, BANAKIS, JOHNSON, FERRAVANTI

NOES: NEMETH

ABSENT:


VICE-CHAIRMAN GARY NEMETH

ATTEST:


ROBERT A. LATA, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

bb\tract\1632\pc10-24.rsl


TR. 1632 Condition of Approval

16-11

14-1


PLANNING AND DESIGN SERVICES
1000 PLEASANT HILL ROAD
SUITE 100
DALLAS, TEXAS 75209
TEL: 972-443-1111
FAX: 972-443-1112
WWW.PDSI.COM

MEADOWLARK FARMS
PHASE 1



MEADOWLARK FARMS

REVISIONS			
DESCRIPTIONS	BY	DATE	APPROVED



NOTES:


- 1. NO MORE THAN 20 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES MAY BE SERVED BY A CUL-DE-SAC STREET (OR A TEMPORARY DEAD-END STUBBED STREET).
- 2. THE USE OF CUL-DE-SACS SHALL BE DISCOURAGED IN COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ZONES.

42'					
(15.8m)	(12.8m)	(18.3m)	(15.2m)	(12.2m)	(18.3m)

MAXIMUM LENGTH OF CUL-DE-SAC (L)	
L=600' (182.9m)	A DEAD-END WATER MAIN WITH A BLOW-OFF AND FIRE-HYDRANT IS ALLOWED FOR THIS LENGTH.
L=900' (274.3m)	PERMITTED WITH A LOOPED WATER SYSTEM.
L=1200' (365.8m)	PERMITTED WITH LOOPED WATER SYSTEM AND EMERGENCY ACCESS AT END OF STREET.

DRAWN BY: C.A.C.	CITY OF PASO ROBLES ENGINEERING DIVISION	DRAWING NO.
DESIGNED BY:		
DATE: 4/18/94	RESIDENTIAL CUL-DE-SAC	A-18
FILE NAME: PR-A-18.DWG	16-13	14-13

22






LARKFIELD
 TRACT 1832 (ERSKINE)

46

TENTATIVE
 TRACT 1832
 BEING A DIVISION OF
 PARCELS A AND
 B OF PLOT 1832
 OF PLOT 1832
 OF PLOT 1832
 OF PLOT 1832
 OF PLOT 1832

1. 107
 2. 108
 3. 109
 4. 110
 5. 111
 6. 112
 7. 113
 8. 114
 9. 115
 10. 116
 11. 117
 12. 118
 13. 119
 14. 120
 15. 121
 16. 122
 17. 123
 18. 124
 19. 125
 20. 126
 21. 127
 22. 128
 23. 129
 24. 130
 25. 131
 26. 132
 27. 133
 28. 134
 29. 135
 30. 136
 31. 137
 32. 138
 33. 139
 34. 140
 35. 141
 36. 142
 37. 143
 38. 144
 39. 145
 40. 146
 41. 147
 42. 148
 43. 149
 44. 150
 45. 151
 46. 152
 47. 153
 48. 154
 49. 155
 50. 156
 51. 157
 52. 158
 53. 159
 54. 160
 55. 161
 56. 162
 57. 163
 58. 164
 59. 165
 60. 166
 61. 167
 62. 168
 63. 169
 64. 170
 65. 171
 66. 172
 67. 173
 68. 174
 69. 175
 70. 176
 71. 177
 72. 178
 73. 179
 74. 180
 75. 181
 76. 182
 77. 183
 78. 184
 79. 185
 80. 186
 81. 187
 82. 188
 83. 189
 84. 190
 85. 191
 86. 192
 87. 193
 88. 194
 89. 195
 90. 196
 91. 197
 92. 198
 93. 199
 94. 200

1. 107
 2. 108
 3. 109
 4. 110
 5. 111
 6. 112
 7. 113
 8. 114
 9. 115
 10. 116
 11. 117
 12. 118
 13. 119
 14. 120
 15. 121
 16. 122
 17. 123
 18. 124
 19. 125
 20. 126
 21. 127
 22. 128
 23. 129
 24. 130
 25. 131
 26. 132
 27. 133
 28. 134
 29. 135
 30. 136
 31. 137
 32. 138
 33. 139
 34. 140
 35. 141
 36. 142
 37. 143
 38. 144
 39. 145
 40. 146
 41. 147
 42. 148
 43. 149
 44. 150
 45. 151
 46. 152
 47. 153
 48. 154
 49. 155
 50. 156
 51. 157
 52. 158
 53. 159
 54. 160
 55. 161
 56. 162
 57. 163
 58. 164
 59. 165
 60. 166
 61. 167
 62. 168
 63. 169
 64. 170
 65. 171
 66. 172
 67. 173
 68. 174
 69. 175
 70. 176
 71. 177
 72. 178
 73. 179
 74. 180
 75. 181
 76. 182
 77. 183
 78. 184
 79. 185
 80. 186
 81. 187
 82. 188
 83. 189
 84. 190
 85. 191
 86. 192
 87. 193
 88. 194
 89. 195
 90. 196
 91. 197
 92. 198
 93. 199
 94. 200



NOTICE OF A CITY COUNCIL HEARING REGARDING LARKFIELD PLACE

The City Council of the City of Paso Robles will be considering the matter of removal of wood posts installed at Larkfield Place between Tract 1832 (Oak Knoll Estates) and Tract 1632 (Meadowlark Farms)

**Where: City Hall Council Chambers
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446**

**When: 7:30 PM
Tuesday, May 18, 1999**

Please attend the meeting if you wish to speak to the City Council regarding this matter. You may also submit written comments at the above location.

NOTE: This matter was continued from the May 4th City Council meeting to May 18th.