

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS, AND  
HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

FROM: ROBERT A. LATA, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT – GENERAL PLAN UPDATE  
AD HOC COMMITTEE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

DATE: APRIL 29, 2003

Needs: For the City Council and the Planning Commission:

- To receive a presentation from the City’s consultant, Mr. John Rickenbach with Rincon:
  - Providing an overview of the work completed to date; and,
  - Reviewing the remaining steps and time frames for completing the General Plan Update.
- To select one of the following land use alternatives as the maximum, theoretical “buildout” for review and evaluation in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR):
  - Initial scope of up to 48,900 residents as released in January, 2003; or
  - Revised scope of up to 45,400 residents as recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee.

- Facts:
1. The Ad Hoc Committee for the General Plan Update is comprised of Council members Picanco and Finigan and Planning Commissioners Flynn, Johnson, and Warnke.
  2. The Ad Hoc Committee’s role is to provide input on formulation of the recommended text for the Update. It has met weekly since January, and is expected to complete its work by June.

Analysis And Conclusion: Based on prior Council direction, the largest geographic area and population scenario and three (3) other land use alternatives will be studied in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Update.

The EIR will present the potential impacts of the maximum, theoretical “buildout” and the other alternatives. The EIR findings will then be available for use in making subsequent decisions on the appropriate level of growth for the City. As recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee (see attached), the land use alternatives would be:

Alternative #1	Maximum Development	43,500 to 45,400
Alternative #2	Moderate Development	42,000 to 43,500
Alternative #3	Minimum Development	40,000 to 42,000
Alternative #4	Existing General Plan	Approximately 35,000

Committee Review - The Ad Hoc Committee on the General Plan has:

- Reviewed the background materials and written requests/comment letters received;
- Created a Revised Proposal for General Plan Alternative #1 incorporating the majority of the modifications requested; and,
- Developed recommended text for the Vision Statement, the Land Use Element, and the Housing Element.

Upon completion of its review, the Ad Hoc Committee developed a Revised Proposal for General Plan Alternative #1. This revision incorporates a series of parcel specific recommendations in response to property-owner requests and other questions posed (see attached)

At this point in the General Plan Update process, the City Council and the Planning Commission have an opportunity to refine the scope of the “maximum buildout” scenario and make the EIR more reflective of the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations.

If the City Council and the Planning Commission concur:

- The initial scope with up to 48,900 residents would be discarded; and,
- The revised scope with up to 45,400 residents would be evaluated in the EIR.

Next Steps (Separate Notice will be provided)

The Committee will complete its work on the remaining General Plan Elements by May/June;

A Council/Commission Public Workshop will be held once all of the Elements are drafted (Tentatively scheduled for June 10<sup>th</sup>);

The EIR will be released for public review and comment (Late Spring/Early Summer); and,

The Public Hearings will be held (Fall/Winter).

Fiscal

Impact:

None. A budget has already been established for the Update. General Plan implementation programs, however, will require establishment of individual budgets, as appropriate.

Options:

For the City Council and the Planning Commission:

- A. To select the revised scope of up to 45,400 residents as recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee as the maximum, theoretical “buildout” for review and evaluation in the EIR.
- B. To select the initial scope of up to 48,900 residents as released in January, 2003 as the maximum, theoretical “buildout” for review and evaluation in the EIR.
- C. To request additional information and analysis.
- D. To amend, modify, or reject the foregoing options.

Attachment:

Informational Report to the Planning Commission dated April 22, 2003

**Table 1. - Potential Development on Vacant & Other Areas Within the City**

Area	Description	Acres	Existing Land Use	Change to?	Housing Potential (Existing GP)	Request Submitted	Assumptions/Notes	Recommended?
<b>C1</b>	Chandler Ranch	806.00	Various	SP	258-1,214 units (256)	City Initiated	<p>Specific Plan is being prepared separately.</p> <p>Four alternatives are being reviewed, providing a range of buildout potential.</p> <p>The housing potential referenced in this table reflects the low and high buildout potential for the geographic area.</p> <p>The area does not include the buildout potential of Our Town, which is in Sphere of influence Area S3.</p> <p>APN 025-371-002, 004, 005, 007, 008, 014, &amp; 015                      APN 025-381-001, 005, 006, 007, 008                      APN 020-211-009, 010</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Different land use alternatives are being studied as part of the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan.</p> <p>The Specific Plan and General Plan Update are tentatively scheduled for public hearings in the fall/winter of 2003</p>
<b>C2</b>	Hanson property	11.00	RSF	RSF-4 (On the 2 level acres adjacent to S. River Road) and RSF-6 on the remainder of the site consistent with Serenade	47 units (33)	City Initiated	<p>APN: 009-815-02</p> <p>Hanson Marilynn M. Revocable Trust                      1650 S. River Road                      Paso Robles, CA 93446</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Clustering not permitted in the lower level area.</p> <p>Density is to be spread uniformly on the top portion of the site.</p>
<b>C3</b>	East side of River Road, North of Niblick Road Near the river	5.50	RSF	RMF-12	50 units (20)	City Initiated	<p>APN 009-611-40</p> <p>Cary Audrey M. Living Trust                      3924 Robinwood                      Visalia, CA 93291</p>	Yes
<b>C4</b>	Subarea D Borkey Area Specific Plan	13.07	RSF-1	RMF-12	122 units (12)	<p>Yes</p> <p>See Letter #1 from Marie Rosenwasser, PhD Cuesta College</p>	<p>Along SR 46 East, with good access to major roads and Cuesta College.</p> <p>APNs: 025-391-006, 007, 008, 009, &amp; 068</p>	Yes.
<b>C14</b>	Sherwood Acres North	12.50	RSF		75 units		<p>Redesignate the area located easterly of Creston Road.</p> <p>This area is bounded by Santa Ysabel on the south, San Rafael on the east, Santa Fe on the north, and San Augustin on the west.</p> <p>This redesignation is in recognition that some at point in the future, considering the age of the existing homes, it may become economically viable to transition into higher densities.</p>	

**Table 1. - Potential Development on Vacant & Other Areas Within the City**

Area	Description	Acres	Existing Land Use	Change to?	Housing Potential (Existing GP)	Request Submitted	Assumptions/Notes	Recommended?
				RMF-8	(38)	City Initiated	APNs 009-328-001 to 020 and APNs 009-329-001 to 020	Yes
<b>C15</b>	North Coast Engineering Request (For Steve Sylvester)	1.60	RSF-1	RSF-3	4 (1)	Yes See Letter #2 from R Lawrence Werner North Coast Engineering	Request for higher density to allow subdivision of 1.6-acre parcel near Union Road APN 025-011-024 (1640 Kleck Road)	No, the recommendation is not to amend the GP land use designation due to concerns about setting precedence for further changes and due to the established RSF-1 development patterns in the area.
<b>C16</b>	SE of Niblick /River	7.23	RC/NC	Add Mixed Use Overlay	110 (0)	City Initiated	Retains the commercial designation, but would allow the option of high density housing on the site APN 009-814-020 & 021	Do not change the existing commercial designation existing designation. Instead, apply a Mixed Use Overlay.
<b>C17</b>	Pankey property	5.00	OP	RMF-8	30 (0)	Yes See Letter #3 from Woody Woodruff, Richard Woodland, and Phil Kispersky APNs 009-641-004 to 011	Change the existing Office Professional designated properties at the northwest corner of Creston & Rolling Hills Road to allow the opportunity for housing. These properties front onto Creston Road between Rolling Hills Road on the east and Orchard Road on the west. This would provide a transition from the RSF properties fronting Rolling Hills Road and the RMF properties fronting Creston Road, west of the subject properties	Yes
<b>C19</b>	North of Meadowlark (Harrod Request)	9.50	RSF-2	RSF-3	21 (14)	Yes. See Letter #21 from Mike Harrod. APN 009-750-001	Demonstration of site suitability required	Yes, contingent upon further analysis. As part of the development review process, there is to be a demonstration of site suitability with respect to topography and drainage

**Table 2. – Other Regulatory Actions Within the City That Could Increase Development Potential**

Area	Description	Acres	Existing Land Use	Change to?	Housing Potential (Existing GP)	Request Submitted	Assumptions/Notes	Recommended?
<b>C5</b>	Existing RMF-H designated site that is currently undeveloped	12.00	RMF-H (16 du/ac)	RMF-20	50	Yes. Prior comments received from the State's Housing & Community Development Department in 1991	Would increase maximum theoretical development potential for RMF-H properties from 16 to 20 du/ac. Would apply to 1401 Creston Road and the other parcels designated RMF-H. "Housing potential" is for the increased theoretical buildout of 1401 Creston Road (vacant), not the already developed parcels designated as RMF-H. APN 009-571-010 (1401 Creston Rd).	Yes
<b>C6</b>	Downtown Mixed Use Overlay	CC: 69.3 CS: 28.9	CC & CS	Downtown Mixed Use		Yes See Letters #4, #5, & #6 From San Luis Obispo's Housing Authority; Peoples' Self-Help Housing Corp; and HomeBuilders Association See Letter #7 from Jim &	Would apply to property designated as CC and CS in the area bounded by 24 <sup>th</sup> Street on the north, Highway 101 on the east, 1 <sup>st</sup> Street on the south, and the alley west of Spring Street on the west. This includes about 69.3 acres of CC and 28.9 acres of CS. This includes the properties south of 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, which had previously been considered separately. Housing potential assumes 20% of the Overlay area would be used for residential, at 75% of the potential maximum density of 20 du/ac. This could include a combination of development on vacant land and 2 <sup>nd</sup> story units over	

**Table 2. – Other Regulatory Actions Within the City That Could Increase Development Potential**

Area	Description	Acres	Existing Land Use	Change to?	Housing Potential (Existing GP)	Request Submitted	Assumptions/Notes	Recommended?
				Overlay	319	Terry Saunders	existing commercial or office development.	Yes
C7	Create Salinas River (SR) Overlay	?	Various	Create SR Overlay	N/A	This Overlay would be applied to properties along the Salinas River., in the river corridor	Standards would be developed to address conservation, access and recreation.	Yes
C8	Second Units	Citywide	RSF-1,2,3,4	Allow Second Units in RSF 1,2,3,4	305	City Initiated  Second Units are allowed as a matter of right per State law;  The City is in the process of creating an ordinance with specific development and design standards for these units	Buildout would apply to about 6,100 RSF designated parcels.  The "housing potential" of 305 units assumes that 5% of all eligible RSF-1, 2, 3, & 4 parcels would construct second units under this provision	Yes
C9	Purple Belt Policy	Citywide	Various	N/A	N/A	Yes  See Letter #9 from Paso Robles Trails Association  See Letter #10 from Editha Spencer	The General Plan would contain policy language addressing the "purple belt" concept and program, intended to be act as a hard urban edge.  The General Plan would not establish the location of the purple belt, but it would direct the purchase of development rights in the purple belt area.	Yes
C10	Change RSF to RSF-4	Citywide	RSF	RSF-4	No change	City Initiated	This change would not affect the buildout development potential.  It would make the RSF designation consistent with the terms used for RSF-1, RSF-2, and RSF-3.	Yes
C11	Create RSF-6 Designation	Citywide		RSF-6	0	City Initiated	Create RSF-6 designation  This designation would accommodate single-family residences up to 6 units per acre; e.g. 4,000 sq. ft. lots similar to Sierra Bonita, Serenade and Creston Courtyard.	Yes
C12	Senior Housing Overlay	To be provided	RMF-M CS, CC, and RMF-M	Senior Housing Overlay	To be provided	Yes  See Letter #8 from McCarthy & Associates	This Overlay would provide for senior housing subject to conformance with specific design and construction standards  Senior Housing Overlay to be applied to the area south of Hwy 101, west of the Railroad, north of 24 <sup>th</sup> Street, and east of Oak Street.	Yes
C13	Employee	Citywide	Varies			Yes  See Letters #4, #5, & #6 From San Luis Obispo's Housing Authority; Peoples' Self-Help; and	This would allow the opportunity for employers to provide workforce housing onsite.  To date, the City has a commitment from two separate	

**Table 2. – Other Regulatory Actions Within the City That Could Increase Development Potential**

Area	Description	Acres	Existing Land Use	Change to?	Housing Potential (Existing GP)	Request Submitted	Assumptions/Notes	Recommended?
	Housing			N/A-	45	The HomeBuilders Assn	employers to provide a total of 45 such units.	Yes
<b>C18</b>	Historical and Architectural Preservation (HP) Overlay District	Westside	Varies	Create Overlay District	N/A-	Yes See Letter #10 from Editha Spencer See Letter #11 from Grace Pucci	Establishes Historic Preservation Overlay District generally bounded by Olive & Chestnut Streets on the west, Vine & Oak Streets on the east, 8 <sup>th</sup> Street on the south, and 21 <sup>st</sup> Street on the north.  Would not affect existing and potential housing stock.  This District is found in Chapter 21.15 of the Municipal Code and is intended to encourage the preservation, restoration, & renovation of buildings and/or neighborhoods of architectural significance or interest.	Yes

**Table 3. - Potential Development Areas Within the Existing Sphere of Influence, but located outside of the City**

Area	Description	Acres	Existing Land Use	Change to?	Housing Potential	Request Submitted?	Assumptions/Notes	Recommended?
<b>S1</b>	Beechwood Area	135.40	RSF-3	Specific Plan Average Density of RSF-4	402	Yes. See Letter #12 from R. Lawrence Werner North Coast Engineering  APNs 020-301-002, 003, 005, 006, 018, 036, 037, 038, 050, & 051	Would be part of a Specific Plan that would also include properties in Expansion Areas E-1 and E-2  See notes on New Specific Plans at the end of the next table	Yes, but reduce the total buildout potential after discounting the PG&E right of way.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remaining area is 134.1 acres.</li> <li>Revised buildout is 402 units</li> </ul> Specific Plan is required to be prepared and adopted prior to any entitlements.  Specific Plan is to cover S1, E1, & E2
<b>S2</b>	Off Linne Road	100.87	RSF	Specific Plan Average Density of RSF-4	303	Yes. See Letter #13 from Neil & Gisela Olsen  APNs 020-261-019, 020, 022, & 023	Logical extension of development  Would be part of a Specific Plan that would also include properties in Expansion Area E-3  See notes on New Specific Plans at the end of the next table  If an inclusionary provision is added requiring 10% of units be affordable (RMF-20), then up to 30 affordable units could be created.	Yes  Specific Plan is required to be prepared and adopted prior to any entitlements  Specific Plan is to cover S2 & E3
<b>S3</b>	Our Town	30.00	RSF	RMF-20 (15 acres) RSF-6 (15 acres)	293	City Initiated  Assessor Book 020 Pages 32 & 33 APNs 020-211-009, 010, & Portion 008	Actually includes Our Town (15 acres) and another 15 acres adjoining Linne Road.  Would be included in the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan (APNs Book 020, Pages 32 & 33)	Yes, could provide an incentive for redevelopment of the site  Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan is required to be prepared and approved prior to any entitlements (currently being prepared)

**Table 4. - Potential Expansion Areas Outside the Existing Sphere of Influence**

Area	Description	Acres	Existing Land Use*	Change to?	Housing Potential	Request Submitted	Assumptions/Notes	Recommended?
E1	Within Area D	38.30	RSF-3	Specific Plan (at average density of RSF-4)	115	City Initiated	Contingent on property owner support. Part of Specific Plan that includes areas S-1 and E-2. APN 020-301-52 (Thomas Erskine)	Yes Specific Plan required prior to any entitlements
E2	Within Area D	62.00	RSF-3	Specific Plan (at average density of RSF-3)	86	City Initiated	Contingent on property owner support. Part of Specific Plan that includes areas S-1 and E-1. APN 020-301-053 & -022 (PG&E) Tom H. Erskine, PO Box 510, Paso Robles, CA 93446 Pacific Gas & Electric	Yes, but reduce buildout potential after discounting the PG&E right of way of 23.78 acres. Specific Plan required prior to any entitlements <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Remaining area is 38.22 acres.</li><li>Revised buildout is 86 units reduced from the 115 units initially identified.</li></ul>
E3	Within Area D	140.20	RSF-3	RSF-3	275	Yes See Letter# 13 from Neil & Gisela Olsen	APN 020-261-018 & 024 Bernard Olsen, 3161 Linne Road, Paso Robles, CA 93446 Olsen Family Trust, PO Box 2519, Paso Robles, CA 93446	Yes, but reduce buildout potential after discounting the PG&E right of way of 18.0 acres. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Remaining area is 122.2 acres.</li><li>Revised buildout is 275 units reduced from the 421 units initially identified.</li></ul>
E4	Within Area D	242.00	RSF-3	RSF-3	545	City Initiated	Contingent on property owner support.	No
E5	Cuesta Student Housing (Area A)	15.5	RR	RMF-20 (student)	232	Yes. See Letters #1 & #14 Marie Rosenwasser, PhD Cuesta College	Potential site for Cuesta student housing adjacent to Buena Vista Road. Action would include policy direction calling for architectural compatibility with Cuesta College Master Plan and adequate buffering from low-density residential area on Circle B Road. APN 020-021-040, 055, & 056 John Gregg, 2726 Walnut Avenue, Signal Hill, CA 90806 James H. Heltsley, 3690 Buena Vista Drive, Paso Robles, CA 93446 King Revocable Living Trust, 4080 Vineyard, Paso Robles, CA 93446	Yes, potential future student housing site
E6	Westside Annexation (Area I)	3.00	RS	RS	No Additional Units	Yes. See Letter #15 from Pat & Sherry Molnar Request to annex 3-acre area designated as RS.	No change to land use designation requested Property to remain as Residential Single-Family with a 2.5-acre minimum lot size (018-241-005) 208 West Fourth Street	Yes, support for annexation to obtain City services; No land use change; the property is to remain at its current single family density
E7	Expand Planning Impact Area A	3,900.00	AG (County)	AG	0	City Initiated	Would extend Planning Impact Area A north to the existing alignment of Tower Road. Although the area would provisionally be designated as Agriculture, the General Plan would not envision annexation or development at this time.	Yes.

\* Because it is outside of the existing Sphere of Influence, there is no existing land use, but existing General Plan indicates potential land use that could be established

**Notes on New Specific Plans.** Two Specific Plans would need to be prepared: Specific Plan #1 (Olson Property--Areas S2 & E3) and Specific Plan #2 (Areas S1, E1 & E2)

**Table 4. - Potential Expansion Areas Outside the Existing Sphere of Influence**

Area	Description	Acres	Existing Land Use*	Change to?	Housing Potential	Request Submitted	Assumptions/Notes	Recommended?
------	-------------	-------	--------------------	------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------

All Specific Plans would include the following requirements: 1) Trail Requirements; 2) Inclusionary Housing (up to 10% to be at affordable rates); and 3) Neighborhood Commercial Areas .  
 The Specific Plan that includes Areas S1, E1 and E2 would also require the extension of Airport Road.



**Table 5. – Other Property Owner Request Reviewed, But Not Otherwise Mapped**

Area	Description	Acres	Existing Land Use	Change to?	Housing Potential	Request Submitted	Assumptions/Notes	Recommended ?
Borkey Specific Plan Subarea D	Northeast Corner Hwy 46 East & Buena Vista	5.99	RSF-1	CS		Yes.  See Letter #16 from Frank Arciero, Arciero & Sons	APN 025-391-013	No.  The commercial project envisioned can be accommodated without changing the GP land use designation.  The commercial project envisioned can be accommodated if the Resort/Lodging Overlay District were applied to the site.
East of Cuesta College North of Dallons	Wisteria Lane	11.47	AG County	RMF-20	N/A	Yes  See Letter #17 from Anthony L. Ritter	APN 020-021-063	No  Land use incompatibility with nearby Municipal Airport  Infrastructure issues  Direct vehicular access lacking
North Park Street	CS Property Amidst RMF-M Sites	0.78	CS	RMF-20	Not Reviewed	Yes  See Letter #18 from David & Cherie Landon	APN 020-041-012	No. Would create spot zoning situation since the parcel is surrounded by RMF-M designated properties between 34 <sup>th</sup> and 36 <sup>th</sup> Streets  The City's intent is to distribute multi-family projects at appropriate sites throughout Paso Robles, rather than have concentrations of multi-family uses in specific geographic areas
2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	532 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street		RMF-L	RMF-20	Not Reviewed	Yes  See Letter #19 From BB Bailey Construction		No.  Would be inconsistent with surrounding neighborhood
Mill Road	4825 Mills Road	131.18	AG County	Tourist oriented, hospitality uses	N/A	Yes  See Letter #20 from JW Gay, President Southcorp Wines	APN 015-051-002 & 006	No
Giacomazzi	North of Meadowlark	9.5	RSF-2	RSF-3	21 units	Yes  See Letter #21 from Mike Harrod	APN 009-750-001	Yes, contingent upon further analysis.  As part of the development review process, there is to be a demonstration of site suitability with respect to topography and drainage. Included as Area C19 in Table 1.
Affordable Housing	Citywide	Citywide	See C5, C6, C8, C12, & C13	See C5, C6, C8, C12, & C13	See C5, C6, C8, C12, & C13	Yes See Letter from Habitat for Humanity	Comments related to Affordable housing	Yes, see C5, C6, C8, C12, & C13

