

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER

FROM: ROBERT A. LATA, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 05-001(1), and REZONE 05-005 (ERSKINE)

DATE: NOVEMBER 15, 2005

Needs: For the City Council to consider the following applications:

General Plan Amendment 05-001(1): a request to change the land use designation of 28 acres from Parks and Open Space (POS) and a portion of Agriculture (AG) to Business Park (BP).

Rezone 05-005: a proposal to change the zoning designation of the same 28 acre site from Parks and Open Space (POS) to Planned Industrial (PM).

- Facts:
1. The proposed applications submitted by John McCarthy on behalf of Tom Erskine of Ranch and Coast Properties, Inc., related to the 28 acre site located at the eastern terminus of Wisteria Lane, north of Highway 46 East and east of Golden Hill Road (see attached Vicinity Map).
 2. The intent of the General Plan Amendment and Rezone for the site is to bring the site into the same designations as the Golden Hills Industrial Park, adjacent to the west.
 3. When and if the General Plan Amendment and Rezone are approved by the City Council, subdivision and development applications will be processed to subdivide the property into twenty (20) 1 to 3 acre parcels for commercial/light-industrial type uses. Oak grove and slope areas would be preserved as private open space areas.
 4. At the time of a master development plan and subdivision, a condition of approval will be added to the project that will require a Constructive Notice to be recorded on each parcel notifying future property owners that each parcel will need to be developed in accordance with the Airport Master Plan and meet all requirements of the plan, depending on which Airport Zone the subject parcel is in.
 5. Similar to the existing development review process for the Golden Hills Business Park, a Development Plan (PD) for approval by the Planning Commission will be required for the development of each lot. Specific site planning, building architecture and landscaping will be reviewed with the PD process for each lot.

6. The proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone applications are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). An Initial Study has been conducted (attached to this staff report) that addresses the potential environmental impacts associated with the General Plan Amendment and Rezone applications. The study concludes that the applications will not have a significant environmental impact, since there is no physical development proposed with the applications and since this is an extension of an existing development pattern. A Negative Declaration is proposed. In the future the proposed subdivision map and development plan for the proposed business park will be required to undergo a separate environmental review process, including but not limited to provisions to protect oaks in a manner consistent with City policies.
7. The Planning Commission at their meeting on October 25, 2005, on a 5-1 vote (One Commissioner was absent) recommended that the City Council approve the General Plan Amendment and Rezone, as requested by Tom Erskine.

Analysis and
Conclusion:

The proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone of the site is being requested by Tom Erskine of Ranch and Coast Properties to redesignate the site to Business Park & Planned Industrial, to be consistent with the existing Golden Hills Business Park located adjacent to the east.

Changing the General Plan and Zoning designations in order to expand the business park in to this property would seem to be reasonable use for the site.

Policy

Reference: General Plan Land Use Element; General Plan Update EIR certified in 2003; Zoning Code and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Fiscal

Impact: No fiscal impacts are anticipated in conjunction with this rezone application.

Options: After considering the information and analysis presented and the public testimony received, the City Council will be asked to select one of the following options:

- a.** (1) Adopt Resolution No. 05-xx adopting a Negative Declaration for the General Plan Amendment 05-001(1) and Rezone 05-005 applications;
- (2) Adopt Resolution No. 05-xx approving General Plan Amendment 05-001(1) that would change the General Plan Land Use Designation of the 28 acre site from Parks and Open Space (POS) and a portion of Agriculture (AG) to Business Park (BP).

(3) Introduce for first reading Ordinance XXX N.S. approving Rezone 05-005 that would change the Zoning designation for the 28 acre site from Parks and Open Space (POS) to Planned Industrial (PM); and set December 6, 2005, as the date for adoption of said Ordinance.




b. Amend, modify, or reject the foregoing options.

Attachments:


1. Vicinity Map
2. Conceptual Site Plan
3. Draft Resolution approving a Negative Declaration
4. Draft Resolution approving General Plan Amendment 05-001(1)
5. Draft Ordinance approving Rezone 05-005
6. Newspaper and Mail Notice Affidavits

darren\ZC\rezone\05-001Erskine\pc report

**GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING CHANGE
GOLDEN HILL INDUSTRIAL PARK EXPANSION - TR 278**



No.	Revision/Date	Date



PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AND ZONE CHANGE
GOLDEN HILL INDUSTRIAL PARK EXPANSION

PROJECT	ERSKINE
DATE	9/2/05
SCALE	1" = 100'
SHEET	1 OF 5

**Conceptual Site Plan
GPA 05-001(1) & Rezone 05-005
(Erskine)**

**ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF PASO ROBLES
PLANNING DIVISION**

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** General Plan Amendment 05-01 (Part 1), Rezone 05-005
- Concurrent Entitlements:** None
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Darren R. Nash, Associate Planner
Phone: (805) 237-3970
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** East end of Golden Hill Road, north of Highway 46 East,
East of the Golden Hills Business Park, Wisteria Lane, Paso Robles, California
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** **Ranch & Coast Properties**
- Contact Person:** **Tom Erskine**
- Phone:** 239-9566
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Parks and Open Space (POS) and a portion of Agriculture (AG)
- 6. ZONING:** Parks and Open Space (POS)
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** General Plan Amendment from Parks and Open Space (POS) to Business Park (BP) general plan designation and Rezone from Parks and Open Space (POS) to Planned Industrial (PM) zoning designation.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The subject 28 acre site is currently vacant and is relatively flat with various scattered oak trees. The terrain is similar to the existing Golden Hills Business Park adjacent to the west. The project along the northern boundary of the site includes the significant river bank areas that slope down to the Huer Huero Creek. The development will take place on the flat areas and not disrupt the existing river bank areas. All oak trees are proposed to be preserved. There is no development associated with this general plan amendment and rezone, environmental impacts associated with the physical development of the site would be determined with the development plan process for a specific project.

Neighboring Properties:

North: POS zoned, **South:** POS zoned, vacant land. **West:** PM Zoned, existing Golden Hills Industrial Park, **East :** Additional POS zoned property.

9. RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

None.

10. PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THE PREPARATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY:

Darren Nash: Associate Planner.

11. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR PROJECT:

This environmental initial study analyzes the potential impacts associated with the changing of the property designations from Parks and Open Space (POS) to Business Parks (BP).

There is no development associated with this general plan amendment and rezone, environmental impacts associated with the physical development of the site would be determined with the development plan process for a specific project.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

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” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):				

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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 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 significant effect(s) on the environment, but one or more effects (1) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) have been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or is “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effect(s) that remain to be addressed.

Signature

Darren R. Nash

Printed Name

Date

Associate Planner

Title

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	
ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact		No Impact

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 the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address 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. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.
4. “Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the 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). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.
6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.
7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix I of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the needs and requirements of the City of Paso Robles.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, a list of applicable standard conditions identified in the discussions has been provided as an attachment to this document.)

SAMPLE QUESTION:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	---	---	------------------

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

Landslides or Mud flows? (Sources: 1, 6)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Paso Robles General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Source: 1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The request to change the General Plan and Zoning designations from POS to BP/PM is in order bring the designations into consistent designations as the Golden Hills Business Park adjacent to the west. The intent is to expand the Business Park into this 47 acre area.

There is no development associated with this general plan amendment and rezone, environmental impacts associated with the physical development of the site would be determined with the development plan process for a specific project.

b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: There are no other environmental plans currently in place for the property by other agencies.

c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? (Source: 1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: This change of the designations would be compatible with surrounding properties.

d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible uses)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The site is currently covered with native grasses. There would not appear to be a conflict with agricultural resources.

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The property is surrounded by property designated with different zoning and general plan designations. There is not an established community in this area of the City.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
projections? (Source: Paso Robles General Plan.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There is no residential development proposed with this General Plan Amendment and Rezone, therefore this project will not exceed population projections.				
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The site is in the vicinity of existing roads/highways. The infrastructure in the area such as sewer and water is in the vicinity of this site and can be extended to serve the project.				
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N?A				

III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

- a) Fault rupture?

Discussion: This portion of San Luis Obispo County (generally the Paso Robles area) is located at the far southerly end of the Salinas Valley which also extends up into Monterey County. There are two known fault zones on either side of this valley. The San Marco-Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and runs through the community of Parkfield east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the Uniform Building Code to all new development within the City. Soils reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standardly applied conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.

- b) Seismic ground shaking?

Discussion: See the response to Section III(a). Based on that response, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.

- c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?

Discussion: The City's General Plan contains public safety policies that would require special attention to projects with potential for liquefaction. Also, see the response to Section III(a). Based on the above discussion, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards, including liquefaction is not considered significant.

- d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area identified at risk for seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazards.

- e) Landslides or Mud flows?

Discussion: See discussion for III (f).

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? Discussion: See the discussion in Section III(a). In addition to standard erosion control measures being part of a future development, all grading would be subject to standard conditions of approval ensuring that soils conditions are suitable for the proposed structures and improvements. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Subsidence of the land? Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expansive soils? Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Unique geologic or physical features? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Source: 6,7,9) Discussion: In the future, when a development plan is submitted for the site, a standard condition of approval would be added to the project that would require the applicant to submit a complete grading and drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer with the improvement plans. Drainage calculations shall be submitted, with provisions made for on-site detention/ retention if adequate disposal facilities are not available, as determined by the City Engineer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? Discussion: See comment for IV.a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity)? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? Discussion: See Sec. IV a, discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Impacts to groundwater quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (source: 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: It is not anticipated that the amount of ground water will be any more than typically used for a business park/light-industrial type use.

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The San Luis Obispo County area is a non-attainment area for the State standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter. The SLO County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) administers a permit system to ensure that stationary sources do not collectively create emissions which would cause local and state standards to be exceeded. To aid in the assessment of project impacts subject to CEQA review, the APCD published the "CEQA Air Quality Handbook" in August, 1995. This handbook establishes screening thresholds for measuring the potential of projects to generate air quality impacts. Generally, any project that generates less than 10lbs./day of emissions would "qualify" for a Negative Declaration determination, and a project that generates between 10 and 24lbs./day of emissions would "qualify" for a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

There is no development associated with this general plan amendment and rezone, environmental impacts associated with the physical development of the site would be determined with the development plan process for a specific project.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There would not be an exposure to sensitive receptors to pollutants with the approval of this project.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Create objectionable odors? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: There is no development proposed with this project. It anticipated that the future project will be accessed from the extension of Wisteria Lane. Traffic patterns and analysis will be further reviewed with the subdivision and development plan that will follow the General Plan Amendment and Rezone applications.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is no development proposed with this application. Upon review of a future development plan, City staff and the project engineer will need to insure that the design does not create any unsafe design features.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is no development proposed with this application. Upon review of a future development plan, City staff and the project engineer will need to insure that the design does not create any unsafe design features.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is no development proposed with this application. Upon review of a future development plan, City staff and the project engineer will need to insure that the proper parking numbers meet city codes.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: There is no development proposed with this general plan amendment and zone change. With the development of the site, further environmental review will take place.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are multiple oak trees located on this site. The future development plans for the site will be required to design around the trees and preserve them.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There are oak tree groves located on the creek banks in the northern area of the site. These slopes along with the trees will be preserved. The development will be proposed to take place on the flatter areas away from the slope banks.				
d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
b) Use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

a) Increases in existing noise levels? Discussion: There is no construction associated with this application, with the future development plan, additional environmental review would take place.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

a) Fire protection? Discussion: Upon the development of the site, standard conditions will be added by the Fire Marshall addressing fire hydrants, sprinklers and access.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection? Discussion: During the development plan process in the future, the police department would have the opportunity to review the project and make comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? Discussion: The project is in the vicinity of schools. Both an elementary school and the high school are within a mile away from the site. Upon the review of a development plan, for the site the school district will have the opportunity to comment on the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? Discussion: With the development of the site, whether R2 or R4 zoned, the developer would be required install the curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements along the property frontage. These improvements would have to be constructed per City Standards, and would eventually be accepted and cared for by the City.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other governmental services? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Power or natural gas? Discussion: Southern California Gas Company provides service to the Paso Robles area. The project is not anticipated to interfere with gas services or create an unmet demand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Communication systems? Discussion: The Pacific Bell Company provides service to the Paso Robles and County areas. The project is not anticipated to interfere with phone/communication services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Source: 7) Discussion: The project will be required to hook up to City sewer and water.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Storm water drainage? (Source: 6) Discussion: A standard condition of approval will be added to the project at the time of development that would require the applicant to submit a complete grading and drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer with the improvement plans. Drainage calculations will need to be submitted, with provisions made for on-site detention/ retention if adequate disposal facilities are not available, as determined by the City Engineer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Solid waste disposal? Discussion: A trash enclosure will be required for this project at the time of development. The enclosure shall have metal "view obscuring" doors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Local or regional water supplies? (source: 3) Discussion: There is no development associated with this general plan amendment and rezone, environmental impacts associated with the physical development of the site would be determined with the development plan process for a specific project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XIII.AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Source: 1,9)
Discussion: There is no development proposed with this application. At the time the development plan goes through the planning process, high architectural and grading standards will be anticipated for this site. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (Source: 1,9)
Discussion: There is no development proposed with this application. At the time the development plan goes through the planning process, high architectural and grading standards will be anticipated for this site. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Create light or glare? (Source: 1,9)
Discussion: At the time of development, light shielding will be required. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

XIV.CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Disturb paleontological resources? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Disturb archaeological resources? Discussion: The Paso Robles area has been classified as territory occupied by the Migueleno Salinan and the Obispeno Chumash Native California populations. Past community populations have been evidenced at several sites within the Paso Robles area and unincorporated portions of the surrounding County.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Affect historical resources? Discussion: See XIV b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? Discussion: N/A.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XV.RECREATION. Would the proposal:

a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? Discussion: When a development plan is studied for the site, outdoor open space will need to be provided to the City's Multifamily Code.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? Discussion N/A.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVI.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 prehistory? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) 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.) Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	1977 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
10	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
11	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
12	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446

Summary of Mitigation Measures

Description of Impact

N/A

Mitigation Measure

N/A


**AFFIDAVIT
OF MAIL NOTICES**

PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL PROJECT NOTICING

I, Lonnie Dolan, employee of the City of El Paso de Robles, California, do hereby certify that the mail notices have been processed as required for General Plan Amendment 05-001 (Part 1) and Rezone 05-005 (Erskine) on this 11th day of October, 2005.

City of El Paso de Robles
Community Development Department
Planning Division

Signed: _____


Lonnie Dolan

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

LEGAL NEWSPAPER NOTICES

PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL
PROJECT NOTICING


Newspaper: Tribune

Date of Publication: October 5, 2005

Meeting Date: October 25, 2005
(Planning Commission)
November 15, 2005
(City Council)

Project: General Plan Amendment 05-001
a) modify General Plan
designation of property currently designated as Parks
and Open Space and a portion designated as Agriculture
to a Business Park land use designation.
b) reflect the most recent land
use data and projections of the City's "build out"
population based on the land use designations estab-
lished in the 2003 General Plan update.

I, Lonnie Dolan, employee of the Community
Development Department, Planning Division, of the City
of El Paso de Robles, do hereby certify that this notice is
a true copy of a published legal newspaper notice for the
above named project.

Signed: 
Lonnie Dolan

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS;
NOTICE OF INTENT
TO ADOPT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

General Plan Amendment 2005-001
A Two Part Amendment to the Land Use Element
of the City of Paso Robles General Plan
(Applicant and City Initiated)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles will hold a Public Hearing to consider making recommendations regarding adoption of Negative Declarations and approval of a two (2) part General Plan Amendment relating to the Land Use Element of the General Plan.

Part 1: A General Plan (Land Use) Amendment to consider modifying the General Plan's designation of property currently designated as "Parks and Open Space" and a portion designated as "Agriculture" to a "Business Park" land use designation. In conjunction with the General Plan Amendment is an application for Rezone 05-005 to consider modifying the Zoning Code designation of the property currently designated as "Parks and Open Space" to a "Planned Industrial" zoning designation. The subject property is located east of Golden Hill Road and north of Highway 46 East and would form an eastward extension to the Golden Hills Business Park. All traffic would be channeled through the existing business park and the existing signalized intersection of Golden Hill Road and Highway 46 East. The applicant is the property owner, Tom Erskine.

Part 2: A General Plan (Land Use) Amendment to reflect the most recent land use data and projections of the City's "build-out" population based on the land use designations established in the 2003 General Plan update. The text changes to the General Plan acknowledge current land use information and recognize that the most recent build-out projections (based on persons per dwelling unit and other specified factors) would result in a City population in 2025 that would be consistent with the established General Plan policy of a population not-to-exceed 44,000 residents. No changes in land use designations or policy are proposed as a part of this General Plan text Amendment, and there would be no environmental impacts resulting from updating the land use data and population build-out projections. City Initiated.

The Planning Commission's hearing will take place in the Conference Room of the Library / City Hall at 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California, at the hour of 7:30 PM on Tuesday, October 25, 2005 at which time all interested parties may appear and be heard.

NOTICE IS ALSO HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles will hold a Public Hearing to consider the same two-part General Plan Amendment. The City Council's hearing will take place in the Conference Room of the Library / City Hall at 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California, at the hour of 7:30 PM on Tuesday, November 15, 2005 at which time all interested parties may appear and be heard.

As part of the noticed Public Hearing, the City Council will consider adoption of Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact (statements that there will be no significant environmental effects) in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The proposed Negative Declarations will be available for public review from October 3, 2005 through October 25, 2005. Copies of the staff report and draft Negative Declaration will be available for the cost of reproduction at the Community Development Department, City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446. Please write to this address or call the Planning Division at (805) 237-3970 should you have questions or comments regarding this notice or related matters.

If you challenge the ordinance in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearings described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission and/or the City Council at, or prior to, the public hearings.

Bob Lata, Community Development Director
Oct 5, 2005

RESOLUTION NO. 05-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 05-001(1) AND REZONE 05-005
(ERSKINE)

WHEREAS, John McCarthy on behalf of Tom Erskine of Ranch and Coast Properties, Inc. has submitted General Plan Amendment 05-001(1), a request to change the land use designation of 28 acre site from Parks and Open Space (POS) and a portion of Agriculture (AG) to Business Park (BP); and

WHEREAS, the application includes Zone Change 05-005, a proposal to change the zoning designation of the same 28 acres from Parks and Open Space (POS) to Planned Industrial (PM); and

WHEREAS, the site is located at the eastern terminus of Wisteria Lane, East of Golden Hill Road, north of Highway 46 East, and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (on file in the Community Development Department), which concludes that the project as proposed will not have significant impacts on the environment, and

WHEREAS, Public Notice of the proposed Negative Declaration was given as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, public hearings were conducted by the Planning Commission on October 25, 2005 and by the City Council on November 15, 2005 to consider the Initial Study prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination for the proposed zoning modification, and

WHEREAS, at their hearing on October 25, 2005, the Planning Commission on 5-1 vote (one Commissioner was absent) recommended that the City Council adopt the General Plan Amendment and Rezone as submitted by Tom Erskine; and

WHEREAS, based on General Plan Land Use Designation, the 2003 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this zoning modification, the staff report and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds no substantial evidence that the project would have a significant impact on the environment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that:

1. That the above Recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

2. That based on the City's independent judgment, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby approve a Negative Declaration for Rezone 05-005 and General Plan Amendment 05-001(1) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles at a regular meeting of said Council held on this 15th November 2005 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sharilyn M. Ryan, Deputy City Clerk

ORDINANCE NO. XXX N.S.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
AMENDING THE ZONING MAP ESTABLISHED BY REFERENCE IN
SECTION 21.12.020 OF THE ZONING CODE (TITLE 21)
(REZONE 05-005 -ERSKINE)

WHEREAS, John McCarthy on behalf of Tom Erskine of Ranch and Coast Properties, Inc. has submitted Zone Change 05-005, a proposal to change the zoning designation of a 28 acre site from Parks and Open Space (POS) to Planned Industrial (PM); and

WHEREAS, the site is located at the eastern terminus of Wisteria Lane, East of Golden Hill Road, north of Highway 46 East, and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with Rezone 05-005, an application has been submitted for General Plan Amendment 05-001(1), a request to change the land use designation of the 28 acre site from Parks and Open Space (POS) and a portion of Agriculture (AG) to Business Park (BP), and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of October 25, 2005, the Planning Commission took the following actions:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for this project;
- b. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on the proposed project;
- c. Based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project, found that there was no substantial evidence that this project would have significant adverse effects on the environment and recommended that the City Council approve a Negative Declaration;
- d. On a 5-1 vote, recommended that the City Council approve the proposed rezone; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of November 15, 2005, the City Council took the following actions:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for this project;
- b. Considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission;
- c. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on the proposed project;
- d. Based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project, found that there was no substantial evidence that this project would have significant adverse effects on the environment and approved a Negative Declaration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT KNOWN that the Paso Robles City Council, based upon the substantial evidence presented at the above referenced public hearing, including oral and written staff reports, finds as follows:

1. The above stated facts of this ordinance are true and correct.
2. This rezone is consistent with the City's General Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 21.12.020 of the Municipal Code (Zoning Map) is hereby amended as shown on the attached Exhibit A.

SECTION 2. Publication. The City Clerk shall cause this ordinance to be published once within fifteen (15) days after its passage in a newspaper of general circulation, printed, published and circulated in the City in accordance with Section 36933 of the Government Code.

SECTION 3. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of the Ordinance is, for any reason, found to be invalid or unconstitutional, such finding shall not affect the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance by section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, or phrases are declared unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. Inconsistency. To the extent that the terms of provisions of this Ordinance may be inconsistent or in conflict with the terms or conditions of any prior City ordinance(s), motion, resolution, rule, or regulation governing the same subject matter thereof and such inconsistent and conflicting provisions of prior ordinances, motions, resolutions, rules, and regulations are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall go into effect and be in full force and effect at 12:01 a.m. on the 31st day after its passage.

Introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council held on November 15, 2005, and passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles on the 6th day of December 2005 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sharilyn M. Ryan, Deputy City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 05-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 2005-001, A TWO-PART GENERAL PLAN
AMENDMENT, WHERE **PART 1** IS REGARDING MODIFYING THE GENERAL PLAN
DESIGNATION OF A 28-ACRE SITE FROM PARKS & OPEN SPACE (POS) TO BUSINESS PARK (BP)
AND **PART 2** AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN TO REFLECT THE MOST RECENT LAND USE
PROJECTIONS OF THE CITY'S "BUILD-OUT" POPULATION
(PART 1 – TOM ERSKINE, PART 2-CITY INITIATED)

WHEREAS, the following applications to amend the Land Use Element were filed as parts of General Plan Amendment 2005-001:

Part 1: A General Plan Amendment (Land Use) to consider modifying the General Plan's designation of property currently designated as "Parks and Open Space" and a portion designated as "Agriculture" to a "Business Park" land use designation. In conjunction with the General Plan Amendment is an application for Rezone 05-005 to consider modifying the Zoning Code designation of the property currently designated as "Parks and Open Space" to a "Planned Industrial" zoning designation. The subject property is located east of Golden Hill Road and north of Highway 46 East and would form an eastward extension to the Golden Hills Business Park. All traffic would be channeled through the existing business park and the existing signalized intersection of Golden Hill Road and Highway 46 East. The applicant is the property owner, Tom Erskine.

Part 2: A General Plan (Land Use) Amendment to reflect the most recent land use data and projections of the City's "build-out" population based on the land use designations established in the 2003 General Plan update. The text changes to the General Plan acknowledge current land use information and recognize that the most recent build-out projections (based on persons per dwelling unit and other specified factors) would result in a City population in 2025 that would be consistent with the established General Plan policy of a population not-to-exceed 44,000 residents. No changes in land use designations or policy are proposed as a part of this General Plan text Amendment, and there would be no environmental impacts resulting from updating the land use data and population build-out projections. City Initiated.

WHEREAS, at its meeting of October 25, 2005, the Planning Commission took the following actions:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff reports prepared for this amendment;
- b. Conducted public hearings to obtain public testimony on the parts of this amendment;
- c. Considered public testimony from all parties;
- d. Based on the information contained in the initial study prepared for the 2003 General Plan update, the Planning Commission unanimously found that there was no substantial evidence that approval of this portion of the amendment would have significant adverse effects on the environment and recommended that the City Council approve Negative Declarations for this component;

WHEREAS, at its meeting November 15, 2005, the City Council took the following actions:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff reports prepared for this amendment, including the recommendations of the Planning Commission;
- b. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on this amendment;
- c. Based on its independent judgment, found that there was no substantial evidence that the parts of this amendment would have significant adverse effects on the environment and approved Negative Declarations for this General Plan amendment in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles, California, to amend the text of the General Plan Land Use Element Map on page LU-6C in the manner shown on the attached Exhibit "A" (Component 1), and amend the Land Use Element as shown in the attached Exhibit B-1, Exhibit B-2, and Exhibit B-3 (Component 2).

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 15th day of November 2005 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:


ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sharilyn M. Ryan, Deputy City Clerk



Sources: City of El Paso de Robles, 2003

General Plan Land Use Subarea 3

Figure LU-6C

City of El Paso de Robles

Exhibit A
GPA 05-001(1)
(Erskine)

floor space through the Year 2025. Much of the industrial development is anticipated to be concentrated near the airport.

2.0 Land Use Goals, Policies And Action Items

GOAL LU-1: Land Uses. Strive to maintain a balanced community, where the majority of residents can live, work, and shop.

POLICY LU-1A: Land Use Categories. Provide an appropriate mix and diversity of land uses.

Land Use Category	Acreage (within 1-1-04 City limits)	Acreage (outside 1-1-04 City limits)	Percent of Total City Area
Commercial	1,276	-	10.1%
Business Park/Industrial	1,693	-	13.3%
Other/Public Facilities	1,947	-	15.3%
Agriculture & Open Space	2,579	-	20.3%
Residential	4,710	506	41.0%
Total	12,205	506	100%

Land Use	Existing (2003)	Potential New Development (2025)				Total
		City Limits	Sphere of Influence	Expansion Areas	Subtotal	
		4878			6593	
Residential	9,694 DU	5,303 DU	990 DU	308 DU	6,602 DU	16,287
Commercial	4,044,000 ft ²	2,896,000 ft ²	0 ft ²	0 ft ²	2,896,000 ft ²	6,940,000 ft ²
Industrial	2,093,000 ft ²	1,498,000 ft ²	0 ft ²	0 ft ²	1,498,000 ft ²	3,591,000 ft ²

Note: Actual full commercial and industrial buildout would be driven largely by market factors and other considerations beyond the control of the City. Residential potential balance between the Sphere and Expansion areas may vary slightly to account for development in Specific Plans that include portions of both.

* Includes reduction of 416 dwelling units to realize a maximum population cap of 44,000 (per City Council Resolution 03-222). This reduction would be taken from the Ghandler Ranch, Olsen Ranch and Beechwood Area Specific Plans in accordance with Policy LU-2G. Table LU-1B assumes this reduction is evenly distributed between city, sphere and expansion areas.

Action Item 1. Amend/update the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that there is a Zoning District for each General Plan Land Use Category on Table LU-2.

Action Item 2. Allow projects in the Mixed Use land use category and/or in Specific Plan areas to be developed with more than one land use.

Table LU-3. Summary of Potential Residential Development

Area	Residential Potential (dwelling units)*
Within January 2004 City Limits	
Development on Vacant Lands	3,982 ** 2,957
Development from land use changes or regulatory changes included in this General Plan update	2,060***
Subtotal (January 2004 City Limits)	5,442
Sphere of Influence Areas, Outside 2003 City Limits	
S1: Beechwood Area	302****
S2: Olsen Ranch	398
S3: Our Town	229
Subtotal (Sphere of Influence)	929****
Expansion Areas, Outside 2003 Sphere of Influence	
E1: Beechwood Area (Portion of Area D)	86****
E2: Beechwood Area (Portion of Area D)	86****
E3: Olsen Ranch (Portion of Area D)	275
Subtotal (Expansion Areas)	447****
S1, E1, and E2 (distribution to be determined within the Beechwood Area Specific Plan)	200****
Reduction to keep 44,000 population maximum	(416)****
TOTAL (Potential Development)	6,602 6,593
Existing Development	9,694
TOTAL (Existing + Potential)	16,296 16,287

* Theoretical development potential. Actual development must be limited such that the population does not exceed 44,000 (per City Council Resolution 03-232).

** Includes 1,423 units already entitled as of 2003.

*** Assumes maximum buildout potential of the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan: up to 1,210 units within the January 2004 City limits.

**** 200 units would be distributed throughout areas S1, E1, and E2 at RMF-20 residential density. Configuration and distribution of multifamily units to be determined through Beechwood Area Specific Plan process. See Figure LU-2 for the location of these areas.

**** Reduction of 416 dwelling units to realize a maximum population cap of 44,000. This reduction would be taken from the Chandler Ranch, Olsen Ranch and Beechwood Area Specific Plans in accordance with Policy LU-2C.

POLICY LU-1B: Airport Land Use Compatibility. As a general policy, new residential development is an undesirable land use within the Airport Influence Area.

Action Item 1. Prohibit further subdivision of land within the Airport Land Use Review Area (AP Overlay Area), or changes to land use or zoning, in a manner that would accommodate additional dwelling units. Existing parcels would, however, be entitled to be occupied by existing or new residential dwelling in accordance with current General Plan and Zoning.

Action Item 2: Continue to review and comment on planning efforts and development projects being considered by the County within the City's Planning Impact Area.

POLICY LU- 2G: Specific Plans. Require for large, vacant and/or underutilized areas, as well as for areas with special planning needs, as follows (refer to Figure LU-3):

- Areas outside of and southeast of the 2003 City limits, within Subarea "D" (proposed Annexation Areas between Linne Road and Creston Road). Two specific plans, which include:
- Olsen Ranch Specific Plan (Areas S2 and E3)
- Beechwood Area Specific Plan (Areas S1, E1 and E2)
- Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan (Areas C1 and S3)
- Oak Park Area Specific Plan
- Other areas as established by the City Council

Limitations on Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan, Olsen Ranch Specific Plan, and Beechwood Area Specific Plan.

1. The following shows the maximum number of dwelling units that can be accommodated within each of the specific plans. These numbers may be reduced, depending on topographic, environmental, or other development constraints:

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| • Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan (Areas C1 and S3): | 1,439 dwellings |
| • Olsen Ranch Specific Plan (Areas S2 and E3): | 673 dwellings |
| • Beechwood Area Specific Plan (Areas S1, E1 and E2): | 674 dwellings |

2. At no time shall the collective buildout potential of the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan, Olsen Ranch Specific Plan, and Beechwood Area Specific Plan exceed a total of **2,786** ~~2,370~~ dwelling units (exclusive of second dwellings), ~~or some other number determined~~ to ensure that the overall citywide population does not exceed 44,000 by the year 2025 (per City Council Resolution 03-232).

Within the scope of a specific plan, the Planning Commission and City Council have the authority to:

Provide flexibility in terms of:

- Distribution of densities within the geographic area covered
- Parcel sizes and location (including clustering to retain unique site features)
- Development Standards and other Zoning Ordinance requirements
- Allowable land uses by providing an opportunity for mixed use provisions (e.g. neighborhood serving commercial land uses) within the overall residential densities anticipated in the General Plan. This flexibility includes the ability to provide for multi-family land uses as long as the total dwelling unit count is within the scope of the General Plan designation for the geographic area under consideration