



# CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES

*"The Pass of the Oaks"*

## CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

Thursday, May 20, 2010 7:00 PM

### ADVISORY BODY INTERVIEWS & APPOINTMENTS

MEETING LOCATION: PASO ROBLES LIBRARY/CITY HALL  
CONFERENCE CENTER, 1000 SPRING STREET

---

---

#### 7:00 PM – CONVENE REGULAR MEETING

**CALL TO ORDER** – Downstairs Conference Center

**ROLL CALL** Council members: John Hamon, Nick Gilman, Ed Steinbeck, Fred Strong, and Mayor Duane Picanco

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

This is the time the public may address the Council on items other than those scheduled on the agenda. **PLEASE SPEAK DIRECTLY INTO THE MICROPHONE AND BEGIN BY STATING YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS. EACH PERSON AND SUBJECT IS LIMITED TO A 3-MINUTE DISCUSSION.** Any person or subject requiring more than three minutes may be scheduled for a future Council meeting or referred to committee or staff. Those persons wishing to speak on any item scheduled on the agenda will be given an opportunity to do so at the time that item is being considered.

#### DISCUSSION

- 1. Advisory Body Interviews & Appointments to the Paso Robles Youth Commission**  
A. Robb, Director, Library and Recreation Services

The City Council conducted interviews to fill five vacancies on the Paso Robles Youth Commission, two vacancies on the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee, and change alternates to regular positions on the Senior Citizen Advisory Committee as follows:

- a) Appoint Christian Prusi, Nicholas Van Wiggeren, Travis Martinus, and Anthony Kalvans to regular, 1-year Youth Commission positions; and

- b) Appoint Noel Aschenbrener and Talitha Jansen Van Rensburg to alternate, two-year Youth Commission positions; and
- c) Appoint Christopher Taranto to a regular, 2-year Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee position; and
- d) Appoint Bertha Bybee and Marie Brinkmeyer (currently alternates) to regular, 2-year Senior Citizens Advisory Committee positions.

After discussion and collection of written ballots, Councilmember Strong, seconded by Councilmember Hamon, moved to seat the above applicants by the following unanimous roll call vote:

AYES: Strong, Hamon, Steinbeck, Gilman, and Picanco  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:  
ABSENT:

**ADJOURNMENT: 8:45 P.M.**

- THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING AT 7:30 PM ON TUESDAY, JUNE 1,2010, AT THE LIBRARY/CITY HALL CONFERENCE CENTER, 1000 SPRING STREET

Submitted:

---

Lonnie Dolan, Deputy City Clerk  
Approved:



**CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES**  
"The Pass of the Oaks"

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA**

**ADJOURNED REGULAR JOINT MEETINGS:**

**Draft Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan**  
**Responses to Comments and Recommendations**

May 26, 2010 3:00 pm

MEETING LOCATION: PASO ROBLES LIBRARY/CITY HALL  
CONFERENCE CENTER, 1000 SPRING STREET

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**INVOCATION**

**ROLL CALL** Council Members Nick Gilman, John Hamon, Ed Steinbeck, Fred Strong, and Mayor Duane Picanco

**ROLL CALL** Planning Commissioners Al Garcia, Steve Gregory, Margaret Holstine, Gary Nemeth, Chuck Treatch, Vince Vanderlip, and Chairman Joel Peterson

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

This is the time the public may address the Council on items **other than those scheduled** on the agenda. ***EACH PERSON AND EACH SUBJECT IS LIMITED TO DISCUSSION OF 3 MINUTES DURATION.*** Any person or subject requiring more than 3 minutes may be scheduled for a future Council meeting, or referred to committee or staff. **PLEASE SPEAK AT THE MICROPHONE AND BEGIN BY STATING YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS.** Those persons wishing to speak on any item scheduled on the agenda will be given an opportunity to do so at the time that item is being considered.

## DISCUSSION

### 1. **Draft Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Presentation and EIR Scoping**

R. Whisenand, Community Development Director

For the City Council and Planning Commission to formulate a “preferred option” consisting of a list of revisions to the Draft Specific Plan that will help focus public discussion at future public hearings on the Draft Specific Plan. The list of revisions will be similar to an errata sheet.

Any writing or document pertaining to an open session item on this agenda which is distributed to a majority of the Planning Commission after the posting of this agenda will be available for public inspection at the time the subject writing or document is distributed. The writing or document will be available for public review in the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA, during normal business hours, and may be posted on the City’s web site at <http://www.prcity.com/government/planning/commission/agendas.asp>.

All persons desiring to speak on an agenda item are asked to fill out *Speaker Information Cards* and place them at the Staff Table prior to public discussion of that item. Each individual speaker will be limited to a presentation total of three (3) minutes per item.

**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT** Any individual, who because of a disability needs special assistance to attend or participate in this meeting, may request assistance by contacting the City Clerk’s Office (805) 237-3960. Whenever possible, requests should be made four (4) working days in advance of the meeting.

## ADJOURNMENT:

**City Council** adjournment to the regular City Council Meeting of Tuesday, June 1, 2010 at 7:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446.

**Planning Commission** adjournment to the Development Review Committee Meeting of Monday, June 7, 2010 at 3:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446;

**Planning Commission** adjournment to the Planning Commission Meeting of Tuesday, June 8, 2010, at 7:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446.

Submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lonnie Dolan, Deputy City Clerk  
Approved:

## **Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Addendum to Public Draft**

The “Addendum” to the Public Draft Specific Plan lists those proposed changes to the draft specific plan that will be discussed in public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council. It is possible that some of the direction presented in the Addendum may be changed by the time that the specific plan is adopted.

Once the specific plan is adopted, a Final Draft Specific Plan will be prepared.

In the following pages, the following conventions are used:

- Recommended additions to text are noted either in quotes (e.g., following a direction to revise the text to read as follows: “new text”) or as underlined text.
- Recommended deletions are noted either in ~~double-strike-through-text~~ or in a direction to delete blocks of text, graphics, or components of graphics.

### Other Notes:

- “FBC” stands for “Form Based Code”, which is the new Zoning Code proposed in Chapter 5 of the specific plan.
- “LID” stands for “Low Impact Design”, an approach to designing development to recapture stormwater runoff on site
- Kimley-Horn is the traffic and parking subconsultant to Moule and Polyzoides.

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 1**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
1:1	1.1 – Plan Purpose	<u>Horizon Year and General Plan Population Planning Threshold:</u> Chapter 2 states that the plan horizon is 25 years, but M&P staff have publicly stated that some aspects of the plan have shorter terms (e.g., implementation schedules) and longer terms (e.g., visionary items). The specific plan should explain the different horizons in clear detail. Additionally, horizons should be broached early in Chapter 1: probably in Section 1.1.
1:1	1.1 – Plan Purpose	<u>Growth Management:</u> Since the plan will propose land uses capable of exceeding the 2003 General Plan population threshold (if all properties in the planning area were to be fully-developed per the plan prior to the General Plan’s 2025 horizon), the specific plan needs to propose a mechanism for monitoring and controlling growth. This issue is discussed in more detail in the comments for Chapter 5. However, a brief mention should be made in Section 1.1.
1:1	1.1 – Plan Purpose	<u>Illustrative/guidelines vs mandatory standards:</u> Chapter 1 needs to include a section that clearly explains how the specific plan is to be administered: which proposals are “illustrative” guidelines and which are mandatory standards. Aspects to be covered would include: land uses as shown on the Illustrative Plan, public facilities, major plan proposals, and architectural styles/treatments. This issue is discussed in more detail in the comments for Chapter 5. However, a brief mention should be made in Section 1.1.
1:11	1.11 - Plan Wide	Item #3: Reword to read: “Introduce pedestrian improvements throughout the specific plan area. Possible projects include introducing curb extensions and crosswalks, building new sidewalks in locations where they are missing or in substandard condition, introducing missing street trees, street lights, and street furniture.”
1:11	1.11 - Plan Wide	Item #4, designate Park Street as a portion of the de Anza Trail: Delete this item; it is covered in the Midtown items, and other streets could be the designated portion of the de Anza Trail.
1:11	1.11 - Plan Wide	Item # 7: Reword to read: “Introduce a performing arts center to be located south of 24 <sup>th</sup> Street and where adequate parking can be provided.”
1:11 to 1:12	1.11 - Plan Wide Policies, Specific	Both Chapters 1 and 2 contain lists of policies and projects that appear to have been intended to be fully-duplicative. Comments on the full list (combined from Chapters 1 and 2) will be discussed under comments on Chapter 2.

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 2**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
2:1	2.1 – Vision and Plan	<p>a. The plan proposes a development scenario in which an additional 1,649 dwelling units, 228,000 sq ft of retail space, 223,000 sq ft of office space, and 275,000 sq ft of industrial space (above levels projected in the 2003 General Plan) could be developed (Figures from EIR Notice of Preparation, Table 1). These projections are not the same as those summarized in Section 2.1 of Chapter 2, nor is there any discussion in the plan explaining the methodology for arriving at those figures.</p> <p>b. The plan needs to add a section that summarizes the projections and explains the methodology on which these figures were based, including the assumptions.</p> <p>c. Section 2.1 Paragraph 2: Any discussion of horizon years in Section 2.1 needs to be consistent with the changes to be made to Chapter 1.</p>
2:1	2.1 – Vision and Plan	<p>a. Item 1: Spring Street Corridor: Add to the final sentence in the first paragraph language that ensures that transforming of Spring Street will be sensitive to and honor its historic past.</p> <p>b. Item 2: Uptown: Delete the word “all” in the sentence that ensures that new buildings line public spaces.</p> <p>c. Item 7: Salinas River Preserve: Revise the last sentence to read: “This Plan intends that the remaining natural landscaping and habitat within the River be preserved and restored, and that appropriate access to its western banks be provided to make it more accessible to residents and visitors, and that new development along the east side of Paso Robles Street <u>eventually</u> front the River along a pedestrian-oriented public way.”</p> <p>d. Item 8: Delete, as Item #3 in Plan-Wide Policies on Page 1:11 will address this need.</p>
2:2	Map and Photos	Eliminate this map and photos (i.e., whole page) as it serves no purpose. The neighborhoods and specific vision projects are adequately discussed and illustrated elsewhere.
2:3	2.1.1.B – Uptown Vision and Plan	Revise Item #5 to read: “Introducing new street segments to create a better connected street and block networks, particularly to connect Oak Park to the surrounding urban fabric, and Uptown to Midtown. <u>The extension of Park Street between 24<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> Streets shall be limited to a pedestrian/bicycle path. Dedication and improvement of the pedestrian path and other streets (25<sup>th</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup>, and Railroad) as shown on the Illustrative Plan will only be required if the scale of development and redevelopment of properties in this area are of a scope large enough to warrant such actions. Examples of development or redevelopment that would warrant such actions would include a change of land use from industrial to residential or commercial use and development of a new commercial or mixed-use center over several</u>

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 2**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
		<u>existing properties. Additions to and alterations of existing buildings would be exempt from such actions.</u>
2:3	2.1.1.B – Uptown Vision and Plan	Item #6: The Hot Springs site is located in the Salinas River District, so Item #6 should be deleted. The Hot Springs Interpretive Center is described on Pages 2:20 and 2:21.
2:4	Illustrative Plan of Uptown	Revise the Illustrative Plan revised to show a pedestrian/bicycle path instead of a street in the alignment of 24 <sup>th</sup> Street in this area.
2:7	2.1.3.B – Midtown Vision and Plan	<p>a. Item 3. Add a sentence to read: “All vehicular access to businesses fronting 24<sup>th</sup> Street shall be from 23<sup>rd</sup> Street or side streets; no vehicular access shall be provided from 24<sup>th</sup> Street.”</p> <p>b. Item 6: Revise to read: “Improving pedestrian access and safety along and across 24<sup>th</sup> Street. <u>A pedestrian and bicycle crossing of the railroad may be located at 23<sup>rd</sup> Street as an alternative.</u>”</p> <p>c. Item 8: Delete, as Item #3 in Plan-Wide Policies on Page 1:11 will address this need.</p>
2:8	Illustrative Plan of Midtown	Revise map to show 16 <sup>th</sup> Street, not 15 <sup>th</sup> Street as the southern boundary of Midtown.
2:9	2.1.4.B – Downtown Vision and Plan	<p>a. Item 1: Revise text to read: “Expand the existing retail district northward to 16th Street and southward along <u>both sides of Pine Street to the train station (7<sup>th</sup> Street)</u>. Retail should be required on the ground floor of all buildings within this district and should be comprised of specialty stores and restaurants peppered with a few national retail chain tenants.</p> <p>b. Item 4: Revise text to read: “Infilling existing parking lots with mixed-use buildings <u>provided that an equal or greater number of parking spaces are provided in the downtown (e.g. in a parking structure or other consolidated parking solution).</u>”</p> <p>c. Item #: <u>Angled parking on Spring and 13<sup>th</sup> Streets</u>. Before this item is “adopted”, the following is to be done:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Kimley-Horn is to provide drawings to show how angled parking will work on Spring Street.</li> <li>(2) Kimley-Horn is to provide drawings to show how 13<sup>th</sup> Street might be configured with parallel parking on one side, angled parking on the other, and three traffic lanes.</li> <li>(3) If Kimley-Horn recommends that angled parking not be installed in Spring and 13<sup>th</sup> Street until a new 4<sup>th</sup> Street underpass connecting to Riverside Avenue is completed, then this needs to be stated in writing in the plan. One way this could be done is to add a note next to Details #2 and 5 on Pages 4:3 and 4:4 to state as such - similar to the note for Detail #22 on Page 4:8</li> </ol>



**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 2**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
		<p>d. Item 10, “Introduce a small plaza at the corner of 10<sup>th</sup> and Spring Streets...” is to be removed from the plan.</p> <p>e. Item 12: Revise to read: “Transform Railroad Street between 10<sup>th</sup> <del>12</del><sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Streets into a more pedestrian-friendly street...”</p> <p>f. Item 14: Performing Arts Center: Delete this item, as it may not be located in Downtown. This facility will be addressed as a “Plan Wide” item on Page 1:11.</p>
2:10	Illustrative Plan of Downtown	Revise map to show 16 <sup>th</sup> Street, not 15 <sup>th</sup> Street as the northern boundary of Downtown.
2:11	2.1.5.B – South of Downtown Vision and Plan	Items #2 and 3: Combine these into one item to read: “Extend Fourth Street beneath the railroad tracks to Riverside Avenue. This may be done either in a manner that preserves the historic rectilinear street and block network or which uses a curvilinear alignment. In conjunction with this project, or as a separate project, Pine Street may be repositioned to the west to align with the center of Robbins Field.”
2:11	2.1.5.B – South of Downtown Vision and Plan	Remove Item #10, “Introduce a flood mitigation and stormwater quality treatment area on the block bounded by Fourth Street, Oak Street, Third Street, and Vine Street” from the plan.
2:12	Illustrative Plan of South of Downtown	Revise map to remove Item B, the flood mitigation and stormwater quality treatment area.
2:13	2.1.6.B – Riverside Corridor Vision and Plan	Add Item #10 to describe the vision for Riverside Avenue north of 24 <sup>th</sup> Street.
2:18	2.1.9.b.1.a - Proposal	The text reads: “New development should “front” the river. The City will be holding a workshop in July to discuss the Salinas River Plan and will consider options for interpretation and implementation of this policy.
2:25 to 2:26	2.2.3.B.1 - Trellis	The proposed trellis along the south side of City Park is to be removed from the plan. This will include removing the text, the photo in the lower left corner of this Page 2:25, and the details on the lower half of Page 2:26.
2:26	2.2.3.B.6.g	Restaurant on the Green: Remove this item (text) from the plan.
2:26	2.2.3.B.7.a	General Storage or food prep area for caterers: Remove this item (text) from the plan.
2:26	2.2.3.B.7.f	Hardscape around Gazebo Area: remove this from the plan. Only temporary dance floors will be used.

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 2**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Issue/Change to Plan</b>
2:26	Illustrative Plan of City Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. This plan drawing is to be enlarged to 11” x 17” as it will serve as the Master Plan for the Park.</li><li>b. Remove Item “H” New Stage Platform from the drawing.</li></ul>

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft – Chapter 3**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Issue/Change to Plan</b>
3:1 to 3:3	3.2 – Catalytic Projects by Plan Area	Instead of “Catalytic” and “Collateral” projects, the City wants to assign priorities as noted below to both projects and programs.
3:9 to 3:16	Table 3.3-1	Replace “Project Type” as the heading for the 4 <sup>th</sup> column with “Priority” and enter the “short-term”, “mid-term”, and “long-term” priorities discussed below.
3:9	Table 3.3-1 - Uptown, Street Improvements	Regarding the 24 <sup>th</sup> Street Bridge Pedestrian Improvements (estimated at up to \$2 million): what form is this? Is it “hanging” a sidewalk off the side of the bridge? If so, that will not work for ADA. Is it a separate structure than the existing bridge?
3:9	Table 3.3-1 - Uptown, Street Improvements	Add a project (and cost estimate) to pave Vine Street between 32 <sup>nd</sup> and 36th Streets (actually to Caballo Place) per Detail #21 on Page 4:8.
3:9	Table 3.3-1 - Downtown, Street Improvements	Need to add a line item for adding 180 additional angled on-street parking spaces. According to Kimley-Horn, this will cost \$25,000.
3:13	Table 3.3-1 – Riverside Corridor, Parks and Open Space	Is the \$82,200 parking lot essentially a re-surfacing of the existing lot with pervious pavers? The lot needs a lot more than re-surfacing. It needs to handle a lot of incoming runoff from the Mountain Springs Creek (probably via an underground cistern), trees (which may be in the next line item) and parking lot lighting (preferably solar-powered). Is seems that the whole project will cost a good deal more than \$82,200.

**Priorities:**

- Short-Term     Pursue in the next 0-10 years or on an ongoing basis by:
- Listing a project on the Capital Improvement Budget, to be accomplished with AB 1600 funds, General funds, redevelopment funds, or enterprise funds.
  - Budgeting staff time to implement a program.
  - The plan itself acts to facilitate private development.
  - Requiring public improvements as a condition of development.
- Mid-Term       Pursue in the next 10-20 years  
NOTE:        Projects that are designated as having long-term priority, would become short term if sufficient grant funds become available.
- Long-Term      Pursue beyond 20 years.  
NOTE:        Projects that are designated as having long-term priority, would become short term if sufficient grant funds become available.

## **Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Addendum to Public Draft – Chapter 3**

### Short-Term Policies/Programs

- Ensure the long-term protection of historically significant buildings and districts as identified in the Historic Resources Survey. (Plan Wide)
- Introduce selective infill on properties not currently occupied by buildings of historical significance. (Plan Wide)
- Address the infrastructure needs and identify areas where improvements will be needed for the long term success of the plan. (Plan Wide)
- Transform Spring Street into a street with segments of differing character in a manner that is sensitive to and honors its historic past. (Spring Street Corridor)
- Expand the existing retail district northward to 16th Street and southward along both sides of Pine Street to the train station. Retail should be required on the ground floor of all buildings within this district and should be comprised of specialty stores and restaurants peppered with a few national retail chain tenants. (Downtown)
- Preserve the industrial character of the area east of Pine Street along the railroad tracks. Uses include commercial businesses, although efforts should be made to support the construction related industries that are concentrated there now. (Downtown)
- New development should “front” the river. This entails introducing public access ways (whether streets or trails) along the river’s bank and requiring buildings to front these streets or trails. (Salinas River)
- Enact stormwater best management practices (BMPs) that filter pollutants from stormwater before it is released into the river. These can include rain gardens, biofiltration strips, sedimentation basins, stormwater wetlands, and other techniques that contribute to recharging the region’s groundwater. Due to the proximity of Highway 101, this effort will require coordination with Caltrans who owns and operates most of the culverts discharging into the River. (Salinas River)
- Incorporate low-impact development (LID) and hydro-modification standards to improve overall quality of stormwater entering the River. (Salinas River)

### Short-Term Projects

- Introduce pedestrian improvements throughout the specific plan area. Possible projects include introducing curb extensions and crosswalks, building new sidewalks in locations where they are missing or in substandard condition, introducing missing street trees, street lights, and street furniture. (Plan Wide)
- Improve Vine Street and Riverside Avenue with sufficient bike lanes to act as a bike boulevard linking the Uptown and Town Centre areas. (Plan Wide)
- Enhance the northern and southern “gateway entries” from Highway 101 with planting. (Spring Street Corridor)
- Improve Spring Street as a transit corridor linking the Uptown and Town Centre areas including transit loops to Riverside Ave. (Spring Street Corridor)
- Introduce a neighborhood-serving retail plaza along Spring Street between 34th and 32nd Streets. (Uptown)
- Develop the block bounded by Oak street, 36th Street, Spring Street, and Highway 101 with an Early Childhood Learning Center that may house a City Library-operated study center. (Uptown)

## **Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Addendum to Public Draft – Chapter 3**

- Rehabilitate the Oak Park Housing Project and introduce a new community recreation center to replace the George Stephan Center. (Uptown)
- Introduce mixed-use and/or flex uses buildings along the segment of Spring Street that passes through Midtown. (Midtown)
- Develop a commercial corridor along 24th Street that includes retail businesses, small offices, and upper floor residences. All vehicular access to businesses fronting 24<sup>th</sup> Street shall be from 23<sup>rd</sup> Street or side streets; no vehicular access shall be provided from 24<sup>th</sup> Street. (Midtown)
- Traffic-calm 13th Street in order to encourage and enable pedestrians and automobiles to comfortably cross in a north-south direction. (Downtown)
- Introduce selective infill on properties not currently occupied by buildings of historical significance. (Downtown)
- Introduce park-once parking garages at strategic locations. Possible locations include the northeast corner of Railroad and 13th Streets, the southeast corner of Pine and 10th Streets, and on the existing City Hall/Library parking lot. (Note: the version in Chapter 1 calls for structures to be “lined” (with ground floor retail and upper floor office uses). (Downtown)
- Reconfigure on-street parking - particularly on Spring and 13th Streets - from parallel to angled to supplement Downtown’s on-street parking supply, calm traffic, improve pedestrian access, and “visually announce” when a driver has arrived in Downtown. (Downtown)
- Introduce a farmers’ market along the north side of 11th Street. The farmers’ market should be located and its layout designed in a manner that maintains adequate access to adjacent businesses as well as provides access to Police and Fire vehicles. (Downtown)
- Develop the Fourth Street Master Plan area in order to kick-start the regeneration of South of Downtown. The recommended concept is comprised of mixed-use buildings with retail on the ground floor, and residential and/or office uses on upper floors. The retail space designs and tenant mix in this location could be favorable to a range of national retail chains. (South of Downtown)
- Infill vacant lots, parking lots, and properties not currently occupied by buildings of historical significance with mixed-use and/or flex buildings to transform South Downtown into a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use neighborhood with a well-defined public realm and strong sense of place. (South of Downtown)
- Improve Riverside Avenue as bicycle-friendly boulevard. (Riverside Corridor)
- Extend the two existing pedestrian/bike trails alongside the river to form a continuous system on both the east and west sides of the river. The trails would include a single, ten-foot wide, main trail for both bicyclists and pedestrians, graded and demarcated by a surface treatment, located outside of the 10-year floodway, and generally outside of the 50-year floodway. (Salinas River)
- Retain lawn open space (City Park Improvements)
- New public restrooms (City Park Improvements)
- Gazebo – temporary dance floor only (City Park Improvements)
- Remove mailboxes in 11<sup>th</sup> Street (City Park Improvements)
- Dinner Events (City Park Improvements)

## Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Addendum to Public Draft – Chapter 3

### Mid-Term Policies/Programs

- In order to enhance the cultural and educational quality of the community, support establishments such as “Studios on the Park”, a project that will introduce working artist studios into the heart of Downtown. (Downtown)

### Mid-Term Projects

- Improve Georgia Brown Elementary School and Vine Street, including terracing the hillside to accommodate provide bleachers for overlooking the fields below. (Uptown)
- Introduce a pedestrian/ vehicular crossing over the existing railroad tracks at 28th Street. (Uptown)
- Introduce a wide greenway along one side of Park Street to provide an attractive pedestrian and bicycle connection between Uptown and Downtown. Park Street could be designated as a portion of the historic Anza Trail. (Midtown)
- Construct an improved drainage course for Mountain Spring Creek that crosses Vine Street, runs along 23rd street, down Oak Street to 21st Street to Spring Street, and on to the Paso Robles Events Center. (Midtown)
- Introduce a park on the block surrounded by 16th Street, Vine Street, 17th Street, and Oak Street. The placement of a park on this site is contingent upon meeting the requirements of a covenant that restricts the site’s use to “educational” uses. (Midtown)
- Improve pedestrian access and safety along and across 24th Street that meet ADA requirements as necessary. A pedestrian and bicycle crossing of the railroad may be located at 23<sup>rd</sup> Street as an alternative. (Midtown)
- Infill existing parking lots with mixed-use buildings provided that an equal or greater number of parking spaces are provided in the downtown (e.g. in a parking structure or in additional angled on-street spaces). (Downtown)
- Transform Railroad Street between 10<sup>th</sup> and 14th Streets into a more pedestrian-friendly street by narrowing its width and introducing new paving materials and street furniture. (Downtown)
- Introduce flex space along Park Street between Robbins Field and City Park. Flex space is an occupancy that is designed to accommodate a variety of uses including office, retail, or residential (typically in a loft configuration) also called “Live/Work”. (South of Downtown)
- Provide a pedestrian and a bicycle path that connects the northern terminus of Riverside Avenue under the 101 Freeway to reach the Hot Springs property. This path provides a missing connection within the overall river trail system. (Riverside Corridor)
- Develop formal gardens in City of Paso Robles Park, south of Carnegie Library (City Park Improvements)
- Develop a new Grand Plaza in City Park on the north side of Carnegie Library: remove existing planter, replace existing fountain (City Park Improvements)
- Introduce public art and signage (City Park Improvements)
- Install electrical improvements (outlets, gazebo/stage light and sound) (City Park Improvements)

## Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Addendum to Public Draft – Chapter 3

### Long-Term Policies/Programs

- Encourage buildings to be pedestrian-oriented, and fronting both Paso Robles Street and the River Paseo, and at the same time to retain the industrial/agrarian architectural character typical of the older buildings in this area. (Riverside Corridor)
- Develop a habitat preservation and management plan for the Salinas River that:
  - a. Ensures the survival of the next generation of vegetation through no-mow protocols and sapling planting;
  - b. Identifies mitigation opportunities for area development that contribute to river restoration;
  - c. Enacts stormwater best management practices (BMPs) to filter out pollutants and contribute to the recharging of the region’s groundwater. (Salinas River)
- Preserve and Enhance Riparian Habitats; adopt a new City maintenance protocol along the river:
  - a. Start a planting program for small saplings that are just taller than the competing grasses in areas currently without reproduction of the large tree species
  - b. Adopt a “no mow” regime in these areas to allow seedlings to succeed
  - c. When seedling removal is necessary (as in the case of invasive species), selectively remove them rather than mowing an entire area
  - d. Train City staff in the new protocol. (Salinas River)
- Develop and formally adopt a native habitat restoration program to insure that the next generation of native vegetation properly takes root. This can be accomplished by implementing an “in-lieu fee” program for projects that have negative impacts on riparian habitats and consequently require mitigation by City, County, State or Federal agencies. This approach will allow the City as well as potential developers to accomplish restoration and mitigation without shouldering the entire financial responsibility. For example, the City can offer mitigation opportunities to developers that are seeking environmental permits by targeting specific areas within the river zone to:
  - a. Restore disturbed areas where invasive species are concentrated.
  - b. Open selective views along the river corridor that are compatible with the restoration of the river, including 1) views up and down the river, and 2) views from the upper banks into the river corridor and vice versa.
  - c. Leverage redevelopment opportunities to simultaneously accomplish restoration goals. (Salinas River)

### Long-Term Projects

- Introduce a performing arts center to be located south of 24<sup>th</sup> Street and in a location where adequate parking can be provided.” (Plan Wide)
- Introduce new street segments to create a better connected street and block networks, particularly to connect Oak Park to the surrounding urban fabric, and Uptown to Midtown. The extension of Park Street between 24<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> Streets shall be limited to a pedestrian/bicycle path. Dedication and improvement of the pedestrian path and other streets (25<sup>th</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup>, and Railroad) as shown on the Illustrative Plan will only be required if the scale of development and redevelopment of properties in this area are of a scope large enough to warrant such actions. Examples of development or redevelopment that would warrant such actions would include a change of land use from industrial to residential or commercial use and development of a new commercial center over several existing properties. Additions to and alterations of existing buildings would be exempt from such actions. (Uptown)

## **Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Addendum to Public Draft – Chapter 3**

- Expand the existing aquatics complex at 28th and Vine Streets. Possible projects include introducing classroom space, expanding and/or updating the existing pool, introducing a water slide, and adding additional parking. (Uptown)
- Future Ballfield between 24<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup>, west of the Railroad (Uptown)
- Introduce a pedestrian bridge at 12th Street that crosses the 101 Freeway, connecting Downtown to the Salinas River. (Downtown)
- Consider transforming Robbins Field into a performance venue or a Civic Park, but only if an appropriate replacement ball field is first developed elsewhere within the West Side of the City. (South of Downtown)

Dismantling of the facilities at Robbins Field should not occur until a replacement ball field with the same amenities are constructed and usable.

- Extend Fourth Street beneath the railroad tracks to Riverside Avenue. This may be done in a manner that preserves the historic rectilinear street and block network or which uses a curvilinear alignment. In conjunction with this project, Pine Street may be repositioned to the west to align with the center of Robbins Field. (South of Downtown)
- Build a new City Hall (South of Downtown)
- Introduce a pedestrian bridge across the railroad tracks between the proposed new City Hall building and the historic Farmers' Alliance building. (South of Downtown)
- Provide a new north frontage for the existing Post Office building that better relates to Park Street. (South of Downtown)
- Revitalize the Paso Robles Event Center, Pioneer Park, and the Pioneer Park historical museums and organizations. (Riverside Corridor)
- Relocate the Pioneer Park softball field and skateboard park to elsewhere in the Specific Plan area. Possible locations include:
  - a. Along Paso Robles Street adjacent to the Salinas River.
  - b. Between 24th and 26th Streets just west of the existing railroad tracks on properties currently occupied by self-storage facilities. (Pioneer Park/Museums)

Dismantling of the facilities at Pioneer Park should not occur until replacement ball field and skate park facilities with the same amenities are constructed and usable.

- Plan and construct a new History Center at the northeast corner of 19th Street and Riverside Avenue, providing new gallery space, visitor serving spaces and support spaces to supplement the existing museum structures. (Pioneer Park/Museums)
- Introduce retail and other related uses in the Farmers Alliance Building as well as the addition of new commercial buildings on the site that will improve the attractiveness of the property as a community destination. (Riverside Corridor)
- Introduce a natural history museum/interpretive center at the Salinas River end of the 12th Street extension, connected to the Downtown via the proposed 12th Street pedestrian bridge. (Riverside Corridor)
- Introduce a Paseo along the Salinas River, shaded by native trees and equipped with seating, forming a clearly-defined edge, public walkway, and river overlook. (Riverside Corridor)
- Develop an amphitheater along the Salinas River Paseo facing the river. (Riverside Corridor)



**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft – Chapter 3**

- Provide greater access to the Salinas River, particularly along its eastern edge. (Salinas River)
- Create destination opportunities, such as an amphitheater, river outlook, outdoor classroom/interpretive displays, and a wetland boardwalk. (Salinas River)
- Extend the two existing pedestrian/bike trails alongside the river to form a continuous system on both the east and west sides of the river. The trails would have the following elements and criteria:
  - a. Spur trails that branch off of the main trail, within the 10-year floodway to allow people to get closer to the water.
  - b. Pedestrian/bicycle bridges at the north (Hot Springs property) and south (Charolais Road) ends of the trail system. (Salinas River)
- Develop the following destinations for trails:
  - a. River Outlook/Paseo on east side of Paso Robles Street
  - b. Equestrian underpass and equestrian park at PREC/County Maintenance Yard
  - c. Hot Springs Interpretive Center
  - d. North River Road Park (below River Oaks).
  - e. Rain garden along Paseo to clean runoff/sulfur spring discharge before entering river. (Salinas River)
  - f. Destination opportunity at the Hot Springs site that includes a boardwalk over the wetland and an interpretive kiosk. (Salinas River)
- Stage and live performances, west side of proposed Grand Plaza. Stage and seating facilities would be temporary. (City Park Improvements)

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 4**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Issue/Change to Plan</b>
4:2 and 5:3 to 5:8	Section 4.2 and Street Network and Parking Plan and Regulating Plan Maps	<u>Local Street Standards:</u> These maps (on Pages 4:2 and 5:3-8) and how many streets with what appears to be medians and a handful of streets without medians. However, there are no detail standards for these types of streets. The second paragraph in Section 4.2 – Streetscape Improvements (P. 4:11) leads the plan reader to assume that there will be details/standards for all streets. If there are not to be standards for local streets, then the medians drawn in the maps indicated above need to be removed.
4:3 to 4:10	Details #1-31	<u>Street Standards/Street tree recommendations:</u> a. Plan needs to address whether street tree species shown at the bottom of each detail are to be recommendations (guidelines) or mandates. b. Avoid planting schedules that concentrate species. Should a blight occur, whole streetscapes could be negatively affected. c. California Pepper is a high-maintenance tree that needs constant pruning and should be removed from the list.
4:3	Detail #1	<u>Spring Street, between 1<sup>st</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Streets:</u> Add a 2 <sup>nd</sup> northbound travel lane from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 6 <sup>th</sup> (right turn only at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street).
4:3-4	Details #2 and 5	See note above for Page 2:9, Section 2.1.4.B – Downtown Vision and Plan regarding angled and parallel parking on Spring and 13 <sup>th</sup> Streets.
4:5	Details #10 and 11	These details appear to have their titles reversed. It is the City’s understanding that the angled parking on Riverside Avenue was to occur south of 13 <sup>th</sup> Street. Change the numbers on the map on Page 4:2 accordingly.
4:5	Detail #12	<u>Paso Robles Street:</u> a. Detail #12 shows a Class II bikeway, but the map on Page 4:11 does not show it. However, consider removing bike lanes and calming traffic via widening the center turn lane – like the Spring Street section (Detail #1). b. Provide a concept design for a new off-ramp from northbound Highway 101. The concept would provide for access to properties south of the current off-ramp and would improve adequate warning and clear delineation of the boundary between the freeway ramp and the City Street.
4:6	Detail #13	4 <sup>th</sup> Street: widen the bike lanes to 6 feet and reduce the travel lanes to 11 feet.
4:7	Detail #20	<u>Park Street, between 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Streets:</u> Extend this to 11 <sup>th</sup> Street and revise the Street Network and Parking Plan map on Page 4:2 accordingly.

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 4**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
4:7	Details #18 and 19	<p><u>Oak Park Streets</u>: Remove these details as a project was approved with their own details on June 1, 2010.</p> <p>NOTE: All references below to Details #20-31 are to the details as numbered in the draft plan. Once Details #18-19 are deleted, change the numbers on the remaining details and on the map on Page 4:2 accordingly.</p>
4:8	Detail #21	<p><u>Vine Street: 32<sup>nd</sup> – 36<sup>th</sup> Street</u> : Parking needs to be provided on the east side of the street adjacent to the proposed terraced seating adjacent to the soccer field at Georgia Brown School. Also, bike lanes need to be added to this detail.</p>
4:9	Detail #26	<p><u>21<sup>st</sup> Street</u>: widen bike lanes to 6 feet and reduce the travel lanes to 11 feet.</p>
4:9	Detail #27	<p><u>10<sup>th</sup> Street</u>: Widen the bike lanes to accommodate a 52 foot paved width as on Vine Street.</p>
4:9	Detail #28	<p><u>16<sup>th</sup> Street</u>: Widen the bike lanes to accommodate a 52 foot paved width as on Vine Street.</p>
4:10	Detail #29	<p><u>32<sup>nd</sup> Street</u>: widen the bike lanes to accommodate a 52 foot paved width as on Vine Street.</p>
4:10	Detail #31	<p><u>Park Street</u>: revise this section to match that for Vine Street between 24<sup>th</sup> and 32<sup>nd</sup> Streets (Detail #30).</p>
4:11	4.1.3 and Trail and Bike Path Plan	<p><u>Bikeways</u>: The specific plan should be consistent with the Bicycle Master Plan, which was adopted by the City Council in December 2009. To do this, the following changes need to be made to Section 4.1.3 on Page 4:11.</p> <p>a. Changes to the Trail and Bike Path Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Vine Street, between 32<sup>nd</sup> Street and Caballo Place needs to be shown as a Class II Bikeway.</li> <li>(2) Add a symbol for bike boulevards and designate Vine Street and Riverside Avenue as Bike Boulevards.</li> <li>(3) Add a symbol for sharrow and designate 13<sup>th</sup> Street, between Vine Street and Riverside Avenue as a sharrow.</li> <li>(4) Show the following street segments as Class II Bikeways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24<sup>th</sup> Street, from west of Vine Street to Highway 101;</li> <li>• 28<sup>th</sup> Street, from Vine Street to the railroad;</li> <li>• 36<sup>th</sup> Street, Vine to Park Streets;</li> <li>• 13<sup>th</sup> Street, east of Riverside Avenue.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 4**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
		<p>Note: The Specific Plan shows the following additional Class II Bikeways (where the Bicycle Master Plan does not): 4<sup>th</sup> Street, 32<sup>nd</sup> Street, Spring Street (north of 36<sup>th</sup> to the Hot Springs Property).</p> <p>(5) Show the following street segments as Class III Bikeways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park Street, from 13<sup>th</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> Streets and from 28<sup>th</sup> Street to 36<sup>th</sup> Street;</li> <li>• Pine Street, from 4<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> Streets;</li> <li>• 34<sup>th</sup> Street, from Oak to Park Streets.</li> </ul> <p>Note: The Specific Plan shows the following additional Class III Bikeways (where the Bicycle Master Plan does not): Park Street (from Park to the proposed Paseo east of Paso Robles Streets), and 4<sup>th</sup> Street (between Vine and Spring Streets).</p>
	b.	<p>Changes to Text in Section 4.1.3:</p> <p>(1) Add the following definition of “Bike Boulevard”.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A roadway where priority is given to bicyclists as opposed to going through traffic. They are appropriate on low-volume and low-speed streets, and include special treatment such as signage and pavement markings, intersection crossing treatments, traffic reduction, and traffic calming treatments.</p> <p>(2) Amend the subsections on Vine Street and Riverside Avenue to indicate that these are designated as bike boulevards.</p> <p>(3) Add the following definition of “Sharrow”.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">An appropriate driving lane marked for a roadway to be shared with bicyclists, Sharrows may be considered for bicycle routes where the roadway/shoulder is not sufficient for a class II bike lane and the safest route is for cyclists to ride directly on the roadway.</p> <p>(4) Add the sharrow logo from the Bicycle Master Plan as an exhibit/detail.</p>
4:13	4.2.B	<p><u>Crosswalks:</u></p> <p>a. Item #5, which suggests mid-block crossings in areas of high retail activity, is not appropriate for Paso Robles; our blocks are relatively short (300 feet).</p> <p>b. Revise Item #6, which specifies installing LED-Lighted Crosswalks at <u>all</u> unsignalized intersections to specify installing them where the need to enhance public safety has been demonstrated.</p>

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 4**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
4:13	4.2.C	<p><u>Street Trees</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed spacing of 1 tree per 30 linear feet (subsection 1) is too close and should be increased.</li> <li>2. Where street trees are planned, they need deep rooting species or root barriers called out in City standards.</li> <li>3. Subsection C5 states that tree wells will be addressed in the LID standards of Section 4.6. However, there appears to be no specific reference to tree wells and LID in Section 4.6.</li> </ol>
4:14	4.2.F	<p><u>Street Lights:</u> The proposed spacing of 1 light per 60 linear feet should be increased. (80 feet is the average on Spring Street in City Park.)</p>
4:18	Transit Route Plan	<p>Add a transit route loop north of 24<sup>th</sup> Street to serve the hotels in the area served by Riverside Avenue, Black Oak Drive, Ysabel Avenue, and 24<sup>th</sup> Street.</p>
4:20 to 4:26	Sewer and Water Plan Maps	<p>The maps are hard to read. The aerial photo/illustrative plan background should be eliminated and a simpler double line street background used.</p>
4:20 to 4:26	Sewer and Water Plan Discussions for Districts	<p>To the paragraphs on Sewer and Water Plans, make the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Remove such statements as "...add housing and retail units requiring significant utility upgrades." Sewer and water upgrades identified in the City's master plans are needed regardless of the implementation of the specific plan. Misleading statements are repeated in Paragraphs A and B for each district. Such statements could be translated into a need for special fees, which are not needed because the utility upgrades have already been included in the analysis supporting detailed rate and capacity charge studies that are the basis for the current rates.</li> <li>b. Comments regarding testing soils for suitability of LID techniques should be left to the development of a City-wide LID Manual. Delete such comments from this section.</li> <li>c. The proposed storm drain network will not likely conform to the goals of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City's Storm Drain Ordinance. A storm drain network tied to the freeway culvert system will result in direct discharges to the River, which is unacceptable.</li> </ol> <p>The project list does not give sufficient direction to serve as a basis to update the City's storm drain impact fee program. The projects on the list must incorporate storm water quality improvements implemented within the public right-of-way,</p>

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 4**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Issue/Change to Plan</b>
		somewhere upstream of each key discharge point into the freeway culvert system.
4:20 to 4:26	Stormdrain Maps and Discussions for Districts	<p><u>Stormdrain Plans:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What is the difference between “upgrade” and “proposed”?</li> <li>b. The stormdrain outfalls noted on the maps do not always coincide with the ends of storm drains as shown on the maps.</li> <li>c. Regarding stormdrains, the proposed cross-section for 21<sup>st</sup> Street shown on map “D” on Page 4:22 does not coincide with Details #17 on Page 4:7 and #26 on Page 4:9.</li> </ul>
4:33	4.6.C	Green Roofs are not feasible in Paso Robles, given its climate. Remove the text, photo, and conceptual detail drawing.
4:34	4.7	<p><u>Parks and Open Space:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Facility “J” (Oak Park No. 2): With the revision of Oak Park plans, this item needs to be amended accordingly.</li> <li>b. Facility “M” (Flood Mitigation and Stormwater Quality Treatment Area): Remove from the plan as most properties in this area have been developed.</li> </ul>

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 5**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
5:1	5.1.B Applicability	<p>See note above for Page 1:1, Section 1.1 – Plan Purpose regarding “Regulations and Guidelines”. The Applicability Section should explain this subject in greater detail and remind/inform readers that Chapter 5 will contain both regulations and guidelines as follows:</p> <p><u>Regulations:</u> Sections 5.1 through 5.5.2, and Sections 5.6 through 5.9, which would include the Regulating Plan (Zoning Map), list of permitted and conditional uses, regulations for the various zones, architectural standards, signs, landscaping, parking, other regulations, and definitions.</p> <p><u>Guidelines:</u> Architectural styles in Section 5.5.3 (Pages 5:49 through 5:102).</p>
5:1	5.1.	<p><u>Modifications and Variances:</u> Add the following to this section, possibly under Subsection B or C.</p> <p><u>Modifications:</u> “On a case-by case basis, in the event that compliance with the provisions of this code can be demonstrated to be physically infeasible for any reasonable type of development within any of the zones described in this chapter, the Planning Commission may, subject to development plan review, approve modified development standards upon a finding that the modified standards will not create a physical hazard or negative visual impact when viewed from a street or neighboring property. The Planning Commission may impose any conditions necessary to ensure that such a finding can be made.”</p> <p><u>Variances:</u> “In the event that special circumstances applicable to a property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under the identical zoning classification, the Planning Commission may grant a variance in accordance with provisions set forth in Chapter 21.23 of the Zoning Code.”</p>
5:1	5.1	<p><u>Growth Monitoring and Management:</u> Add the following to this section, possibly under Subsection B or C.</p> <p>The draft specific plan has the potential to allow more dwelling units to be built than the current (2003) General Plan population planning threshold of 44,000 by 2025 would accommodate. Because the specific plan proposes to set a vision that will last beyond the General Plan’s 2025 horizon. To ensure that the Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan, the following growth management and monitoring program is established.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annually monitor and report the rate of growth in the specific plan area and city-wide as part of the annual General Plan Status Report.</li> <li>• Establish 600 new units (added since January 1, 2010) as a milestone expressed as the number of dwelling units (within the planning area) at which point the City will begin to develop a growth management program that would limit the number of</li> </ul>

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 5**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
		<p>building permits issued annually for new dwelling units (in the planning area).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish 750 new units (added since January 1, 2010) as the number of dwelling units (within the planning area) at which point the City will implement the growth management program would be implemented.</li> </ul>
5:16	5.4.B	<p>New Subsection B: <u>Principles of Traditional Neighborhood Design</u></p> <p>Add text enumerating the principles that the form-based code is designed to implement. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dwelling units should front (address) the street.</li> <li>• All dwelling units should have pedestrian access to the street; none should be limited to access only from alleys.</li> <li>• Explain the transect as it applies to zoning (T-4 is denser in terms of lot coverage and massing than T-3).</li> <li>• Etc.</li> </ul> <p>This will help explain the principles supporting the proposed zoning standards to the public, Planning Commission, Council, and staff.</p>
5:5-8	Regulating Plan Map	<p>Eliminate the “Proposed Right-of-Way Regulating Plan maps. They are superfluous.</p>
5:5 to 5:8	Regulating Plan Map	<p>Make the following changes to zoning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Change the area north of 32<sup>nd</sup> Street, between Oak and Vine Streets, and south of Georgia Brown School from T-3N to T-4N.</li> <li>b. Extend T-3F zoning up the Oak Street Corridor between 13<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> Streets, wherever T-3N Zoning was proposed.</li> <li>c. Extend T-4F zoning up the Park Street Corridor between 13<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> Streets, wherever T-4N Zoning was proposed.</li> <li>d. The 21<sup>st</sup> Street Corridor, east of Spring Street, should be zoned T-4F, not T-3F, as this area is more commercial in nature. On the west side of Pine Street, the second lot south of 21<sup>st</sup> Street (APN 008-228-017) is shown as being zoned T4N but should be shown as being zoned T4F. (The City’s existing Zoning Map is in error here.)</li> <li>e. Change the following APNs from Civic to RC: 008-182-002 (northwest corner of Riverside Avenue and 21<sup>st</sup> Street) and 008-247-003, -008, -012, and -015 (located at the southwest corner of Riverside Avenue and 21<sup>st</sup> Street).</li> <li>f. Change the zoning for those properties fronting onto Vine Street, between 10<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> from T-4F to T-3F. (Note: This change is not to be applied to other T-4F properties adjacent to those fronting Vine.)</li> <li>g. Change the zoning on those properties fronting on to 12<sup>th</sup> Street between Spring Street and the Alley east of Vine Street from T-4F to TC-1.</li> </ol>



**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 5**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Issue/Change to Plan</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>h. Show all of APN 009-093-071 (Paso Robles Inn) as being zoned TC-1. The Draft Regulating plan map shows a non-existent lot on the west side of this APN adjacent to the alley as being zoned T-4F (the middle of 3 “lots” on the east side of the alley between 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Streets).</li> <li>i. Change the zoning on those properties fronting the west side of Oak Street, between 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Streets from T-3N to T3F.</li> <li>j. Change the parcel at the southeast corner of Oak and 8<sup>th</sup> Streets (APN 009-195-001) from T-4F to T-3F.</li> <li>k. Change the second parcel east of Oak Street on the north side of 7<sup>th</sup> Street (APN 009-195-016) from T-3N to TC-2.</li> <li>l. Extend TC-1 Zoning south along the west side of Pine Street to 7<sup>th</sup> Street, to match the TC-1 Zoning proposed on the east side of the street (at the North County Transportation Center).</li> </ul>
5:9 to 5:12	Table 5.3-1	<p><u>Permitted and Conditional Land Uses:</u> Make the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Land uses that should not be permitted in the T-3F Zone would include: neighborhood markets, retail sales, personal and business support services, restaurants. (I.e., they would be too intense for a neighborhood.)</li> <li>b. Banks and financial institutions should not be permitted uses in the T-3F and T-4F Zones. (Too much intensity for a neighborhood)</li> </ul>
5:17 to 5:20	5.4.1 – 5.4.4 T-3 and T-4 Zones	<p>In the T-3 and T-4 Zones, for lots that are larger than the standard, if a property owner wants to develop a complex consisting of a series of duplexes and/or triplexes, the FBC will require submittal of a conceptual subdivision plan per Section 5.8 on Pages 5:111-112. Insert text clarifying the use of “design lot lines” to ensure that the massing, setbacks, etc. of new buildings and building complexes conform to the existing, historic urban fabric. <b>Section 5.5.1.E.1 on Page 5:25 might be a good place to do this.</b></p>
5:17 to 5:20	5.4.1 – 5.4.4 T-3 and T-4 Zones	<p><u>Allowed Frontage Types (Subsection F):</u> Every new residential building would be required to have a porch, stoop, or terrace frontage. The Building Code requires that residential buildings with 3 or more units must provide one or more accessible units.</p>
5:17 to 5:24	5.4.1 – 5.4.8 Subsection H (Parking Requirements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>The one-size-fits-all parking ratio for retail, office, and industrial:</u> Eliminate the exemption of the first 3,000 sf from the parking requirements.</li> <li>b. Propose a new parking ratio for hotels (The one space per 400 sq ft ratio is too onerous for hotels.)</li> </ul>
5:17 to 5:24	5.4.1 – 5.4.8 Subsection I (Parking Access Standards)	<p>The FBC requires all lots with alley access to have their parking accessed only from the alley and not from the street. Should the City prohibit placement of driveways to a street if alleys are available?</p>

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 5**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
		Planning Commissioner Steve Gregory wants to provide photos of garages facing side streets.
5:19	5.4.3.B	<u>Villas</u> : Revise this section to provide that villas will be allowed in the T-4N Zone.
5:20 to 5:24	5.4.4 – 5.4.8 T-4F to RC Zones	<u>Allowed Building Types for Commercial Uses</u> : Revise Subsection B to allow for residential buildings (single family dwellings, duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes) as appropriate types of buildings to house commercial and mixed uses.
5:25	5.5.1.E.1	The discussion of lot standards should clarify the use of “design lot lines” to ensure that the massing, setbacks, etc. of new buildings and building complexes conform to the existing, historic urban fabric.
5:26	Table 5.5.1	Make changes to lot widths as discussed below for Paged 5:28-5:42, Subsection I.
5:27	Table 5.5.2 and Subsection 7, Sustainable Stormwater Standards	Remove Table 5.5.2 and make the bulleted changes to Subsection 7 as shown below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater should be collected and reused to the extent possible;</li> <li>• Drainage strategies for runoff from buildings, driveways, parking lots and sidewalks for the site should reduce impervious surfaces to absorb rainwater into the ground, filter runoff using soil and vegetation, and reduce the speed of runoff</li> <li>• Pervious surfaces and capture and reuse strategies are encouraged.</li> </ul>
5:24 and 5:42	5.4.8 (RC Zone) and 5.5.1.N (Flex Block)	<u>Mixed Use Development in the Riverside Corridor</u> : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The FBC is not clear on mixing residential with light industrial. The standards for the Flex Shed Building do not appear to allow apartments within the same building (e.g. for caretakers). Clarify in Specific Plan that residential uses will be allowed within the Flex Shed, provided a certain amount of private or shared open space is provided.</li> <li>b. The Building Placement standards for lots less than or greater than 85 feet (Subsections C.2 and C.3 of Section 5.4.8 on Page 5:24) are not clear. Explain why is 85 feet was selected as a threshold and clarify the regulations.</li> </ol>
5:28	5.5.1.A	<u>Carriage Houses and Rear-Yard Duplexes</u> : Revise the plan to provide the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Maximum floor areas and dimensions for carriage houses and rear-yard duplexes that act to preserve the neighborhood character, keeping in mind that the typical West Side lot (south of 24<sup>th</sup> Street) measures 50 feet wide by 140 feet deep.</li> </ol>

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 5**

Page	Section	Issue/Change to Plan
		b. Allow for a single unit carriage house to be attached to an existing single family dwelling subject to a maximum floor area that may be less than a detached carriage house. 600 sq ft might be an appropriate size.
5:28 to 5:42	5.5.1.A – 5.5.1.N Subsections 8, 9, or 10 for Sustainable Storm Drainage Standards	Remove subsection “a”, which establishes maximum percentages of lots that could be covered in impervious surfaces.
5:28 to 5:42	5.5.1.A – 5.5.1.N Subsections 1 for Lot Standards	a. The FBC specifies minimum lot widths and depths, presumably for creating new lots via a parcel map or lot line adjustment. The existing zoning code does not have minimum lot sizes, widths or depths for multi-family residential (which is all of the residential property in the specific plan area), but requires applicants for parcel maps and lot line adjustments to submit conceptual plans for development on all lots affected by the application as a means of demonstrating that the lots to be created are developable. Insert text clarifying the use of “design lot lines” to ensure that the massing, setbacks, etc. of new buildings and building complexes conform to the existing, historic urban fabric.  b. Re-set lot widths for Villa, Live/Work, Bungalow Courts, and Stacked Dwellings to 100 feet. The diagrams for each of these types would need to be revised as well.
5:28 to 5:39	5.5.1.A – 5.5.1.K Subsections 2	Building separations are not specified for any building type. This may be linked to the general standard that there would be one primary building per lot (discussed above). But there are situations in which there could be more than one residential building per lot. For example, could a rear yard dwelling be 5 feet from the main house? Introduce text that clarifies minimum distances between buildings on same lot.
5:28 to 5:39	5.5.1.A – 5.5.1.K Subsections 5	<u>Open Space Standards:</u> Presently, in multi-family zones, the City requires the same open space standards for all dwelling units, regardless of building type. The proposed standards are not consistent among building types, nor do they appear to be complete. Update the standards so that required private outdoor space for the various types of multi-family buildings is consistent.
5:28 to 5:39	5.5.1.A – 5.5.1.K Subsections 6	<u>Landscape Standards:</u> Remove the prohibition of use of landscaping to separate yards from the specific plan.
5:29 to 5:30	5.5.1.B and 5.5.1.C	Revise the introductory sentences for Single Dwellings and Duplexes, Triplexes,... to provide that these types of buildings may be used for commercial and mixed uses.

**Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan  
Addendum to Public Draft - Chapter 5**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Issue/Change to Plan</b>
5:29, 5:30, 5:34, 5:35	5.5.1.B, C, G, H Subsections B.3	The FBC requires that all single family dwellings, duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, rowhouses, and tuck-unders face the street. Add text to provide that this would allow front doors to open to a front porch, face a side yard (instead of the street).
5:30	5.5.5.C	Subsection 2.g proposes that sixplexes only be allowed on corner lots. On a standard 50' x 140' corner lot, sixplexes are infeasible. Only 40 feet of alley width would be available for parking, as 10 feet of landscaping needs to be provided adjacent to the street. This then would force a tandem parking arrangement in which parking spaces for two units would be behind two spaces for other units.  Remove the sixplex building type from the Specific Plan.
5:35	Diagrams (2) and Photo	<u>Tuck-Unders</u> : Revise the diagram to be consistent with the text.
5:103 to 5:106	5.6	<u>Signs</u> : For signs in the Downtown, this section will supplement existing sign regulations in the City's Sign Code. This section needs to address the following:  a. Revise the FBC to provide an overall square footage limitation for signs on buildings. (Section 5.6 does not propose a limit.)  b. Revise the FBC to limit the number of types of signs placed on a building. One could read the FBC to allow a wall-mounted plus an awning plus a marquee plus a roof-mounted sign plus a projecting sign - all on one building.



# CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES

*"The Pass of the Oaks"*

## CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

Tuesday, June 1, 2010 7:30 PM

MEETING LOCATION: PASO ROBLES LIBRARY/CITY HALL  
CONFERENCE CENTER, 1000 SPRING STREET

---

---

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL CORRESPONDENCE FOR CITY COUNCIL PRIOR  
TO THE MEETING WITH A COPY TO THE CITY CLERK

7:30 PM – CONVENE REGULAR MEETING

CALL TO ORDER – Downstairs Conference Center

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INVOCATION

ROLL CALL Councilmembers Nick Gilman, John Hamon, Ed Steinbeck, Fred Strong and Mayor Duane Picanco

STAFF INTRODUCTIONS

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- **Adam Lovera** commented that the speed limit is too fast on Union Road near Barney Schwartz Park.
- **Annie Robb** announced the final meeting of the Youth Commission for the year. She introduced CJ Prusi and Cameron Holt.
- **Patrick Mahan** from "FunRide"; a car sharing service that uses only alternative fuel vehicles.
- **Denise Serber** Invited everyone to participate in library summer reading programs.
- **David Oliver** wished to speak on the agenda item regarding the City pools; the mayor invited him to speak at the time of the regularly scheduled item.
- **Ditas Esperanza** Announced that the City has received awards from the American Public Works Association and the American Society of Civil Engineers for the South Vine Street bike lanes.
- **Norma Moyer** Announced the Baby/Children Fair for this weekend in City Park.

AGENDA ITEMS TO BE DEFERRED (IF ANY)

## PRESENTATIONS

### 1. National Hunger Awareness Day

Carl Hansen, Executive Director – SLO County Food Bank

Mayor Picanco introduced Carl Hansen who presented a report on Hunger in SLO County. Hunger Awareness Day is Thursday, June 3 and there will be 17 sites in the north county set up to raise funds for “food insecure” persons.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### 2. Planned Development 10-001 and Vesting Tentative Tract 3024 (Oak Park Redevelopment)

R. Whisenand, Community Development Director

That the City Council considers the Oak Park Redevelopment Project and accompanying Environmental Impact Report.

Ron Whisenand introduced Ed Gallagher who presented the staff report. The project design team then made a brief presentation. Speaking from the design team were Starla Warren of Monterey County Housing Authority; Paul Davis, project architect and David Foote, landscape architect.

Mayor Picanco opened the Public Hearing. Speaking from the public was Kathy Barnett and Jerry Rioux of the Housing Trust Fund. There were no other comments received from the public, either written or oral, and the public hearing was closed.

Councilmember Gilman, seconded by Councilmember Hamon, moved to adopt Resolution 10-070 approving the Final Environmental Impact Report with statements of Overriding Considerations.

Motion passed by the following unanimous roll call vote:

AYES: Gilman, Hamon, Steinbeck, Strong and Picanco

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Councilmember Gilman, seconded by Councilmember Hamon, moved to adopt Resolution 10-071 adopting Planned Development 10-001 and Vesting Tentative Tract 3024, including the approval of the three incentives related to off-street parking, reduction of storage space and modification of building setbacks and separations. The approval would also allow for the removal of 10 oak trees, and the demolition of the existing 145 buildings including the administrative and accessory buildings in phases, subject to standard and site specific conditions.

Motion passed by the following unanimous roll call vote:

AYES: Gilman, Hamon, Steinbeck, Strong and Picanco

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

## CONSENT CALENDAR

ITEMS ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR ARE CONSIDERED ROUTINE, NOT REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION. However, if discussion is wanted or if a member of the public wishes to comment on an item, the item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately. Councilmembers may ask questions of clarification without removing an item from the Calendar. INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ARE APPROVED BY THE VOTE THAT APPROVES THE CONSENT CALENDAR, UNLESS AN ITEM IS PULLED FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION.

3. Approve City Council minutes of May 18, 2010  
D. Fansler, City Clerk
4. Approve Warrant Register: Nos. 90792-90939 (05/14/10); and 90940-91058 (05/21/10)  
J. Throop, Administrative Services Director
5. Receive and file Advisory Body Committee minutes as follows:  
Library Board of Trustees Minutes of March 11, 2010  
Advisory Body Interviews and Appointments Minutes of May 6, 2010
6. Adopt Resolution No. 10-072 appropriating \$52,000 in re-programmed 2007 CDBG funds.  
R. Whisenand, Community Development Director
7. Adopt Resolution No. 10-073 awarding the contract to demolish the structure at 390 Gahan Place to Viborg Sand and Gravel in the amount of \$12,750, and authorize the City Manager to execute the contract.  
D. Monn, Public Works Director
8. Adopt Resolution No. 10-074 awarding a construction contract for the Ashwood Culvert project to C3 Construction in the amount of \$177,130.86 and authorize the City Manager to execute the contract.  
D. Monn, Public Works Director
9. Read, by title only, and adopt Ordinance No. 968 N.S. to make certain amendments to Chapter 3.40 of the City's Municipal Code modifying the Fiscal Year 2009/2010 Budget for the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Paso Robles (First Reading Date: May 18, 2010)  
R. Whisenand, Community Development Director
10. Adopt Resolution No. 10-075 approving a Lease Assignment and Amendment to the Lease agreement with Frank Johnson and Mike Weber for property in the Airport Industrial Park.  
M. Williamson, Assistant City Manager
11. Adopt Resolution No. 10-076 authorizing the application for grant funding from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for runway rehabilitation under the current Airport Improvement Program.  
M. Williamson, Assistant City Manager

Consent Calendar Items No. 3-11 were approved on a single motion by Councilmember Strong, seconded by Councilmember Hamon.

Motion passed by the following unanimous roll call vote:

AYES: Gilman, Hamon, Steinbeck, Strong and Picanco  
NOES:  
ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

## DISCUSSION

### 12. **General Fund Financial Forecast 2010-2013**

J. App, City Manager and J. Throop, Administrative Services Director

For the City Council to receive an update of, and consider options to address, the General Fund Financial Forecast for the years 2010-2013.

Mayor Picanco opened the Public Hearing. Speaking from the public was David Oliver; Marty Renfrow; Field Gibson, Youth Sports; Duane McRoy, Paso Robles High School Coach; Natalie McCall; Priscilla Young; Dale Gustin; Kathy Barnett; Juana Moore; Matt Masia, PCC Chairman, member of the Chamber, Main Street and the Wine Alliance; Staci Jacob, Executive Director of Wine Country Alliance. There were no other comments received from the public, either written or oral, and the public hearing was closed.

Councilmember Steinbeck, seconded by Councilmember Strong, moved to receive the June 2010 financial forecast but defer action to consider public input and a November 2010 forecast update.

Motion passed by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Gilman, Steinbeck, Strong and Picanco  
NOES: Hamon  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

### 13. **Oak Tree Removal 10-005**

R. Whisenand, Community Development Director

For the City Council to consider a request by Matt Mullin on behalf of Santa Cruz Biotechnology to remove two Oak trees in conjunction with the construction of a new 40,000 square foot warehouse building.

Mayor Picanco opened the Public Hearing. Speaking from the public was Matt Mullin, project applicant; Kathy Barnett; Michael Helming, project architect. There were no other comments received from the public, either written or oral, and the public hearing was closed.

Councilmember Hamon, seconded by Councilmember Gilman, moved to adopt Resolution No. 10-077 allowing the removal of two Valley Oak trees based on the trees conflicting with the location of the new building and therefore allowing reasonable use of the property for the purpose for which it is zoned, and require twelve (12) 1.5-inch diameter Valley Oak replacement trees to be planted at the direction of the arborist, or payment made to the City's Oak tree replacement fund.

Motion passed by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Gilman, Hamon, Steinbeck, Strong and Picanco  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:



**COUNCIL COMMENTS (Including oral reports on conferences attended)**

**Adjourned at 10:05 pm to**

**CLOSED SESSION**

**CALL TO ORDER** – Large Conference Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

**a. Conference with real property negotiators**

Government Code Section 54956.8

City Negotiator: Meg Williamson, Assistant City Manager  
Property: 5.4 acre site on South River Road  
(APN: 009-513-051)  
Owner/Negotiator: Bunnell Development Corporation/Dan Scarry

**b. Conference with Legal Counsel – existing litigation**

Government Code Section 54956.9(a)

John E. Borst et al. v. City of Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County Superior Court,  
Case No. CV 108193

**ADJOURNMENT from closed session at 10:35 pm to:**

- ECONOMIC FORECAST AT 8:00 AM ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 2010 AT THE PASO ROBLES EVENT CENTER, 2198 RIVERSIDE AVENUE
- THE REGULAR MEETING AT 7:30 PM ON TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 2010 AT THE LIBRARY/CITY HALL CONFERENCE CENTER, 1000 SPRING STREET

Any writing or document pertaining to an open session item on this agenda which is distributed to a majority of the City Council after the posting of this agenda will be available for public inspection at the time the subject writing or document is distributed. The writing or document will be available for public review in the City Clerk's Office, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA, during normal business hours, and may be posted on the City's web site at <http://www.prcity.com/government/citycouncil/agendas.asp>.

All persons desiring to speak on an agenda item are asked to fill out Speaker Information Cards and place them at the Staff Table prior to public discussion of that item. Each individual speaker will be limited to a presentation total of three (3) minutes per item.

**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT** Any individual, who because of a disability needs special assistance to attend or participate in this meeting, may request assistance by contacting the City Clerk's Office (805) 237-3960. Whenever possible, requests should be made four (4) working days in advance of the meeting.

Submitted:

---

Lonnie Dolan, Deputy City Clerk  
Approved: