

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER

FROM: ED GALLAGHER, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 11-007 & REZONE 12-002  
(GOLDEN OAKS DEVELOPERS - MARSHALL)

DATE: MARCH 20, 2012

---

Needs: For the City Council to consider an application filed by Ted Weber on behalf of Golden Oaks Developers, Inc., proposing to rezone an existing one acre lot and to construct a new 5-unit apartment complex.

Facts:

1. The project is located on the north side of Creston Road, at the intersection of Creston Road and Nickerson Avenue (see attached Vicinity Map).
2. The General Plan designation is Residential Multi-Family, 8 units to the acre (RMF-8). The current zoning designation is R1-B3 (Residential Single Family, half-acre lot size). The request is to change the R1-B3 Zoning to R2, which would bring the Zoning into compliance with the General Plan designation.
3. The Zoning Code provides that the construction of 5 or more residential units, requires approval of a Development Plan (PD).
4. The average slope of the site is 14 percent. The Zoning Code limits R2 zoned properties with such slope to 5 units are per acre.
5. The site is currently vacant. The project proposes to construct two separate buildings: a duplex and a triplex. The project would also include a laundry room, private outdoor patios for each unit, a common area (open space/play area), driveways and parking lot.
6. The DRC reviewed the project on January 23, 2012. The only issue discussed at the DRC meeting was the zoning code requirement that each unit have a separate secure storage area. The project has been revised to include the required storage areas. The DRC recommended that the Planning Commission make the necessary recommendation to the City Council to approve the Rezone.
7. On February 28, 2012, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to review the PD 11-007 and Rezone 12-002, and on a 7-0 vote, unanimously recommended that the City Council approve the Development Plan, Rezone and associated Negative Declaration.

8. Pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study and Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment. Based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study (and comments and responses thereto), a determination has been made that the project may be approved with a Negative Declaration.

**Analysis and**

**Conclusion:**

The proposed project is consistent with the zoning code regulations for an R2 development. The project has been designed to take in consideration the slope on the site and also to be in scale with the surrounding residential properties.

As noted above, the General Plan land use designation for this site is RMF-8. Therefore, the General Plan anticipates that a multi-family development should be on this site. The Rezone request would bring the zoning designation (which is currently R-1) in compliance with the General Plan, by changing it to R2.

**Policy**

**Reference:**

General Plan Land Use Element, Zoning Code, and 2006 Economic Strategy.

**Fiscal**

**Impact:**

There are no specific fiscal impacts associated with approval of this Planned Development.

**Options:**

After opening the public hearing and taking public testimony, the City Council is requested to take one of the actions listed below:

- a.
  1. Adopt the attached Resolution approving a Negative Declaration for Rezone 12-002 and PD 11-007;
  2. Adopt the attached Ordinance approving Rezone 12-002, changing the zoning designation of the site from R1-B3 to R2;
  3. Adopt the attached Resolution approving Planned Development 11-007, allowing the construction of the 5-unit apartment complex, subject to standard and site specific conditions;
- b. Amend, modify, or reject the above-listed action;


Prepared by Darren Nash

**Attachments:**


1. Vicinity Map
2. Site Plan
3. City Engineer's Memo
4. Draft Resolution to approve Negative Declaration
5. Draft Ordinance adopting Rezone 12-002
6. Draft Resolution to approve PD 11-007
7. Mail and Newspaper Affidavits

# VICINITY MAP

N. T. S.



**Attachment 1**  
Vicinity Map  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Devel.)



<p>Project: GOLDEN OAK DEVELOPERS INC. 8400 CAPSTAN CIRCLE BRADLEY, CA 93426</p>	<p>Project: GOLDEN OAK VILLARS CRESTON ROAD PASO ROBLES CA</p>	<p>Sheet Contents: SITE PLAN</p>	<p>Date: 2/16/2012</p>	<p>Job No: 1104</p>	<p>Sheet: C - 1</p>
<p>P.O. BOX 148 PASO ROBLES, CA 93441 (805)238-4111</p>	<p>ARCHITECT</p>	<p>NO. 4 OF 24</p>	<p>Revised: -</p>	<p>North Arrow</p>	<p>Graphic Scale</p>

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Darren Nash  
**FROM:** John Falkenstien  
**SUBJECT:** PD 11-007, Marshall  
**DATE:** January 23, 2012

**Streets**

The subject property is located on the north side of Creston Road at the intersection of Nickerson Drive. Improvements to Creston Road will conform to the draft Creston Road Plan Line. Creston Road is a two lane divided arterial featuring parking, bike lanes and a center turn lane. Needed improvements include curbs, sidewalks, street lights and landscaping. Sidewalk improvements need to be extended to Ivy Lane to effectively serve the existing cross-walk at Daniel Lewis Middle School.

An 8-foot offer of dedication of public right-of-way will be required along the frontage of the property.

**Sewer and Water**

Sewer is available to the site from a 10-inch line in Creston Road that terminates at Ivy Lane. The main must be extended westerly to serve the project.

Water is available from a 10-inch line in Creston Road. In order to meet Emergency Services standards a fire hydrant will be needed along the frontage of the project.

**Storm Water Quality**

The project must comply with interim hydromodification criteria in accordance with the City's adopted Storm Water Management Plan. An assessment must be made of the extent of impervious surfaces and mitigation applied with Low Impact Development best management practices.

---

**Conditions of Approval**

The grading design will be subject to the City's Interim Low Impact Development Guidelines for Tier 3 projects.

Street improvements shall be completed on Creston Road including curb, gutter, sidewalk, street lights and landscaping in accordance with plans approved by the City Engineer. Sidewalk improvements must be extended to Ivy Lane.

An 8-inch sewer line must be extended to the property in Creston Road from Ivy Lane.

A new fire hydrant must be installed on the project frontage.

Due to the potential number and extent of new utility trenches, it may be necessary to overlay the paving on the north half of Creston Road along the frontage of the property in accordance with the City's pavement management program. The paving will be completed in accordance with plans approved by the City Engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 12-xxx

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR REZONE 12-002 AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 11-007 (GOLDEN OAKS DEVELOPERS, INC.)

WHEREAS, Ted Weber on behalf of Golden Oaks Developers, Inc. has submitted Rezone 12-002, a proposal to change the zoning designation of a 1-acre site from Residential Single Family, 20,000 square foot lot size (R1-B3) to Residential Multi-family, Duplex/Triplex (R2); and

WHEREAS, the site is located on the north side of Creston Road, at the intersection of Creston Road and Nickerson Drive; and

WHEREAS, changing the zoning from R1 to R2 would bring the zoning into conformance with the existing RMF-8 (Residential Multi-Family, 8 units per acre) General Plan Land Use designation; and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with Rezone 12-002, Planned Development 11-007 has been submitted requesting to construct a 5-unit apartment complex on a vacant 1-acre site; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (attached as Exhibit A), 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 February 28, 2012 and by the City Council on March 20, 2012 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, 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:

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 12-002, and PD 11-007, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 20<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2012 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Duane Picanco, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

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

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** Golden Oaks Developers, Inc.
- Concurrent Entitlements:** PD 11-007 & Rezone 12-002
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles  
1000 Spring Street  
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:**  
**Phone:** (805) 237-3970  
**Email:**
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** North side of Creston Road at intersection  
with Nicklaus Drive.
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Ted J. Weber, Architect
- Contact Person:** Ted Weber
- Phone:** (805) 238-4711  
**Email:** tjweberarch@yahoo.com
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** RMF-8 (Residential Multi-Family, 8 units per acre)
- 6. ZONING:** R1-B3 (Residential Single Family, 20,000sf min. lot size)
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Development Plan to construct five (5) multi-family residential units on a 1 acre vacant parcel of land. Rezone the parcel from R1-B3 to R2, to be consistent with the existing RMF-8 General Plan Land Use designation.
- 8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:** The 1 acre lot is vacant and is adjacent to Creston Road which is classified as an arterial road. Creston Road is along the southern property boundary. An existing multi-family residential complex (R2 zoned) is adjacent to the site to the west, single family residences exist to the north and to the east. The site has an approximate 14-percent slope that slopes from Creston Road up to the north.
- 9. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED):** None.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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


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

**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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions of mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature:



Date

2/8/12



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

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>I. AESTHETICS:</b> Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is not located within a scenic vista.				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The site is not considered a scenic resource and is not located along a state scenic highway, and there are no historic buildings located on this site.				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed development would maintain the existing residential character of the surrounding properties. The project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or surroundings.				
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Any new exterior lighting will be required to be shielded so that it does not produce off-site glare.				

---

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project is not located on agriculturally zoned land and there are no agricultural activities taking place on the site.				
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion section for Section II.a.				
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
rezoning of, forest, land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 5114(g))?				

Discussion: The project is not located on agriculturally zoned land and there are no agricultural activities taking place on the site.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located on land zoned for forest purposes.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: This project would not result in the conversion of farmland or forest land.

**III. AIR QUALITY:** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source: 11) | <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. The potential for future project development to create adverse air quality impacts falls generally into two categories: Short term and Long term impacts.*

*Short term impacts are associated with the grading and development portion of a project where earth work generates dust, but the impact ends when construction is complete. Long term impacts are related to the ongoing operational characteristics of a project and are generally related to vehicular trip generation and the level of offensiveness of the onsite activity being developed.*

*There will be short term impacts associated with grading for the proposed construction, standard conditions required by the City as well as the APCD will be implemented.*

*When reviewing the project with the APCD CEQA Handbook, the project would produce less than the 25 lbs/day of ROG+NOx and there for be considered less than significant and no mitigation is required for operational or long-term impacts based on multi-family residential type of land use.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11) Discussion: See Section III.a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 11) Discussion: See Section III.a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11) Discussion: Besides the short term impacts from the actual grading, there will not be a significant impact to sensitive receptors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11) Discussion: The project will not create objectionable odors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

---

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-f):

Discussion: The project is considered an infill project within the Creston Road corridor. The site is surrounded by existing improved streets as well as neighboring residential properties, churches, schools and commercial developments. There are no biological impacts associated with this project. Additionally, the request to rezone the property to R2 to be consistent with the current General Plan RMF-8 designation would also not be an impact.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-d):

Discussion: The project is considered an infill project within the Creston Road corridor. The site is surrounded by existing improved streets as well as neighboring residential properties, churches, schools and commercial developments. Given the location, it is not anticipated that there are any cultural impacts associated with this project.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

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

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

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

*Discussion: The potential for and mitigation of impacts that may result from fault rupture in the project area are identified and addressed in the General Plan EIR, pg. 4.5-8. There are two known fault zones on either side of the Salinas Rivers valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley, and grazes the City on its western boundary. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and is situated about 30 miles 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. Review of available information and examinations indicate that neither of these faults is active with respect to ground rupture in Paso Robles. Soils and geotechnical reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standard conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within City limits.*

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

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

*Discussion: The proposed project will be constructed to current CBC codes. The General Plan EIR identified impacts resulting from ground shaking as less than significant and provided mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the design of this project including adequate structural design and not constructing over active or potentially active faults.*

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3)

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

*Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is located in an area with soil conditions that have a potential for liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events and soil conditions. To implement the EIR's mitigation measures to reduce this potential impact, the City has a standard condition to require submittal of soils and geotechnical reports, which include site-specific analysis of liquefaction potential for all building permits for new construction, and incorporation of the recommendations of said reports into the design of the project*

iv. Landslides?

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

Discussion: See discussions above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated. A geotechnical/ soils analysis will be required prior to issuance of building permits that will evaluate the site specific soil stability and suitability of grading and retaining walls proposed. This study will determine the necessary grading techniques that will ensure that potential impacts due to soil stability will not occur. An erosion control plan shall be required to be approved by the City Engineer prior to commencement of site grading.</i>				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Discussion: See response to item a.iii, above.</i>				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Discussion: See response to item a.iii, above.</i>				
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Discussion: The building will be hooked up to the City's sanitary sewer system, therefore there is no impact.</i>				

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:** Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-b):

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

This project consists of 5 residential units on a 1 acre parcel that is can be served by existing streets, and City infrastructure (sewer & water). Furthermore, allowing for the change of zoning to R2 to be consistent with the existing General Plan RMF-8 designation will provide for a higher density of residential homes that would be close to existing schools, churches, and shopping. When compared to having the possibility of two single family homes, which the current zoning would allow, by allowing for the increase in the three units for a toal of 5, impacts to GHG emissions would be improve, and therefore this project will have a less than significant impact to GHG emissions.

---

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion (a-h):

The 5 unit residential complex will be constructed in a manner that will comply with the necessary building codes. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will be constructed in a manner that would not create any physical hazards.

---

**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., Would the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? Would decreased rainfall infiltration or groundwater recharge reduce stream baseflow? (Source: 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-l):

*Discussion a-l: The City is obligated by the State Water Board to require that this project be developed in accordance with Best Management Practices(BMPs) to mitigate impacts to the quality of storm water run-off to the maximum extent possible. These goals will be accomplished by the implementation of Low Impact Development standards. Low Impact Development is an array of BMPs designed to ensure that a site's post-development hydrologic functions mimic those in its pre-development state. The preliminary grading plan incorporates these standards. Impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality will be less than significant.*

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

---

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The 5 unit residential complex would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation (RMF-8). Since this is an infill site that is surrounded by existing development, the development of the site would be consistent with other development along the Creston Road corridor. The development of the project would not physically divide an established community.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

This project would not only be consistent with the RMF-8 General Plan land use designation, the proposed rezone from R1 to R2 would bring the zoning into compliance with the General Plan, therefore there would not be a conflict with land use or zoning designations.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans established in this area of the City. Therefore there is no impact.

---

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?<br>(Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.

---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**XII. NOISE:** Would the project result in:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: 1)   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Because of this projects proximity to Creston Road which is classified as a arterial street in the City's Circulation Element, the City Noise Element requires that the project be designed in a manner where the indoor area maintains a noise level not to exceed 45 CNEL, and that outdoor living areas not exceed 65 CNEL. A Noise Study was prepared by David Dubbink Associates that analyzed the City Noise Element with the proposed design of the project. The Study indicates that the outdoor patio areas as proposed will meet the 65 db requirement and with conventional construction techniques the interior noise will be reduced by 20 to 25 db, therefore the interior noise level will be reduced to meet the Noise Element standard. The City's Building Codes have limitations on the times of the day that construction equipment can operate. Based on the conclusions within this study, noise impacts on the residents who will reside in this project will be less than significant.

---

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion (a-c):				
The project will not create induce population growth, displace housing or people.				

---

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. Fire protection? (Sources: 1,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion (a-e):				
The project will not create an impact to public services.				

---

**XV. RECREATION**

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion (a&b):

The project will not impact recreational facilities.

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures or effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (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"/> |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-f):

The project consists of development a five-unit residential project on a vacant 1-acre parcel that is surrounded by existing schools, churches, shopping and residential. The project along with the rezone request would be consistent with the General Plan. Therefore, the minimal trips created by this project would have less than a

significant impact on the community.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

---

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project=s projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-g):

The existing utilities and service systems will be adequate for this project.

---

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-c):

The project consists of development a five-unit residential project on a vacant 1-acre parcel that is surrounded by existing schools, churches, shopping and residential. The project along with the rezone request would be consistent with the General Plan. Therefore, Since this project will be developed on an infill site that has utilities available for connection, impacts to Sections a-c above will be less than significant.



**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

<b><u>Reference #</u></b>	<b><u>Document Title</u></b>	<b><u>Available for Review at:</u></b>
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	2005 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 Urban Water Management Plan 2005	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
10	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
11	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
12	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
13	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446

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 12-002 –GOLDEN OAKS DEVELOPMENT, INC.)

WHEREAS, Ted Weber on behalf of Golden Oaks Developers, Inc. has submitted Rezone 12-002, a proposal to change the zoning designation of a 1-acre site from Residential Single Family, 20,000 square foot lot size (R1-B3) to Residential Multi-family, Duplex/Triplex (R2); and

WHEREAS, the site is located on the north side of Creston Road, at the intersection of Creston Road and Nickerson Drive; and

WHEREAS, changing the zoning from R1 to R2 would bring the zoning into conformance with the existing RMF-8 (Residential Multi-Family, 8 units per acre) General Plan Land Use designation; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of February 28, 2012, 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;

WHEREAS, at its meeting of March 20, 2012, 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 March 20, 2012, and passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of April 2012 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:  
ABSENT:

---

Duane Picanco, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

## RESOLUTION NO. 12-xxx

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES APPROVING  
 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 11-007 CRESTON ROAD AT NICKERSON DRIVE  
 (GOLDEN OAKS DEVELOPERS, INC.)  
 APN: 009-451-017

---

WHEREAS, Planned Development 11-007 has been submitted by Ted Weber, Architect, on behalf of Golden Oaks Developers, Inc., requesting to construct a 5-unit apartment complex on a vacant 1-acre site; and

WHEREAS, the project is located on the north side of Creston Road at the intersection of Creston Road and Nickerson Drive; and

WHEREAS, Section 21.23B.030(5a), of the Zoning Code require the development of 5 or more residential units go through the development plan (PD) review process; and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with PD 11-007, the applicants have submitted an application for Rezone 12-002, requesting to change the zoning on the site from R1-B3 to R2; and

WHEREAS, changing the zoning to R2 would bring the zoning designation into compliance with the current RMF-8 Land Use designation; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on February 28, 2012, to consider facts as presented in the staff report prepared for this project, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed development plan, rezone and associated Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council approve the PD 11-007, Rezone 12-002 and associated Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the City Council on March 20, 2012, to consider facts as presented in the staff report prepared for this project, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed development plan, rezone and associated Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, a resolution was adopted by the City Council approving a Negative Declaration status for this project, and a Negative Declaration was prepared for the proposed Planned Development and Rezone applications in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, based upon facts and analysis presented in the staff report and the attachments thereto, the public testimony received, and subject to the Conditions of Approval listed below, the City Council makes the following findings:

1. The project is consistent with the adopted codes, policies, standards and plans of the City; and
2. The proposed development plan will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the residents and or businesses in the surrounding area, or be injurious or detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City; and

3. The proposed development plan accommodates the aesthetic quality of the City as a whole, especially where development will be visible from the gateways to the City, scenic corridors; and the public right-of-way; and
4. The proposed development plan is compatible with, and is not detrimental to, surrounding land uses and improvements, provides an appropriate visual appearance, and contributes to the mitigation of any environmental and social impacts; and
5. The proposed development plan is compatible with existing scenic and environmental resources such as hillsides, oak trees, vistas, etc.; and
6. The proposed development plan contributes to the orderly development of the City as a whole.
7. The proposed development plan as conditioned would meet the intent of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance by providing multi-family residential development in an area of the City that is in close proximity to schools, churches and shopping.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby approve Planned Development 11-007, subject to the following conditions:

STANDARD CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant/developer shall comply with those standard conditions which are indicated as applicable in "Exhibit A" to this resolution.

SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

NOTE: In the event of conflict or duplication between standard and site-specific conditions, the site-specific condition shall supersede the standard condition.

2. The project shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the Conditions of Approval established by this Resolution and it shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the following Exhibits:

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
A	Standard Conditions
B	Title Sheet
C	Civil Title Sheet
D	Grading Plan
E	Grading Sections
F	Utility Plan
G	Landscape Plan
H	Lower Floor Plan 1 & 2
I	Upper Floor Plan 1 & 2
J	Lower Floor Plan 3, 4 & 5
K	Upper Floor Plan 3, 4 & 5
L	Elevations 1 & 2
M	Elevations 3, 4 & 5 (east/south)
N	Elevations 3, 4 & 5 (west/north)

3. This PD 11-007 allows for development of a 5-unit apartment complex as presented in the Exhibits listed above.

4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the main building the following final details shall be submitted for Planning Division Staff review:
  - a. Final site plan and architectural elevations;
  - b. Exterior light fixtures;
  - c. Final colors/materials;
  - d. Detailed landscape plan including transformer, backflow and other equipment screening; Note: Landscape plan is subject to the requirements within the LS Ordinance.
  - e. Fencing Plan (if any fencing)
5. The final landscaping plan shall comply with the requirements with in the City Landscape and Irrigation Ordinance (Chapter 21.22B).
6. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall work with Paso Robles Waste to determine what type of trash container(s) will be required for this complex (individual containers for each unit, or a common dumpster). A decorative masonry trash enclosure will be required to be constructed with screened gates. The size and location of the enclosure will depend on the type of container required. More than one enclosure may be necessary.
7. The sprinkler backflow valve shall be located in an underground vault or adequately screened from public view with architectural features and vegetation that is dense and high enough to conceal it.
8. The grading design will be subject to the City's Interim Low Impact Development Guidelines for Tier 3 projects.
9. Street improvements shall be completed on Creston Road including curb, gutter, sidewalk, street lights and landscaping in accordance with plans approved by the City Engineer. Sidewalk improvements must be extended to Ivy Lane.
10. An 8-inch sewer line must be extended to the property in Creston Road from Ivy Lane.
11. A new fire hydrant must be installed on the project frontage.
12. Due to the potential number and extent of new utility trenches, it may be necessary to overlay the paving on the north half of Creston Road along the frontage of the property in accordance with the City's pavement management program. The paving will be completed in accordance with plans approved by the City Engineer.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 20th day of March 2012 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

---

Duane Picanco, Mayor

---

Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

EXHIBIT A OF RESOLUTION  
CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES  
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

Planned Development \_\_\_\_\_  Conditional Use Permit \_\_\_\_\_

Tentative Parcel Map \_\_\_\_\_  Tentative Tract Map \_\_\_\_\_

Approval Body: City Council \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Approval: March 20, 2012 \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant: Golden Oaks Devel. \_\_\_\_\_

Location: Creston & Nickerson \_\_\_\_\_

APN: 009-451-017 \_\_\_\_\_

The following conditions that have been checked are standard conditions of approval for the above referenced project. The checked conditions shall be complied with in their entirety before the project can be finalized, unless otherwise specifically indicated. In addition, there may be site specific conditions of approval that apply to this project in the resolution.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT - The applicant shall contact the Community Development Department, (805) 237-3970, for compliance with the following conditions:**

**A. GENERAL CONDITIONS – PD/CUP:**

- 1. This project approval shall expire on Mar. 20, 2014 unless a time extension request is filed with the Community Development Department, or a State mandated automatic time extension is applied prior to expiration.
- 2. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the approved plans and unless specifically provided for through the Planned Development process shall not waive compliance with any sections of the Zoning Code, all other applicable City Ordinances, and applicable Specific Plans.
- 3. To the extent allowable by law, Owner agrees to hold City harmless from costs and expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by City or held to be the liability of City in connection with City's defense of its actions in any proceeding brought in any State or Federal court challenging the City's actions with respect to the project. Owner understands and acknowledges that City is under no obligation to defend any legal actions challenging the City's actions with respect to the project.

- 4. Any site specific condition imposed by the Planning Commission in approving this project (**Conditional Use Permit**) may be modified or eliminated, or new conditions may be added, provided that the Planning Commission shall first conduct a public hearing in the same manner as required for the approval of this project. No such modification shall be made unless the Commission finds that such modification is necessary to protect the public interest and/or neighboring properties, or, in the case of deletion of an existing condition, that such action is necessary to permit reasonable operation and use for this approval.
- 5. The site shall be kept in a neat manner at all times and the landscaping shall be continuously maintained in a healthy and thriving condition.
- 6. All signs shall be subject to review and approval as required by Municipal Code Section 21.19 and shall require a separate application and approval prior to installation of any sign.
- 7. All walls/fences and exposed retaining walls shall be constructed of decorative materials which include but are not limited to splitface block, slumpstone, stuccoed block, brick, wood, crib walls or other similar materials as determined by the Development Review Committee, but specifically excluding precision block.
- 8. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit a landscape and irrigation plan consistent with the Landscape and Irrigation Ordinance, shall be submitted for City review and approval. The plan needs to be designed in a manner that utilizes drought tolerant plants, trees and ground covers and minimizes, if not eliminates the use of turf. The irrigation plan shall utilize drip irrigation and limit the use of spray irrigation. All existing and/or new landscaping shall be installed with automatic irrigation systems.
- 9. A reciprocal parking and access easement and agreement for site access, parking, and maintenance of all project entrances, parking areas, landscaping, hardscape, common open space, areas and site lighting standards and fixtures, shall be recorded prior to or in conjunction with the Final Map. Said easement and agreement shall apply to all properties, and be referenced in the site Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs).
- 10. All outdoor storage shall be screened from public view by landscaping and walls or fences per Section 21.21.110 of the Municipal Code.
- 11. For commercial, industrial, office or multi-family projects, all refuse enclosures are required to provide adequate space for recycling bins. The enclosure shall be architecturally compatible with the primary building. Gates shall be view obscuring and constructed of durable materials. Check with Paso Robles Waste Disposal to determine the adequate size of enclosure based on the number and size of containers to be stored in the enclosure.



- 12. For commercial, industrial, office or multi-family projects, all existing and/or new ground-mounted appurtenances such as air-conditioning condensers, electrical transformers, backflow devices etc., shall be screened from public view through the use of decorative walls and/or landscaping subject to approval by the Community Development Director or his designee. Details shall be included in the building plans.
- 13. All existing and/or new roof appurtenances such as air-conditioning units, grease hoods, etc. shall be screened from public view. The screening shall be architecturally integrated with the building design and constructed of compatible materials to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or his designee. Details shall be included in the building plans.
- 14. All existing and/or new lighting shall be shielded so as to be directed downward in such a manner as to not create off-site glare or adversely impact adjacent properties. The style, location and height of the lighting fixtures shall be submitted with the building plans and shall be subject to approval by the Community Development Director or his designee.
- 15. All walls/fences and exposed retaining walls shall be constructed of decorative materials which include but are not limited to splitface block, slumpstone, stuccoed block, brick, wood, crib walls or other similar materials as determined by the Development Review Committee, but specifically excluding precision block.
- 16. It is the property owner's responsibility to insure that all construction of private property improvements occur on private property. It is the owner's responsibility to identify the property lines and insure compliance by the owner's agents.
- 17. Any existing Oak trees located on the project site shall be protected and preserved as required in City Ordinance No.835 N.S., Municipal Code No. 10.01 "Oak Tree Preservation", unless specifically approved to be removed. An Oak tree inventory shall be prepared listing the Oak trees, their disposition, and the proposed location of any replacement trees required. In the event an Oak tree is designated for removal, an approved Oak Tree Removal Permit must be obtained from the City, prior to removal.
- 18. No storage of trash cans or recycling bins shall be permitted within the public right-of-way.
- 19. Prior to recordation of the map or prior to occupancy of a project, all conditions of approval shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Community Developer Director or his designee.
- 20. Two sets of the revised Planning Commission approved plans incorporating all Conditions of Approval, standard and site specific, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of building permits.

- 21. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the
  - Development Review Committee shall approve the following:
  - Planning Division Staff shall approve the following:
    - a. A detailed site plan indicating the location of all structures, parking layout, outdoor storage areas, walls, fences and trash enclosures;
    - b. A detailed landscape plan;
    - c. Detailed building elevations of all structures indicating materials, colors, and architectural treatments;
    - d. Other: See PD 11-007 Resolution

**B. GENERAL CONDITIONS – TRACT/PARCEL MAP:**

- 1. In accordance with Government Section 66474.9, the subdivider shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City, or its agent, officers and employees, from any claim, action or proceeding brought within the time period provided for in Government Code section 66499.37, against the City, or its agents, officers, or employees, to attack, set aside, void, annul the City's approval of this subdivision. The City will promptly notify subdivider of any such claim or action and will cooperate fully in the defense thereof.
- 2. The Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and/or Articles Affecting Real Property Interests are subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department, the Public Works Department and/or the City Attorney. They shall be recorded concurrently with the Final Map or prior to the issuance of building permits, whichever occurs first. A recorded copy shall be provided to the affected City Departments.
- 3. The owner shall petition to annex residential Tract (or Parcel Map)\_\_\_\_\_ into the City of Paso Robles Community Facilities District No. 2005-1 for the purposes of mitigation of impacts on the City's Police and Emergency Services Departments.
- 4. Street names shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Commission, prior to approval of the final map.
- 5. The following areas shall be permanently maintained by the property owner, Homeowners' Association, or other means acceptable to the City:  


---


---

\*\*\*\*\*

**ENGINEERING DIVISION- The applicant shall contact the Engineering Division, (805) 237-3860, for compliance with the following conditions:**

All conditions marked are applicable to the above referenced project for the phase indicated.

**C. PRIOR TO ANY PLAN CHECK:**

- 1. The applicant shall enter into an Engineering Plan Check and Inspection Services Agreement with the City.

**D. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A GRADING PERMIT:**

- 1. Prior to approval of a grading plan, the developer shall apply through the City, to FEMA and receive a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) issued from FEMA. The developer's engineer shall provide the required supporting data to justify the application.
- 2. Any existing Oak trees located on the project site shall be protected and preserved as required in City Ordinance No. 553, Municipal Code No. 10.01 "Oak Tree Preservation", unless specifically approved to be removed. An Oak tree inventory shall be prepared listing the Oak trees, their disposition, and the proposed location of any replacement trees required. In the event an Oak tree is designated for removal, an approved Oak Tree Removal Permit must be obtained from the City, prior to its removal.
- 3. A complete grading and drainage plan shall be prepared for the project by a registered civil engineer and subject to approval by the City Engineer. The project shall conform to the City's Storm Water Discharge Ordinance.
- 4. A Preliminary Soils and/or Geology Report providing technical specifications for grading of the site shall be prepared by a Geotechnical Engineer.
- 5. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan per the State General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity shall be provided for any site that disturbs greater than or equal to one acre, including projects that are less than one acre that are part of a larger plan of development or sale that would disturb more than one acre.

**E. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT:**

- 1. All off-site public improvement plans shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval. The improvements shall be designed and placed to the Public Works Department Standards and Specifications.

- 2. The applicant shall submit a composite utility plan signed as approved by a representative of each public utility.
- 3. Landscape and irrigation plans for the public right-of-way shall be incorporated into the improvement plans and shall require approval by the Streets Division Supervisor and the Community Development Department.
- 4. In a special Flood Hazard Area as indicated on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) the owner shall provide an Elevation Certificate in accordance with the National Flood Insurance program. This form must be completed by a land surveyor or civil engineer licensed in the State of California.

**F. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY OR RECORDATION OF THE FINAL MAP:**

**The Planning Commission has made a finding that the fulfillment of the construction requirements listed below are a necessary prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area.**

- 1. The applicant shall pay any current and outstanding fees for Engineering Plan Checking and Construction Inspection services.
- 2. All public improvements are completed and approved by the City Engineer, and accepted by the City Council for maintenance.
- 3. The owner shall offer to dedicate and improve the following street(s) to the standard indicated:

Creston Road		
Street Name	City Standard	Standard Drawing No.

- 4. If, at the time of approval of the final map, any required public improvements have not been completed and accepted by the City the owner shall be required to enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the City in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act.

Bonds required and the amount shall be as follows:  
 Performance Bond.....100% of improvement costs.  
 Labor and Materials Bond.....50% of performance bond.

- 5. If the existing City street adjacent to the frontage of the project is inadequate for the traffic generated by the project, or will be severely damaged by the construction, the applicant shall excavate the entire structural section and replace it with a standard half-width street plus a 12' wide travel lane and 8' wide graded shoulder adequate to provide for two-way traffic.
- 6. If the existing pavement and structural section of the City street adjacent to the

frontage of the project is adequate, the applicant shall provide a new structural section from the proposed curb to the edge of pavement and shall overlay the existing paving to centerline for a smooth transition.

- 7. Due to the number of utility trenches required for this project, the City Council adopted Pavement Management Program requires a pavement overlay on Creston Road along the frontage of the project.
- 8. The applicant shall install all utilities. Street lights shall be installed at locations as required by the City Engineer. All existing overhead utilities adjacent to or within the project shall be relocated underground except for electrical lines 77 kilovolts or greater. All utilities shall be extended to the boundaries of the project.
- 9. The owner shall offer to dedicate to the City the following easement(s). The location and alignment of the easement(s) shall be to the description and satisfaction of the City Engineer:
  - a. Public Utilities Easement;
  - b. Water Line Easement;
  - c. Sewer Facilities Easement;
  - d. Landscape Easement;
  - e. Storm Drain Easement.
- 10. The developer shall annex to the City's Landscape and Lighting District for payment of the operating and maintenance costs of the following:
  - a. Street lights;
  - b. Parkway/open space landscaping;
  - c. Wall maintenance in conjunction with landscaping;
  - d. Graffiti abatement;
  - e. Maintenance of open space areas.
- 11. For a building with a Special Flood Hazard Area as indicated on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the developer shall provide an Elevation Certificate in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Program. This form must be completed by a lands surveyor or civil engineer licensed in the State of California.
- 12. All final property corners shall be installed.
- 13. All areas of the project shall be protected against erosion by hydro seeding or landscaping.
- 14. All construction refuse shall be separated (i.e. concrete, asphalt concrete, wood gypsum board, etc.) and removed from the project in accordance with the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element.

- 15. Clear blackline mylars and paper prints of record drawings, signed by the engineer of record, shall be provided to the City Engineer prior to the final inspection. An electronic autocad drawing file registered to the California State Plane – Zone 5 / NAD83 projected coordinate system, units in survey feet, shall be provided.


\*\*\*\*\*

**PASO ROBLES DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES- The applicant shall contact the Department of Emergency Services, (805) 227-7560, for compliance with the following conditions:**

**G. GENERAL CONDITIONS**

- 1.  Prior to the start of construction:
  - Plans shall be reviewed, approved and permits issued by Emergency Services for underground fire lines.
  - Applicant shall provide documentation to Emergency Services that required fire flows can be provided to meet project demands.
  - Fire hydrants shall be installed and operative to current, adopted edition of the California Fire Code.
  - A based access road sufficient to support the department's fire apparatus (HS-20 truck loading) shall be constructed and maintained for the duration of the construction phase of the project.
  - Access road shall be at least twenty (20) feet in width with at least thirteen (13) feet, six (6) inches of vertical clearance.
  
- 2.  Provide central station monitored fire sprinkler system for all residential, commercial and industrial buildings that require fire sprinklers in current, adopted edition of the California Building Code, California Fire Code and Paso Robles Municipal Code.
  - Plans shall be reviewed, approved and permits issued by Emergency Services for the installation of fire sprinkler systems.
  
- 3.  Provide central station monitored fire alarm system for all residential, commercial and industrial buildings that require fire alarm system in current, adopted edition of the California Building Code, California Fire Code and Paso Robles Municipal Code.
  
- 4.  If required by the Fire Chief, provide on the address side of the building if applicable:
  - Fire alarm annunciator panel in weatherproof case.
  - Knox box key entry box or system.
  - Fire department connection to fire sprinkler system.

5.  Provide temporary turn-around to current City Engineering Standard for phased construction streets that exceed 150 feet in length.
6.  Project shall comply with all requirements in current, adopted edition of California Fire Code and Paso Robles Municipal Code.
7.  Prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy:
  - Final inspections shall be completed on all underground fire lines, fire sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems and chemical hood fire suppression systems.
  - Final inspections shall be completed on all buildings.



CITY OF PAS  
 ASSessor's MA  
 SAN LUIS OBIS  
 BOOK 009 PAGE

56

k. 2, Pg. 55.

Exhibit A  
 Rezone 12-002  
 (Golden Oaks Devel.)

51

REVISIONS	I.S.	DATE
	04-232	12-08-03
	04-241	12/18/03
	05-060	07-07-04

50' 0 100' 200'

THIS MAP IS PREPARED FOR  
 JAN 08-21-01 ASSESSMENT PURPOSES ONLY.






# GOLDEN OAK VILLAS

A MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR:

**GOLDEN OAK DEVELOPERS, INC.**  
8400 CAPSTAN CIRCLE  
BRADLEY, CA 93426

**VICINITY MAP**

N. T. S.



**PROJECT DATA**

DESCRIPTION: A PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 151 UNITS.

- OWNER: GOLDEN OAK DEVELOPERS, INC.  
8400 CAPSTAN CIRCLE  
BRADLEY, CA 93426
- SITE INFORMATION:  
STREET ADDRESS: 8400 CAPSTAN CIRCLE  
CITY: BRADLEY, CA 93426
- LEGAL DESCRIPTION: RTN LOT 24 KNOWN AS PARCELS 100, 101 & 102 PER 1475 & 1476, ASSOC. ALMOND GROVES BINGUALO, SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA
- A.P.N. #: 009-481-011
- ZONING: RSP/165
- LOT SIZE: 28' x 104'
- SETBACKS: FRONT: 25' SIDE: 10'
- BUILDING INFORMATION:  
RESIDENCE AREA: BUILDINGS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 - 2445 SQ. FT. LAUNDRY ROOM - 144 SQ. FT.
- NUMBER OF STORES: 2
- BUILDING TYPE: V-B
- OCCUPANCY GROUP: R3
- SPRINKLER: YES
- ROOF RATING: CLASS 'A'
- UTILITIES:  
ELECTRICITY: PAUP PASO  
GAS: CITY PASO  
SEWER: NONE  
WATER: NONE
- OTHER: CAL GAS




**SHEET INDEX**


DESCRIPTION	SHEET NO.
TITLE, VICINITY MAP, PROJECT STATISTICS	T1
CIVIL TITLE SHEET	C1
GRADING PLAN	C2
GRADING SECTIONS	C3
UTILITY PLAN	C4
LANDSCAPE PLAN	L1
LOWER FLOOR PLAN 1 & 2	A1
UPPER FLOOR PLAN 1 & 2	A2
LOWER FLOOR PLAN 3, 4 & 5	A3
UPPER FLOOR PLAN 3, 4 & 5	A4
ELEVATIONS 1 & 2	A5
ELEVATIONS 3, 4 & 5	A6
ELEVATIONS 3, 4 & 5	A7

**Exhibit B**  
Title Sheet  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Devel.)









**Exhibit F**  
 Utility Plan  
 Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
 (Golden Oaks Level.)


REV	DESCRIPTION	DATE



**CASEY J. PATTERSON**  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT  
905 438 7828

**PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN**  
PROJECT: GOLDEN OAKS APARTMENTS  
CRESTON RD., PASO ROBLES, CA

SCALE: 1"=8'-0"  
DATE: 11/07/11  
JOB NO.:  
SHEET NO.: **10f1**



- CALL-OUT NOTES**
1. NEW RETAINING WALL. SEE CIVIL PLANS.
  2. EXISTING WOOD STRUCTURE TO REMAIN.
  3. 24" WIDE D.G. PAVING STRIP PER WATER.
  4. NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION ON D.G. PAD.
  5. PROPOSED TABLE LOCATION ON D.G. PAD.
  6. RIVER COBBLE MULCH DRY STREAM BED FOR DRAINAGE & EROSION CONTROL.
  7. 30" SWALE PLANTING AREA.

- PLANTING SYMBOL LEGEND**
- LAWN AREA, TALL DWARF FESCUE 500
  - PERENNIALS, GRASS COVERS AND LEGUMINOUS PLANTING AREA - SEE PLANT LIST
  - DECOMPOSED GRANITE (D.G.) PATHWAY SURFACE
  - 30" SWALE AREA
  - 8" x 4" DIA. LARGE RIVER COBBLE AREA
  - SCREEN SHRUB, SEE PLANT LIST
  - MEDIUM ACCENT TREE IS GAL. IN (LARGEST) INDICA (CASCAPARTELLE)
  - PERENNIAL SCREEN TREE (LARGEST) INDICA (CASCAPARTELLE)
  - LARGE ACCENT TREE IS GAL. DANWY (LARGEST) INDICA (CASCAPARTELLE)
  - LARGE KERICAPIC TREE IS GAL. QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA (COAST LIVE OAK) (LARGEST) ILEX HOLLY (OAK)
  - SHADE TREE IS GAL. PLATANUS ACERIFOLIA (LONDON PLANE TREE) (LARGEST) S. PALO ALTO (BEECH OAK) (LARGEST) PISTACHIA CHINENSIS (CHINESE PISTACHE)

- PLANTING LIST**
- THE FOLLOWING IS A LIST OF PLANTS WITH PLANT SPACING NOT SHOWN THAT WILL BE USED FOR THE KERICAPIC AREAS OF THE SITE:
- CISTIS SPECIES (BACCHOSIDE) - SPACING VARIES
  - MARILIA A. COMPOSITA (WAMP) (ORANGE GRASS) - 50C
  - ERIGON LARTRONICUS (SANTA BARBARA GARDY) - 24" D.C.
  - CEANTHUS SPECIES (MOUNTAIN LILAC) - SPACING VARIES
  - ACTINOPHYLLUS SPECIES (MAGNANTIA) - SPACING VARIES
  - IRIS DANIA (SWEET WISH) - 50C
  - BACHARIS FL. (WOODY POINT) (WAMP) (COTTONE BUSH) - 50C
  - AGUCHA REPENS (MAY) - 50C
  - CISTIS OCCIDENTALIS (WESTERN REDBUD) - 50C
  - CHENILLEDES SUPER (RED PLUMBER) (CANDY) - 50C
  - ACTINOPHYLLUS SPECIES (MAGNANTIA) - SPACING VARIES
  - FRAXINUS (WALNUT) (CHERRY) - 50C
  - PHANOGAL (SPRINGBERRY) - 50C (SCREEN PLANT)
  - HEPTOMELIS (TOTOBI) - 50C (SCREEN PLANT)

**IRRIGATION NOTES**


ALL PLANTS WILL BE WATERED BY AN AUTOMATIC IRRIGATION SYSTEM. THE SYSTEM WILL BE DESIGNED TO PROVIDE A DEEP IRRIGATION SYSTEM ALL LAWN AREA TO A POP-UP SPRINKLER SYSTEM. THE SYSTEM WILL BE DESIGNED TO PROVIDE A DEEP IRRIGATION SYSTEM ALL LAWN AREA TO A POP-UP SPRINKLER SYSTEM. THE SYSTEM WILL BE DESIGNED TO PROVIDE A DEEP IRRIGATION SYSTEM ALL LAWN AREA TO A POP-UP SPRINKLER SYSTEM.

**LAWN AREA CALCULATION**

TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA: 26,875 S.F.  
TOTAL LAWN AREA: 14,400 S.F.  
LAWN AREA PROVIDED: 14,400 S.F.

**PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN**

**Exhibit G**  
Landscape Plan  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Level.)




RESIDENCE 80 S.F. (EACH UNIT)  
LAUNDRY: 44 S.F.

LOWER FLOOR PLAN (UNITS 1 & 2)  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

**Exhibit H**  
Lower Floor Plan 1&2  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Devel.)




SEE 4E S.P. (EACH UNIT)



**UPPER FLOOR PLAN (UNITS 1 & 2)**  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

**Exhibit I**  
Upper Floor Plan 1&2  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Devel.)






RESIDENCE: 80 S.F. (EACH UNIT)

**LOWER FLOOR PLAN (UNITS 3, 4 & 5)**

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

**Exhibit J**  
Lower Floor Plan 3, 4 & 5  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Devel.)



RESIDENCE: 48 S.F. EACH UNIT.

**UPPER FLOOR PLAN (UNITS 3, 4 & 5)**  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

**Exhibit K**  
Upper Floor Plan 3, 4 & 5  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Devel.)



Project:

Sheet Contents:

**ELEVATIONS  
UNITS 1 & 2**

Date: 1/30/2012


Revised: -

Job. No: 1104

Sheet:  
**A - 12**  
No. 16 of 24


**FINISH KEY NOTES**

- 1 CORR. SHINGLES ROOFING
- 2 2x12 PASCIA
- 3 STUCCO SIDING
- 4 1/2" GIPSUM BOARD
- 5 FINISH GRADE




**NORTH ELEVATION (UNITS 1 & 2)**

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




**WEST ELEVATION (UNITS 1 & 2)**

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




**SOUTH ELEVATION (UNITS 1 & 2)**

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



**EAST ELEVATION (UNITS 1 & 2)**

**Exhibit L**  
Elevations 1 & 2  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Devel.)




**EAST ELEVATION (UNITS 3, 4 & 5)**

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

**FINISH KEY NOTES**


- 1 COMP. SHINGLE ROOFING
- 2 2" HF FASCIA
- 3 STUCCO SIDING
- 4 VINYL WINDOWS
- 5 FINISH GRADE



**SOUTH ELEVATION (UNITS 3, 4 & 5)**


SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

**Exhibit M**  
Elevations 3,4 & 5 (east/south)  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Devel.)



**WEST ELEVATION (UNITS 3, 4 & 5)**

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



**NORTH ELEVATION (UNITS 3, 4 & 5)**

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

**FINISH KEY NOTES**

- 1 CORR. SHINGLE ROOFING
- 2 2" WF FASCIA
- 3 STUCCO SIDING
- 4 VINYL WINDOWS
- 5 FINISH GRADE


**Exhibit N**

Elevations 3,4 & 5 (west/north)  
Rezone 12-002 & PD 11-007  
(Golden Oaks Devel.)

**AFFIDAVIT**  
**OF MAIL NOTICES**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL PROJECT NOTICING**

I, Theresa Variano, employee of the City of El Paso de Robles, California, do hereby certify that the mail notices have been processed as required for Planned Development 11-007 and Rezone 12-002 (Golden Oaks Development) on this 6th day of March 2012.

City of El Paso de Robles  
Community Development Department  
Planning Division

Signed:   
Theresa Variano

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

LEGAL NEWSPAPER NOTICES

PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL  
PROJECT NOTICING


Newspaper: Tribune

Date of  
Publication: March 8, 2012

Hearing  
Date: March 20, 2012  
(City Council)

Project: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative  
Declaration, Planned Development 11-007  
and Rezone 12-002

I, Theresa Variano, 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:   
Theresa Variano

forms/newsaffi.691

**CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES**  
**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE  
DECLARATION AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT  
11-007 AND REZONE 12-002**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles will hold a Public Hearing on Tuesday, March 20, 2012. The meeting will be held at 7:30 p.m. at the City of El Paso de Robles, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California, in the City Council Chambers, to consider an adoption of a Planned Development, Rezone and the associated Negative Declaration (statement that there will be no significant environmental effects) in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the following project:

- **Planned Development 11-007:** Request to construct five multi-family residential units on an existing vacant one-acre parcel.
- **Rezone 12-002:** Request to rezone the parcel from R1-B3 (Residential Single Family, 20,000 square foot lot minimum size) to R2 (Multi-Family Residential, Duplex/Triplex). Changing the zoning to R2, would bring the zoning into compliance with the Multi-Family Residential, 8 units per acre (RMF-8) General Plan Land Use Designation.

The project has been filed by Ted Weber on behalf of Golden Oaks Developers, Inc. The site is located on the north side of Creston Road across from Nickerson Drive. (APN: 009-451-017).

The public review period for the Negative Declaration (ND) began on February 8, 2012 and will end at the hearing on March 20, 2012. The proposed ND may be reviewed at the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California. Copies may be purchased for the cost of reproduction.

On February 28, 2012, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to review the PD 11-007 and Rezone 12-002, and on a 7-0 vote, unanimously recommended that the City Council approve the Development Plan, Rezone and associated Negative Declaration.

Questions about this application may be directed to the Community Development Department at (805) 237-3970 or via email at [planning@prcity.com](mailto:planning@prcity.com). Comments on the proposed Project may be mailed to the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446 or emailed to [planning@prcity.com](mailto:planning@prcity.com) provided that such comments are received prior to the time of the hearing.

If you challenge this application in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City Council at or prior to the public hearing.

6978585      3/8/12