

TO: James L. App, City Manager  
FROM: Ed Gallagher, Community Development Director  
SUBJECT: General Plan Amendment 2013-0012 and Prezone 13-001  
DATE: September 17, 2013

---

Needs: For City Council to consider a City-initiated amendment to the Land Use Element of the General Plan to make the following changes to the Land Use Element's Land Use Map (Figure LU-6) and Sphere of Influence Map (Figure LU-1) and to Prezone a 1.4 acre parcel:

- a. Amend Figure LU-6 to redesignate 60 lots developed with urban uses located in the historic downtown (between Vine Street and the UP Railroad and between 10<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Streets, to make their land use designations more-closely conform to zoning applied by the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan.
- b. Amend Figure LU-6 to remove the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Overlay Land Use Designation from two adjacent properties (15 and 17 acres) located north side of Union Road at the eastern boundary of the City.
- c. Amend Figure LU-6 to pre-designate a 1.4 acre parcel, located on the western City boundary, south of Pacific Avenue for Residential Single Family, 4 units per acre (RSF-4) land use. Prezone 13-003 will establish R-1 zoning on the 1.4 acre parcel to match the existing zoning of adjacent parcels within City limits.
- d. Amend Figure LU-1 to show the Sphere of Influence Boundaries as updated by LAFCO on February 21, 2013.

Facts:

1. The Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan was adopted on May 3, 2011. Zoning for the specific plan area was a part of this adoption.
2. Facts and analysis pertinent to the four components of the proposed general plan amendment are discussed in the Analysis and Conclusion Section, below.
3. The proposed general plan amendment is a project that is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). An Initial Study has been prepared for this project that concludes that the amendment will not have a significant effect on the environment. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this general plan amendment.

4. At its meeting of August 27, 2013, the Planning Commission considered this general plan amendment and Prezone 13-001 and recommended that the City Council approve these applications as proposed. The Commission's recommendations were unanimous (6-0 with one commissioner absent) for Components "B", "C", and "D" and Prezone 13-001 and 3-0-3-1 (3 abstentions for conflicts of interest and one commissioner absent) for Component "A" (Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan).

#### Analysis and

Conclusion: Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Area

The 60 lots that are the subject of this amendment are developed with urban uses. For 5 lots, the general plan should have been amended at the time of adoption of the plan as the specific plan called for changes in the range of permitted uses and intensity of development on those parcels. This error was an oversight on City staff's part.

The other 55 lots were zoned T-3F, which allows for mixed use residential development at densities up to 8 units per acre, office uses, and limited amounts of retail commercial uses. The existing land use designation on these 55 lots is "Office Professional", which allows residential use in conjunction with office uses. However, the description of this designation in the General Plan is not clear about allowable density and permissibility of retail commercial uses. The majority of other lots in the specific plan area that had been zoned T-3F were re-designated as "Mixed Use, 8 units per acre (MU-8)", for which the description of this designation in the General Plan is clear. The proposed general plan amendment will make all T-3F zoned lots within the specific plan area designated as MU-8.

None of the zoning adopted by the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan in May 2011 is proposed to be changed.

#### Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan

The two subject properties, located north side of Union Road at the eastern boundary of the City, were originally included in the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan as the previous (2003) Circulation Element had planned for extension of Airport Road, an arterial street, north from Union Road to intersect with Highway 46 East. The 2011 Circulation Element eliminated the section of Airport Road between Union Road and Highway 46 East. There no longer is a need for these two properties to be a part of the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan.

#### Ernst Property

Margaret Ernst owns a 1.4 acre parcel immediately west of City Limits and south of Pacific Avenue on which half of a single family home is situated. The other half of the home is situated on a 1.1 acre parcel within City Limits. Ms. Ernst has applied for annexation of the 1.4 acre parcel to correct this situation. Since the adjacent property in

City limits is designated Residential, Single Family, 4 units per acre and zoned R-1, the same designation and zoning are proposed.

### Sphere of Influence

Figure LU-1 of the Land Use Element shows the Sphere of Influence Boundaries as they existing in 2003 at the time of adoption of the General Plan. On February 21, 2013, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) adopted an updated Sphere of Influence for the City. This map change does not affect policy (which was established by LAFCO); it is informational in nature.

Conflicts of Interest: Three Planning Commissioners (Barth, Gregory, and Vanderlip) own property within 300 feet of some of the affected properties within the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan and will need to recuse themselves during discussion of, and recommendation to the City Council for, redesignation of the 60 lots.

Reference: General Plan: Land Use and Circulation Elements; Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan; Sphere of Influence as Updated February 2013

### Fiscal

Impact: The proposed general plan amendment does not change policy and it will not have an effect on the General Fund.

Options: That the City Council approve one of the following sets of options:

- a. (1) Adopt the attached Resolution Approving a Negative Declaration for the general plan amendment;
- (2) Adopt the attached Resolution Adopting General Plan Amendment 2013-001;
- (3) Adopt the attached Ordinance Approving Prezone 13-001.
- b. Amend, modify, or reject the above options.

### ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution Approving a Negative Declaration
2. Resolution Adopting General Plan Amendment 2013-001
3. Ordinance Approving Prezone 13-001
4. Newspaper Notice Affidavit
5. Mail Notice Affidavits

RESOLUTION NO. 13-XXX

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES  
APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 2013-001  
AND PREZONE 13-001 (LAND USE MAP UPDATES)

WHEREAS, the City has initiated General Plan Amendment 2013-001 to amend the Land Use Element of the General Plan to make the following changes to the Land Use Element's Land Use Map (Figure LU-6) and Sphere of Influence Map (Figure LU-1) and to Prezone a 1.4 acre parcel:

- a. Amend Figure LU-6 to redesignate 60 lots developed with urban uses located in the historic downtown (between Vine Street and the UP Railroad and between 10<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Streets, to make their land use designations more-closely conform to zoning applied by the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan.
- b. Amend Figure LU-6 to remove the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Overlay Land Use Designation from two adjacent properties (15 and 17 acres) located north side of Union Road at the eastern boundary of the City.
- c. Amend Figure LU-6 to pre-designate a 1.4 acre parcel, located on the western City boundary, south of Pacific Avenue for Residential Single Family, 4 units per acre (RSF-4) land use. Prezone 13-003 will establish R-1 zoning on the 1.4 acre parcel to match the existing zoning of adjacent parcels within City limits.
- d. Amend Figure LU-1 to show the Sphere of Influence Boundaries as updated by LAFCO on February 21, 2013.

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (attached to this resolution), which proposed that a Negative Declaration be approved; 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 August 27, 2013 and by the City Council on September 17, 2013 to consider the Initial Study prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination for the proposed general plan amendment; and

WHEREAS, based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this general plan amendment and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment if the general plan amendment was approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, 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 General Plan Amendment 2013-001 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 1<sup>st</sup> day of October 2013 by the following vote:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

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

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

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

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** **General Plan Amendment (GPA) 2013-001**
- Concurrent Entitlements:** **Specific Plan Amendment 13-001, Prezone 13-001**
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles  
1000 Spring Street  
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:**  
**Phone:** (805) 237-3970  
**Email:**
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:**
1. 60 lots in the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Area (See attached map – “Exhibit A”.);
  2. Two adjacent properties (15 and 17 acres) located north side of Union Road at the eastern boundary of the City (See attached map – “Exhibit B”.);
  3. A 1.4 acre parcel proposed for annexation located west of the western City limits and south of Pacific Avenue. (See attached map – “Exhibit C”.)
  4. Sphere of Influence for the City, as adopted by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of the County of San Luis Obispo on February 21, 2013. (See attached map – “Exhibit D”).
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** **City of Paso Robles**
- Contact Person:** **Ed Gallagher, Community Development Director**
- Phone:** **(805) 237-3970**  
**Email:** ed@prcity.com
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** **Several land use designations**
- 6. ZONING:** **Several zones**
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The City of Paso Robles proposes to amend the Land Use Element of the General Plan to make the following changes to the Land Use Element’s Land Use Map (Figure LU-6) and Sphere of Influence Map (Figure LU-1):
- e. Amend Figure LU-6 to redesignate 60 lots developed with urban uses located in the historic downtown to make their land use designations more-closely conform to zoning applied by the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan, which was adopted on May 3, 2011. For 5 lots, the general

plan should have been amended at the time of adoption of the plan as the specific plan called for changes in the range of permitted uses and intensity of development on those parcels. The other 55 lots were zoned T-3F, which allows for mixed use development and residential densities up to 8 units per acre. Existing land use base and overlay categories of “Office Professional”, which allowed multi-family residential use, were retained on those lots, while the majority of other lots in the specific plan area that had been zoned T-3F were re-designated as “Mixed Use, 8 units per acre (MU-8)”. The proposed general plan amendment will make all T-3F zoned lots designated as MU-8.

- f. Amend Figure LU-6 to remove the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Overlay Land Use Designation from two adjacent properties (15 and 17 acres) located north side of Union Road at the eastern boundary of the City. This action would exclude these parcels from being included in a future specific plan for about 800 acres located on the south side of Union Road. These properties had originally been included within the specific plan area as the previous (2003) Circulation Element had planned for extension of Airport Road, an arterial street, north from the 800 acres, across Union Road to intersect with Highway 46 East. The 2011 Circulation Element eliminated the section of Airport Road between Union Road and Highway 46 East. There no longer is a need for these two properties to be a part of the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan.
- g. Amend Figure LU-6 to pre-designate a 1.4 acre parcel proposed for annexation to the City of Paso Robles for Residential Single Family, 4 units per acre (RSF-4) land use. (The City’s General Plan had previously pre-designated it for Residential suburban (RS) use.) There is an existing house that straddles two parcels under common ownership: (1) the subject parcel and (2) an adjacent 1.0 acre parcel within City limits. The parcel that is presently in the City is designated RSF-4. Prezone 13-001 will establish R-1 zoning on the 1.4 acre parcel to match the existing zoning of adjacent parcels within City limits.
- h. Amend Figure LU-1 to show the Sphere of Influence Boundaries as updated by LAFCO on February 21, 2013. This map change does not affect policy (which was established by LAFCO); it is informational in nature.

## **8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

- a. The portions of the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan Area to be the subject of this General Plan Amendment are fully-urbanized. The Environmental Impact Report for this specific plan (certified in 2011) describes the environmental setting.
- b. The eastern of the two properties north of Union Road is vacant; the western property is half vacant, half construction yard. Huerhuero Creek bisects both properties. Barney Schwartz Park lies to the southwest, Paso Robles Athletic Club lies to the west, Highway 46 East lies to the north, and vacant/agricultural properties lie to the east.
- c. As noted above, the property in question adjoins another parcel under the same ownership that is located within City Limits. An existing single family home straddles both lots. The properties to the east are vacant lots that have been subdivided for single family homes. There are larger agricultural parcels in County unincorporated area that abut the 1.4 acre parcel. The property to the west has a single family home and the remnants of an almond orchard; the portion of the parcel to the south that abuts the site is a vacant, steep, oak-covered hillside.
- d. The 2013 Sphere of Influence Update was the subject of a Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared and adopted by LAFCO. That document describes the environmental setting of that project.

**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 or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

July 8, 2013

Date

**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



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<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"/>
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"/>
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"/>
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 (a-d) This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on aesthetics.

**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"/>
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"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause 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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

<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-e: This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on agricultural resources.

**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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11)  | <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) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11)  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11)   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion a-e: This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on air quality.

**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   | <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
California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
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"/>
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): This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on biological resources.

**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): This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on cultural



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-b): This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on greenhouse gas 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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): This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no increase in or exposure to hazardous materials.



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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-l): This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on hydrology and water quality.

**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 code amendment will not physically divide established communities. It will improve land use patterns and development by eliminating conflicts between zoning and general plan categories, removing 2 properties from a proposed specific plan that the subject properties no longer have a nexus to, and by placing an existing house and property onto a single jurisdiction.

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: The proposed general plan amendment will resolve minor land use conflicts as described above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 could not be impacts related to conservation plans.

**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? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: There are no known mineral resources within the City of Paso Robles.

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: see XI a. above.

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

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<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>
---	---	---	----------------------

(Sources: 1, 4)

Discussion: This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no increase in noise impacts.

**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"/> |
| 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 proposed general plan amendment will not create or induce population growth or 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): This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

Discussion (a-b): See XIV above, the project will not impact recreational facilities.

This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on recreation.

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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): This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts to transportation or traffic.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:</b>				
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): This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There will be no impacts on utilities, water or wastewater treatment or delivery services.

**XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the	<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>
range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-c): This general plan amendment does not propose any substantive change in land use and development policy from that which already exists in the General Plan. There would be no impact related to issues in this section.

**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	Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan	Same as above
12	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
13	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
14	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446

## RESOLUTION NO. 13-XXX

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES  
APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 2013-001 AMENDING THE  
LAND USE MAP (FIGURE LU-6) AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE MAP (FIGURE LU-1)  
(CITY-INITIATED)

---

WHEREAS, the City has initiated General Plan Amendment 2013-001 to:

- a. Amend Figure LU-6 to redesignate 60 lots developed with urban uses located in the historic downtown (between Vine Street and the UP Railroad and between 10<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Streets, to make their land use designations more-closely conform to zoning applied by the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan;
- b. Amend Figure LU-6 to remove the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Overlay Land Use Designation from two adjacent properties (15 and 17 acres) located north side of Union Road at the eastern boundary of the City;
- c. Amend Figure LU-6 to pre-designate a 1.4 acre parcel, located on the western City boundary, south of Pacific Avenue for Residential Single Family, 4 units per acre (RSF-4) land use. Prezone 13-003 will establish R-1 zoning on the 1.4 acre parcel to match the existing zoning of adjacent parcels within City limits;
- d. Amend Figure LU-1 to show the Sphere of Influence Boundaries as updated by LAFCO on February 21, 2013; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Negative Declaration was prepared to describe the effects of the general plan amendment; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of August 27, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the Project and took the following actions:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for the Project;
- b. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on the parts of the Project;
- c. Considered public testimony from all parties;
- d. Recommended that the City Council approve a Negative Declaration for the Project;
- e. Recommended that the City Council approve the general plan amendment; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of September 17, 2013, the City Council conducted a public hearing on the Project and took the following actions:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for this amendment, including the recommendation of the Planning Commission;
- b. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on this amendment;
- c. Based on its independent judgment, approved a Negative Declaration for the Project in accordance

with the California Environmental Quality Act;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles, California, does hereby amend the Land Use Element of the General Plan as shown in Exhibits A through D.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2013 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:


---

Duane Picanco, Mayor

---

Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

**EXHIBIT A**  
**Resolution 13-\_\_\_**  
**General Plan Amendment 2013-001A**  
**Changes to Land Use Map (Figure LU-6) in Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan**






**EXHIBIT B**  
**Resolution 13-\_\_\_**  
**General Plan Amendment 2013-001B**  
**Changes to Land Use Map (Figure LU-6)**  
**Remove Two Parcels from Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Overlay**



**EXHIBIT C**  
**Resolution 13-\_\_\_**  
**General Plan Amendment 2013-001C**  
**Changes to Land Use Map (Figure LU-6)**  
**Predesignate 1.4 Acre Parcel (Ernst Annexation)**



**EXHIBIT D**  
**Resolution 13-\_\_\_**  
**General Plan Amendment 2013-001D**  
**Update Sphere of Influence Map (Figure LU-1)**



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 13-001 – Ernst)

---

WHEREAS, Don Ernst, on behalf of Margaret Ernst, has submitted an application to annex and prezone a 1.4 acre parcel (Assessor's Parcel no. 018-201-005) located immediately west of the City Limits, south of Pacific Avenue ("the Site") R-1; and

WHEREAS, the Site shares a single dwelling with an adjacent parcel that is located within City Limits and is designated by the General Plan for Residential, Single Family, 4 units per acre (RSF-4) land use and is zoned R-1; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of September 17, 2013, the City Council adopted General Plan Amendment 2013-001, which pre-designated the Site as RSF-4; and

WHEREAS, R-1 zoning is consistent with the RSF-4 General Plan Land Use Designation; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of August 27, 2013, 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 September 17, 2013, 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 and its independent judgment, 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 September 17, 2013, and passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of October 2013 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

---

Duane Picanco, Mayor

---

Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

**EXHIBIT A**  
**Ordinance \_\_\_\_ N.S.**  
**Rezone 13-001 (Ernst)**



PROOF OF PUBLICATION

LEGAL NEWSPAPER NOTICES

PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL  
PROJECT NOTICING

Newspaper: Tribune

Date of Publication: September 6, 2013

Meeting Date: September 17, 2013  
(City Council)

Project: Public Hearing Notice of Intent to Adopt  
a Negative Declaration to consider  
General Plan Amendment 2013-001 and  
Prezone 13-001.

I, Kristen Buxkemper, 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: Kristen Buxkemper  
Kristen Buxkemper

CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT  
A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles will hold a Public Hearing to consider General Plan Amendment 2013-001 and Prezone 13-001, which was initiated by the City of Paso Robles to make the following changes to the Land Use Element's Land Use Map (Figure LU-6) and Sphere of Influence Map (Figure LU-1) and to Prezone a 1.4 acre parcel:

a. Amend Figure LU-6 to redesignate 60 lots developed with urban uses located in the historic downtown (between Vine Street and the UP Railroad and between 10th and 21st Streets, to make their land use designations more closely conform to zoning applied by the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan.

b. Amend Figure LU-6 to remove the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Overlay Land Use Designation from two adjacent properties (15 and 17 acres) located north side of Union Road at the eastern boundary of the City.

c. Amend Figure LU-6 to pre-designate a 1.4 acre parcel, located on the western City boundary, south of Pacific Avenue for Residential Single Family, 4 units per acre (RSF-4) land use. Prezone 13-003 will establish R-1 zoning on the 1.4 acre parcel to match the existing zoning of adjacent parcels within City limits.

d. Amend Figure LU-1 to show the Sphere of Influence Boundaries as updated by LAFCO on February 21, 2013.

The public hearing will be conducted on Tuesday, September 17, 2013 in the Conference Room at the Paso Robles Library/City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California, at the hour of 7:30 pm. All interested parties are invited to attend and be heard on this matter.

NOTICE IS ALSO HEREBY GIVEN that the City of Paso Robles has prepared a Negative Declaration (statement that there will be no significant environmental effects resulting from this project) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for this project. The Public Review Period for the proposed Negative Declaration commenced on August 16, 2013, and will end at the City Council hearing on September 17.

The proposed Negative Declaration may be reviewed at the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California. Copies may be purchased for the cost of reproduction.

Written comments on the proposed General Plan Amendment and Prezone and its corresponding Negative Declaration may be mailed to the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446 or emailed to: ed@prcity.com, provided that the comments are received prior to the time of the public hearing. Oral comments may be made at the hearing. Should you have any questions regarding this project, please call Ed Gallagher at (805) 237-3970.

At its meeting of August 27, 2013, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment 2013-001 and Prezone 13-001 and approve a Negative Declaration for these applications.

If you challenge this project or Negative Declaration 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 Planning Commission at or prior to the public hearing.

s/ Ed Gallagher, Community Development Director  
September 6, 2013 7031463



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

ATTACHMENT 5

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

I, Kristen Buxkemper, employee of the City of El Paso de Robles, California, do hereby certify that the mail notices have been processed as required for General Plan Amendment (GPA) 2013-001A, B & C, on this 6th day of September 16, 2013.

City of El Paso de Robles  
Community Development Department  
Planning Division

Signed: Kristen Buxkemper  
Kristen Buxkemper