

RESOLUTION NO: 96-28  
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES  
GRANTING NEGATIVE DECLARATION STATUS FOR  
TENTATIVE TRACT 2214 AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 95008  
(RICHARD WILLHOIT) - APN: 09-752-06

WHEREAS, Richard Willhoit has filed Tentative Tract 2214 and Planned Development 95008 to divide 9.6 acres of R-3 zoned property into 90 residential lots and common open space area, and to construct detached residential dwelling units on those lots, located east of Creston Road, at Stoney Creek Drive (2000 Creston Road), and

WHEREAS, a Background Information Report and Initial Study were prepared for this project (Attached as Exhibits A and B), and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on February 12, 1996 to consider the initial study prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination on the tentative tract map and development plan, and

WHEREAS, at said public meeting, the Planning Commission made specific findings per Section 21.16A.070 of the zoning code (Planned Development - required findings of approval) determining that certain items of noncompliance with the Residential Multiple Family zoning code standards was acceptable in this case, based on specific qualities and amenities of the proposed project, and

WHEREAS, on February 12, 1996, the Planning Commission, in their independent judgment, that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment subject to the mitigation measures applied to the project, and a Negative Declaration status was granted for the project via Resolution 96-011, and

WHEREAS, on February 27, 1996, an application was filed in appeal of the Planning Commission's February 12, 1996 action to grant the Negative Declaration in conjunction with approvals for Planned Development 95008 and Tentative Tract 2214, and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the City Council on March 19, 1996, to consider facts as presented in the staff report and initial study prepared for this project, to accept public testimony regarding the proposed development plan, and to consider the action taken by the Planning Commission, and

RIMC CODE:	Community Development Department
DATE:	March 19, 1996
FILE PLAN/GE CAT.:	Current Planning/Subdivisions and Planned Development
SUBJECT:	Tract 2214/PD 95008 (Willhoit) - CC Negative Dec. Resolution
LOCATION:	Development Services File Room
RETENTION:	Permanent
OTHER:	mw/tracts/2214/CC/env.res

Item	Environmental Impact	Yes/Maybe	No
3.	<u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS:</u>		
a.	Unstable earth, changes in geological substructures.....		X
b.	Changes to soil strata (disruption, displacement, compaction, etc.).....		X
c.	Exposure of people or property to landslides and seismic hazards.....		X
d.	Increase in soil erosion.....		X
4.	<u>SURFACE AND SUBSURFACE WATER:</u>		
a.	Changes to groundwater flows.....		X
b.	Groundwater quality and quantity.....		X
c.	Streamcourse alteration and siltation.....		X
d.	Increase in runoff, storm drainage impact.....	X	
e.	Other water-related impacts.....		X
5.	<u>VEGETATION AND ANIMAL LIFE:</u>		
a.	Oak trees.....	X	
b.	Other vegetation concerns.....		X
c.	Wildlife habitats.....		X
d.	Other wildlife concerns.....		X
6.	<u>AIR QUALITY:</u>		
a.	Creation of air emissions.....	X	
b.	Creation of objectionable odors.....		X
c.	Alteration of air movement patterns.....		X
d.	Other air quality concerns.....		X
7.	<u>PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES:</u>		
a.	Fire protection.....	X	
b.	Police protection.....	X	
c.	Water service.....	X	
d.	Sewer service.....	X	
e.	Street maintenance.....	X	
f.	Other governmental services.....	X	
g.	PG&E.....		X
h.	So. California Gas Co.....		X
i.	Sonic Cable TV, Pacific Bell.....		X
j.	Solid waste disposal.....		X

Item	Environmental Impact	Yes/Maybe	No
8.	<u>HEALTH AND SAFETY:</u>		
	a. Noise: Creation of or exposure to.....	X	
	b. Light & Glare: Creation of.....	X	
	c. Electromagnetic disturbance, radiation.....		X
	d. Health hazards: Creation of or exposure to.....		X
	e. Fire, Explosion, Chemical spill.....		X
9.	<u>AESTHETICS:</u>		
	a. Visually-sensitive area or corridor.....	X	
	b. Hillside, grading issues.....		X
	c. Other aesthetic concerns.....	X	
10.	<u>PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE:</u>		
	a. Impact on public parks and recreation.....	X	
	b. Generates need for private recreation.....	X	
	c. Need to maintain open space.....		X
11.	<u>CULTURAL, HISTORICAL, AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL:</u>		
	a. Historic and/or cultural sites.....		X
	b. Archaeological sites.....		X
12.	<u>NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY:</u>		
	a. Natural resources supply.....		X
	b. Energy supply.....		X
13.	<u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:</u>		
	a. Potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a wildlife species, cause 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.....		X
	b. Potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals..		X
	c. Impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.....		X
	d. Substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.....		X

TRACT 2214 AND PD 95008 (WILLHOIT)

DISCUSSION OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT  
ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

1. Land Use (Item 1b):

The applicant proposes to develop 90 units on a 9.6 acre (gross) site. After dedications have been made for Beechwood and Stoney Creek Drive and Creston Road, the net lot size would 9.25 acres, for a proposed density of 9.7 units per acre. The adjacent properties to the east are zoned R-1,PD (4 units per acre) and properties to the south are zoned R-1,PD2.7 (2.7 units per acre). Properties to the north are zoned R-3,PD and have three and four unit structures developed on 6,000 square foot lots.

In general, there should be sensitivity in the manner in which multiple family densities are constructed next to single family development. This can be done through appropriate design treatment along property boundaries abutting single family development and adhering to the adopted multiple family zoning code standards.

The applicant has proposed a set back of 20 feet along the south and east property boundaries and set backs of both 10 and 20 feet along the northern boundary. This meet and exceeds the minimum set back for rear yards as established by the R-3 zoning district. Teamed with the setback, the applicant proposes the following perimeter treatments:

- o North property line: An 8 foot high block wall
- o South property line: A 6 foot high wooden fence
- o East property line: A 6 foot high wooden fence
- o West property line: A combination 5 foot block retaining wall and 6 foot high masonry screen wall are proposed. The total effect from Creston Road would be a 10 foot high wall, depressed in elevation from the road approximately 5 feet. Additionally, a 2 foot garden wall is proposed approximately 5 feet behind sidewalk, with landscaping.

In addition to fencing, trees are proposed to be planted around the project's perimeter boundaries. To provide the maximum opportunity for vegetative screen to be established, it is recommended that all trees be required to be planted with phase one development. Additionally, because of the proximity of the proposed homes to each other, and adjacent residential developments, it is recommended that the applicant be required to provide 4-sided enhanced architecture (window trim treatments etc..) as shown on the development plans submitted.

2. Circulation (Item 2a,b, c, d and e):

o Traffic:

The applicant had submitted a traffic study, contracted with Bill Heath (a Traffic Consultant) in 1992, which analyzed traffic generation associated with the use, impacts of the project to various street intersections and cumulative impacts associated with site development. An addendum to that 1992 study was submitted with the applicant's current submittal. Please see the analysis prepared by the Engineering Division regarding traffic.

o Pedestrian:

The applicant is proposing to develop a pedestrian walkway connecting Stoney Creek (Beechwood Drive) to the residential neighborhoods to the north. A letter from the School District indicating their support for having a through pedestrian connection was submitted with the project application.

The City staff has recommended that Beechwood Drive be constructed as a through vehicular connection to the north, rather than pedestrian only (please see Engineering Division analysis). If the through street connection is established as a design option for this project, pedestrian needs will still be met. If the street is not connected through, the pedestrian connection should be required as a minimum mitigation measure in order to provide neighborhood linkages and ease of travel for school children.

o Parking:

The City's recently adopted Multiple Family zoning code (which is applicable to the base zone of this site), establishes parking standards for apartment complexes based on the number of bedrooms of each unit and a 1:5 ratio of visitor parking to units.

The applicant contends that their project is closer to single family development in its character (regardless of base zoning) and therefore proposes each unit to have its own two car garage. An additional 10 off-street visitor parking stalls are also proposed. The applicant asserts that the 75 on-street parallel parking stalls will meet visitor and other overflow parking needs beyond the individual garages. Driveway aprons in front of garages vary between 5 and 20 feet per the multiple family code standards.

The appropriateness and logic of the parking layout is a question that may be addressed through the planned development process, if findings are made that the on-street parking is adequate to serve the needs of the character of the development. Alternatively, potential mitigation measures may include requiring additional on-site parking for visitor use, distributed through the site.

o Emergency Vehicle Access:

The applicant is not proposing to extend Beechwood Drive through to the north of the project site. The Engineering Division analysis addresses the need for this through connection based on planned circulation for the area. Opening this through connection would further improve emergency response access to this project site and the surrounding neighborhoods. In the absence of through connection of Beechwood Drive to the north, the project will provide the minimum of two points of access.

3. Drainage (Item 4d):

The development of this site will result in increased storm water runoff. Additionally, the flow of the unnamed blue-line creek which traverses the site must be maintained and culverted for the street crossing. In order to avoid undesirable off-site impacts, it will be necessary for the applicant to construct on-site detention basin(s). The plans show basins to be improved at Creston Road (please see the section on Aesthetics which addresses the construction of this basin).

4. Vegetation (Item 5a):

The applicant has submitted an arborist report which addresses the potential impact of this project on existing oaks. The report also makes recommendations for mitigation measures relating to landscaping material placement and construction operations within the sensitive area of the oak trees.

The applicant proposes to remove five (5) oak trees with this development. One is located at Creston Road and is within the planned right of way for that arterial road design. The other four are in the southeast quadrant of the project at the location where Beechwood crosses the existing drainage channel. Three of the four oaks in this area are directly within the planned right of way of Beechwood Drive, the fourth is located near the channel outlet, west of the road. It appears that the maximum number of oak trees are proposed to be preserved in this portion of the project, given the planned connection and drainage improvement needs associated with the Beechwood Drive connection.

The Engineering Division's analysis addresses concerns associated with construction impacts to the 60-inch mature oak located in the recreational area on the north side of the project. The arborist report proposes restrictions of the types of landscape materials and the area of construction encroachment which would be acceptable and still assure the preservation of this significant oak tree. It would be recommended that, consistent with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, that the applicant be required to post oak tree preservation bonds as determined to be appropriate by the Public Works Director, in order to prolong the applicant's responsibility for these trees beyond the point of initial construction.

Additionally, it should be a stipulation of any project approval that no oak trees are to be removed until such time that construction permits are issued; and that replacement oak trees be planted in accordance with the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance (2 for every one removed). This would be assured through DRC final review of landscaping plans.

5. Air Quality, Public Services and Public Parks  
(Items 6a, 7a through f and 10a):

The General Plan Update EIR identifies significant impacts to public services (streets, highways, bridges, police, fire protection, parks and recreation, solid waste disposal and library) that would occur if residential development continues beyond existing levels, even if said development is consistent with existing zoning.

The adopted General Plan proposed that the City develop updated impact fees to pay for the necessary public facilities to mitigate these impacts. In 1993, the City Council adopted a residential development impact fee schedule. This impact fee is paid prior to a residence obtaining certificate of occupancy and is intended to address the potential impact of the residence on public infrastructure and facilities.

6. Noise and Lighting (Items 8a and 8b):

o Noise:

The project is located adjacent to Creston Road which is a designated arterial road with a future build-out to four travel lanes. Residential units are proposed as close as twenty-five (25) feet from the established right-of-way. The applicant has provided a noise impact study prepared by Donald Asquith (an environmental noise consultant) which concludes that with the construction of the proposed privacy wall, the noise standards established by the City's adopted Noise Element will be met now and into the future (in terms of increased traffic on Creston Road anticipated as a result of additional buildout within the City). To assure compliance with anticipated future build-out, it is recommended that the masonry wall be included as a project mitigation measure, at a 6 foot height minimum.

o Lighting:

Because of the density of this project and the common recreational areas proposed, lighting for the purposes of safety are essential. Street lights will be provided along public street frontages per City Standards. The applicant proposes to install decorative light standards along the interior private driveways and the recreational areas. It is recommended that these light standards be no higher than 14 feet in height and be designed with a shielded light source so as to assure that they will not create off-site glare impacts to surrounding residential areas and public rights of way.

7. Aesthetics (Items 9a and 9c):

Creston Road is a highly traveled corridor. Development along this corridor will be highly visible from the Creston right of way and the development's architectural and site design is a reflection on our community's image.

As a sensitive visual corridor, there is the expectation for this project to provide attractive and interesting architectural features, adequate setbacks to maintain proper scale of the 2-story buildings to roads and adjacent properties, and for adequate landscaping to be incorporated into the design.

The residential units are proposed to be set back from property line approximately 25 feet, with this set back area proposed to be utilized as detention basin and to be landscaped. The greatest design concerns along Creston Road are: a) the buildings being oriented with their side elevations facing Creston Road, and b) the combined retaining and privacy wall (for the detention basin and noise attenuation) being approximately 11 feet in height.

As assurance that the final project design details are within the parameters of the City's design expectations, the conditions of planned development approval call for the Development Review Committee (DRC) to review and approval final building, site and landscape design details for the project prior to issuance of building permits. However, specific conditions of any project approval should include requirements for the elevation details on units facing Creston Road incorporate enhanced architectural treatment (pop-out windows) as shown by the applicants plan submittal, and that the wall along Creston Road incorporate additional area for landscape planting (either through the use of interlocking crib-lock wall, or providing a planter area at the top of the retaining wall to establish planting at the front of the privacy portion of the wall.

8. Private Recreation (Item 10b):

The applicant is proposing two recreational areas within the project which would be shared by the project residents. One of these areas is proposed with a play structure for children, the other is proposed with barbecue facilities and outdoor picnic tables. Both areas have seating areas for passive enjoyment and are in proximity to large existing oak trees.

The Multiple Family zoning code standards require a project of this size to provide two (2) tot-lot recreational areas and two (2) "other" recreational areas (for a total of four shared recreational areas). The project does not meet this code standard.

The zoning code also requires that each unit be provided with a fenced private use area, a minimum of 100 square feet in size. The cluster design proposed provides a minimum of approximately 400 square feet, and up to approximately 800 square feet, in private yard areas. The applicant is requesting that the Planned Development overlay zoning be used as the vehicle for the Planning Commission to make findings that the private open space would exceed the minimum multiple family requirements and therefore justify the reduced number of shared recreational areas. If such a finding is made by the Commission, the combined private and shared recreational areas would be concluded as meeting the recreational needs of this residential project.

Additionally, in order to function as attractive and comfortable (safe) areas to recreate and gather, these common lots should be well lighted and their maintenance assured through the home owner's association.



Conclusion:

Based on the information provided, including the applicant's traffic study, noise study and arborist study, there would not appear to be a significant impact on the environment as a result of approving this project, subject to the following specific findings and conditions of project mitigation:

1. Land Use Compatibility:
  - a. Setbacks shall be maintained from perimeter property lines as shown on the plans (20 foot minimum from south and east, 10 foot minimum from the north);
  - b. All units shall utilize four-sided enhanced architecture;
  - c. All fencing and perimeter trees shall be installed with phase one development.
  
2. Circulation and Traffic:
  - a. The Commission must be able to make findings that the through vehicular street connection is not needed for this project or neighborhood circulation needs;
  - b. The pedestrian connection through to the north must be provided as shown;
  - c. The Commission must be able to make findings that the combination of private garages, off-street visitor parking spaces, and on-street parking, are adequate to meet the parking needs of the project.
  
3. Oak Tree Preservation:
  - a. No oak trees shall be removed until construction permits have been issued for the project;
  - b. The mitigation measures contained in the arborist report dated January 28, 1996 shall be adhered to as conditions of project development;
  - c. Replacement oak trees shall be provided as required by the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, and cited on the plan in accordance with DRC approval during review of final landscaping plans.
  
4. Noise and Lighting:
  - a. The 6 foot high decorative block privacy wall along Creston Road shall be installed with phase one improvements;
  - b. All units shall utilize four-sided enhanced architecture;
  - c. The maximum height of light pole fixtures within the project area (outside of the right of way) shall be 14 feet and the lamp fixtures shall be designed so as to shield the light source and not create off-site glare.

5. Aesthetics:

- a. All units shall utilize four-sided enhanced architecture;
- b. The Creston Road retaining and privacy wall shall be designed to incorporate landscaping;
- c. The Creston Road-facing side elevations of residential units shall incorporate bump-out window detailing as shown in the applicant's elevation drawings.

6. Parks and Recreation:

- a. The private yard areas shown on the applicant's plan shall be maintained as shown on the plans; at no time being provided at less than 400 square feet per unit;
- b. The southern shared recreational area shall be constructed with phase one development; the northern shared recreational area shall be constructed with phase three development;
- c. Lighting shall be provided within the park areas in a manner to be approved by the DRC, Police, Engineering and Planning Staff;

The aforementioned mitigation measures are recommended to be attached to any action to approve the proposed residential project. However, please note, that the issuance of a Negative Declaration would not impact the ability of the Planning Commission/City Council to approve or deny the subject project based on its merits including but not limited to consideration of project design, non-compliance with multiple family code standards, neighborhood compatibility, and public health, safety and welfare.

\\nw\tracts\2214\environ.a1

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 grant a Negative Declaration status for Tentative Tract 2214 and Planned Development 95008 subject to the applicant complying with the mitigation measures contained in the City Council Resolutions of Approval for Tract 2214 and PD 95008, summarized as follows:

1. Land Use Compatibility:
  - a. Setbacks shall be maintained from perimeter property lines as shown on the plans (20 foot minimum from south and east, 10 foot minimum from the north);
  - b. All units shall utilize four-sided enhanced architecture;
  - c. All fencing and perimeter trees shall be installed with phase one development.
2. Circulation and Traffic:
  - a. The Council must be able to make findings that the through vehicular street connection is not needed for this project or neighborhood circulation needs;
  - b. The pedestrian connection through to the north must be provided as shown;
  - c. The Council must be able to make findings that the combination of private garages, off-street visitor parking spaces, and on-street parking, are adequate to meet the parking needs of the project.
3. Oak Tree Preservation:
  - a. No oak trees shall be removed without City Council approval and until construction permits have been issued;
  - b. The mitigation measures contained in the arborist report dated January 28, 1996 shall be adhered to as conditions of project development;
  - c. Replacement oak trees shall be provided as required by the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, and cited on the plan in accordance with DRC approval during review of final landscaping plans.
4. Noise and Lighting:
  - a. The 6 foot high decorative block privacy wall along Creston Road shall be installed with phase one improvements;
  - b. All units shall utilize four-sided enhanced architecture;
  - c. The maximum height of light pole fixtures within the project area (outside of the right of way) shall be 14 feet and the lamp fixtures shall be designed so as to shield the light source and not create off-site glare.

5. Aesthetics:

- a. All units shall utilize four-sided enhanced architecture;
- b. The Creston Road retaining and privacy wall shall be designed to incorporate landscaping;
- c. The Creston Road-facing side elevations of residential units shall incorporate bump-out window detailing as shown in the applicant's elevation drawings.

6. Parks and Recreation:

- a. The private yard areas shown on the applicant's plan shall be maintained as shown on the plans; at no time being provided at less than 400 square feet per unit;
- b. The southern shared recreational area shall be constructed with phase one development; the northern shared recreational area shall be constructed with phase three development;
- c. Lighting shall be provided within the park areas in a manner to be approved by the DRC, Police, Engineering and Planning Staff;

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 19th day of March, 1996 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Heggarty, Iversen, Martin, and Picanco

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Macklin

ABSENT: None

  
MAYOR WALTER J. MACKLIN

ATTEST:

  
RICHARD J. RAMIREZ, CITY MANAGER/CITY CLERK

rw\tracts\2214\cc\env.res

INITIAL STUDY

DATE: January 19, 1996  
FILE #: Tract 2214 and Planned Development 95008  
APPLICATION: Division of an approximate 9.5 acre parcel into 90 parcels and common area for the development of 90 detached residential units  
APPLICANT: Richard Willhoit

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION: Attached.
2. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: Attached.
3. IDENTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS: Please see attached Initial Study Checklist.
4. DISCUSSION OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS:  
If any of the items on the Initial Study Checklist are marked "Yes/Maybe", please see the attached Analysis for discussion and recommendations for mitigation or further environmental study.
5. CONSISTENCY OF PROJECT WITH EXISTING GENERAL PLAN, ZONING AND OTHER LAND USE CONTROLS:

- This project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and other land use controls.
- This project involves a request to change the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and/or other land use controls.

6. PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY:

Meg Williamson, Principal Planner  
Ditas Esperanza, City Engineer  
Bob Lata, Community Development Director  
John McCarthy, Public Works Director

7. DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study:

- I find that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration will be prepared.
- I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on the attached Discussion of Environmental Evaluation have been added to the project. A Negative Declaration will be prepared.
- I find that there is insufficient information to determine whether the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment and that the applicant needs to provide additional information in the form of an expanded initial study.
- I find that the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and recommend that an Environmental Impact Report be prepared.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal Planner

**TRACT 2214, PD 95008 (RICHARD WILLHOIT)  
PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant is requesting approval of the following applications:

- o To subdivide an approximate 9.6 acre site into 90 individual lots;
- o Use of the Planned Development (PD) Overlay Zone to authorize modifications to setbacks from lot lines, building separations and street design;
- o A Development Plan for the construction of 90 units upon the site.

The project site is located on the east side of Creston Road, opposite Stoney Creek Drive and west of Beechwood Drive (2000 Creston Road).

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

**A. SITE**

1. **Site Size:** 9.6 gross acres
2. **General Plan Designation:** Residential Multiple Family - Medium Density (RMF-M)
3. **Zoning:** R-3,PD
4. **Topography:** The site is relatively flat and there is a portion of a blue line stream which traverses the site at its southeasterly corner.
5. **Flood Zone Status:** There is an existing storm drain stubbed out in the Beechwood Drive right-of-way.
6. **Vegetation:** According to previously submitted arborist report data, there are 27 oak trees located on this property, five (5) of which are proposed to be removed.
7. **Existing Land Use and Improvements:** The site is vacant at this time.

8. Utilities:

- a. Water: There is an exiting 14" water main existing within Creston Road.
- b. Sewer: This project is proposed to sewer through Beechwood Drive and also out to Creston Road to connect to the existing 10-inch main in Cedarwood.

9. Access to Circulation System:

- a. Creston Road: Creston Road is designated as a 100 foot wide arterial road. The project fronts this right-of-way, and accesses it as its main entrance.
- b. Stoney Creek: Stoney Creek, to the west of this project site, is a 60 foot wide local street. The applicant proposes to extend Stoney Creek as a 36 foot wide curb to curb within a 56 foot wide right-of-way from Creston Road to act as their main project entrance.
- c. Beechwood Drive: Beechwood Drive is a 60 foot wide local street which the applicant proposes to connect to, transitioning the width of right-of-way and paving improvements, in order to complete the north/south connection of Beechwood.

B. SURROUNDING PROPERTIES (General Plan; Zoning; Land Use)

- North: Residential Multiple Family - Medium; R-3,PD; Apartments
- South: Residential Single Family, 3 units per acre; R-1,PD2.7; Custom Single Family Residential (average 10,000 s.f. lots)
- East: Residential Single Family, 4 units per acre; R-1,PD; Single Family Residential (average 6,000 s.f. lots)
- West: Residential Multiple Family - Medium; R-3, 15; Dry Creek Village Apartments across Creston Road

C. PROJECT HISTORY

Tract 1991 and Planned Development 90015 were filed on this property in 1990. On June 18, 1991, after Subdivision Review Committee (SRC) and Planning Commission meetings, the City Council considered the project on an appeal of the environmental determination. The City Council concluded that a focused Environmental Impact Report should be prepared for the project.

The applicant did not pursue the preparation of that focused EIR, and on February 18, 1992 submitted new plans, revised to show several redesigned elements of the project (mainly building set backs, sewer and drainage design).

On March 17, 1992, the City Council held a public hearing and acted to deny Tract 1991 and Planned Development 90015, based on timing constraints established by State Law requiring Cities to take action on a project within a specific time frame. The denial was based on the absence of a focused EIR for the project, and the inability to respond to the new project design within the constraints existing deadlines for taking action on the project.

At that same March 17, 1992 meeting, the City Council directed that the February 18, 1992 submittal be treated as a new project submittal (requiring new project file numbers), but allowed a rollover of the previous application fees to the new submittals.

On July 14, 1992, the Planning Commission adopted resolutions granting tentative map approval to Tract 2106 and Planned Development 92005. The Planning Commission's action to approve the project was appealed by a neighboring property owner.

On August 18, 1992, the City Council held a public hearing to consider the project appeal and adopted a resolution denying the project on that same date.

On November 28, 1995, the current Tentative Tract 2214 and Planned Development 95008 applications were filed with the City of Paso Robles.

MEGTRACTS2214\BGI





**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

FILE #s: Tract 2214 and Planned Development 95008  
 APPLICATION: To subdivide an approximate 9.5 acre RMF parcel into 90 lots with common area for the construction of detached residential units  
 APPLICANT: Richard Willhoit

This Initial Study Checklist was completed by reviewing the project application in light of the following:

- a. The City's General Plan, Municipal Code and adopted Standards;
- b. Environmental information and studies maintained by the City;
- c. Consultation, when necessary, with Responsible and Trustee Agencies, as defined by CEQA, and other interested parties;
- d. Observation of the project site in the field.

All items checked "Yes/Maybe" will be discussed in the section entitled "Analysis" attached to this checklist.

If an item is checked "No", the project will either not have a significant effect on the environment, or, any potential significant effects will be mitigated by standard conditions of development required by the City.

Item	Environmental Impact	Yes/Maybe	No
1.	<u>LAND USE, POPULATION, HOUSING:</u>		
a.	Alteration of present or planned land use in an area.....		X
b.	Compatibility with existing or planned land uses in an area.....	X	
c.	Alteration of location, distribution, density or population growth rate of an area.....		X
d.	Affect existing housing or create demand for additional housing.....		X
e.	Airport Land Use Plan.....		X..
2.	<u>CIRCULATION/TRANSPORTATION:</u>		
a.	Traffic generation.....	X	
b.	Traffic access, movement, hazards.....	X.	
c.	Pedestrian, bicycle systems.....	X.	
d.	Parking facilities.....	X.	
e.	Emergency vehicle access.....	X.	
f.	Air, rail operations.....		X..