TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Ed Gallagher, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: Code Amendment 13-001 – Update of Off-Street Parking Regulations

DATE: April 23, 2013

Needs: For the Planning Commission to consider recommending that the City Council adopt amendments to the parking regulations in the City's Zoning Ordinance to implement Low Impact Development (LID) measures and to streamline the Parking Code.

Facts:

1. The State has mandated that the City implement LID measures to reduce the amount of, and to clean, stormwater runoff associated with new development and re-development. Such measures will require an increase in the percentage of site area for landscaping and a reduction in percentage of site area development with impervious surfaces.

2. Reducing the amount of paving for parking and/or the use of alternative surface materials is proposed to provide a means to reduce the amount of impervious surfaces while minimizing reduction of building floor area in order to meet the State's stormwater management mandate.

3. The proposed parking amendments include re-organizing the text to help make it easier to find parking information.

4. Parking regulations for most of the west side of the City will continue to be implemented through the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan. The proposed code amendment will apply outside of this area.

5. The Development Review Committee (DRC) considered the proposed amendments on March 18, 2013. The DRC's discussion focused on the number of parking spaces for land uses and parking surface materials. The DRC made a few suggestions to modify the proposed language, which is discussed in the Analysis Section, below.

6. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a draft Negative Declaration was prepared for this project and circulated on March 25, 2013. The Negative Declaration concludes that this project will not result in significant environmental impacts. (Please see Attachment 1.)

Analysis and Conclusion

The objective of this Code Amendment is to reduce the amount of paving to help meet the State's mandate to manage storm water. Without such a reduction, implementation of LID measures would mandate reduction in floor areas of buildings.

The secondary objective of this Code Amendment is to streamline the Parking Code to make it more user-friendly. Examples include the following.

- Many land uses categories that have similar parking needs would be condensed to reduce repetitive text. A couple land uses were added, such as "wine production" under manufacturing, since the City's experience with development applications for this use

demonstrate that it does not typically require as much parking as other types of manufacturing uses.

- Shifting the space requirement ratio from "x" spaces per hundred square feet to "x" spaces per 1,000 square feet. The 1,000 square feet ratio is more-broadly used, particularly by the real estate industry.

- Reduction in the number of parking spaces for certain commercial uses (e.g. general office, retail and restaurants) from one space per 150 square feet (or 7 spaces/1,000 sf) for restaurants, one space per 200 square feet (or 5 spaces/1,000 sf) for offices, and one space per 250 square feet (or 4 spaces/1,000 sf) of retail to three spaces per 1,000 gross square feet. (For reference, the UTCSP requires one space per 400 square feet for non-residential land uses.)

- For lodging with accessory uses such as restaurants or conference rooms on the same site, a 30 percent parking reduction is proposed based on the assumption that lodging guests will patronize the accessory uses reducing the overall parking demand on site.

- Adding motorcycle parking provisions and increasing the number of compact parking spaces in parking lots from 25 percent to 30 percent.

- The DRC recommended providing flexibility for warehouse and storage buildings larger than 10,000 square feet by including a provision that allows applicants to apply for a Conditional Use Permit to reduce the number of parking spaces, if it can be demonstrated that the parking demand is less than required.

- The DRC also suggested allowing a reduction of parking requirement for studios and one-bedroom units from 1.5 spaces per unit to only 1.0 space per unit if the parking space surface material is constructed with porous materials. This was added as an incentive to encourage reducing impervious surfaces.

- A broader range of parking lot surface materials to include porous concrete or asphalt and alternative materials (e.g., decomposed granite) for rural uses, such as agricultural uses and overflow parking areas at event sites.

- Narrowing parking lot drive aisles widths from 27 feet wide to 24 feet. This would be more in keeping with other jurisdictions in the County.

Staff Report Prepared By: Susan DeCarli, AICP

Reference: State Water Code, CEQA, Zoning Ordinance

Fiscal Impact: The ordinance itself will have no direct impact on public finances. However, to the extent that it would prevent reduction of building sizes in order to accommodate LID measures, it could act to help preserve sales tax revenue that could otherwise occur if buildings had to be smaller.

Options: After opening the public hearing and taking public testimony, the Planning Commission is requested to take one of the actions listed below:

a. (1) Recommend that the City Council adopt the attached resolution approving a Negative Declaration for this project; and

(2) Recommend that the City Council adopt the attached Ordinance.

b. Amend, modify, or reject the above-listed action.

Attachments:

1. Resolution to recommend adoption of draft Negative Declaration
2. Draft Ordinance
3. Public Hearing Notice

RESOLUTION NO:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
ADOPTING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
ZONING ORDINANCE "CHAPTER 21.22 OFF-STREET PARKING"
CODE AMENDMENT 13-001

WHEREAS, the City Zoning Ordinance is amended from time to time to clarify language, correct errors and respond to changing circumstances; and

WHEREAS, Code Amendment 13-001 is proposed to amend Chapter 21.22 Off-Street Parking regulations of the Zoning Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the amendments to Chapter 21.22 includes re-organizing the existing text and a general "clean-up" to make information easier to find and use. It also includes substantive changes including a reduction in the number of parking spaces required for certain land uses, broadens the types of parking area surface materials that may be used, and reduces parking lot driveway widths; and

WHEREAS, this Code Amendment is intended to provide options to reduce the amount of impervious surfaces associated with development for required parking spaces and parking lots to implement "Low-Impact Development" practices to help manage storm water; and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared an ordinance to amend the Zoning Code to modify the above regulations noted; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate whether these amendments would result in environmental impacts, and the City has determined that the Zoning Code Amendment modifying these provisions will not result in significant environmental impacts, and;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study and a Draft Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, no public comments or responses were received in regard to the Draft Negative Declaration and Initial Study prepared for this project; and

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on April 23, 2012 to consider the Initial Study and the proposed Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project, and to accept public testimony on Code Amendment 13-001, "Chapter 21.22 Off-Street Parking" Ordinance and the Environmental Determination, and the Planning Commission recommended approval of the draft Negative Declaration to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds that there is no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment as a result of implementation of Code Amendment 13-001, "Chapter 21.22 Off-Street Parking" Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment does hereby adopt a Negative Declaration for Code Amendment 13-001, "Chapter 21.22 Off-Street Parking" Ordinance in accordance with the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 7th day of May, 2012, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

_____
DUANE PICANCO, MAYOR

ATTEST:

_____
CARYN JACKSON, DEPUTY CITY CLEARK

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF PASO ROBLES

PROJECT TITLE: Code Amendment (CA 13-001)
Chapter 21.22 – Off-Street Parking Regulations

Concurrent Entitlements:

2. **LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Contact: Susan DeCarli
Phone: 805-237-3970
Email: sdecarli@prcity.com

3. **PROJECT LOCATION:** Citywide (except not applicable in the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan area)

3. **PROJECT PROPONENT:** City of Paso Robles

Contact Person: Susan DeCarli

Phone: above
Email: sdecarli@prcity.com

5. **GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Not applicable

6. **ZONING:** Not applicable

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a comprehensive revision of Chapter 21.22 – Off-Street Parking Regulations of the City of Paso Robles Zoning Code. The revisions include reorganizing the text to streamline it into a logical sequence of information, and to provide flexibility in regulations to reduce the amount of impervious surfaces that result from parking standards.

Substantive changes include condensing the list of land uses where parking needs and potential impacts are similar. The number of parking spaces required for certain uses is also proposed to be reduced. The number of compact spaces that may be incorporated into non-residential development is proposed to be increased from 25% to 30%. The parking lot driveway widths are proposed to be reduced from 27 feet to 24 feet wide. The amendment also includes provision of motorcycle spaces.

Parking lot surfacing materials that may be used is proposed to be broadened to include pervious materials and lot drainage is suggested to be drained toward bioretension features such as landscape bioswales and other features.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: The environmental setting for this project is the City of Paso Robles, which is an urbanized area.

9. **OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED)**:

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.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology /Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic	☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ 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: _____ 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

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion: The proposed project will not directly affect a scenic vista or resources. It may result in indirect beneficial impacts through reduced paving in areas with scenic resources.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion: See 1a. above.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion: See 1a above.

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) ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion: Parking regulations are not related to light and glare. Parking lot lights are not a part of the Parking Ordinance and will not be affected by this project.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY **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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forest land, including the forest and Range Assessment Project and the forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion. II a. – e. The proposed parking code revisions could not directly impact agriculture or forestry resources. There are no forestry resources (as defined) within the City. Beneficial indirect impacts may occur to agricultural resources since the project encourages reduced impervious surfaces.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
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 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				

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)	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion: III a. – e. The proposed parking code revisions could not directly impact air quality. The code revisions would not conflict with the Clean Air Plan or violate air quality standards.

The scope of the project is to reduce impervious surfaces by reducing the number of parking spaces required for specific land uses, etc., and to reorganize text. Reducing impervious surfaces may indirectly reduce the potential for "heat island" effect thereby resulting in a small amount of beneficial impacts to air temperature.

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11)	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
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	☐	☐	☐	■

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ozone precursors)? (Source: 11) Discussion:				
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11) Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11) Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■

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?	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion: IV. a. – f. The proposed parking code revisions could not directly impact biological resources, but it could indirectly result in beneficial impacts by reducing site disturbance and improve water quality.

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
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? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
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	☐	☐	☐	■

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
sites?				
Discussion:				
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion: There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans that apply in the City of Paso Robles.				
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion: V. a. – d. The proposed project does not apply to, or directly or indirectly affect Cultural Resources.				
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-	☐	☐	☐	■

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)				
Discussion: IV. A. – f. The proposed project parking regulations do not apply to, nor could they directly or indirectly impact geology. Potential impacts to geologic resources are beyond the scope of this project.				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3)	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
b. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
c. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
d. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
e. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
f. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the	☐	☐	☐	■

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

disposal of waste water?

Discussion:

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion: VII a. – b. The proposed project of reduced parking regulations could not directly or indirectly result in the emission of greenhouse gas emissions.

b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion:

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion: VIII a. – h. The proposed project of reduced parking regulations could not directly or indirectly result in creating hazards to the environment or public, nor would it result in emitting hazardous emissions, impact wildfires, etc. There is no specific development project proposed that could impact airport facilities or operations.

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion:

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion:

d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? Discussion:				
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? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
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? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
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? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion: IX. a. – l. The primary intent of the proposed parking regulations is to provide options for developers to reduce impervious surfaces to reduce stormwater runoff, encourage groundwater recharge and reduce water pollution. Therefore, the proposed project will result in beneficial impacts to hydrology and water quality.				
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	☐	☐	☐	■

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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) Discussion:				
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) Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
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) Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
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) Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
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?	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion: g.- j. Not applicable since the project does not include development of structures.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	■
	Discussion:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	■
	Discussion:				
j.	Inundation by mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	■
	Discussion:				
k.	Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
	Discussion : The proposed regulations specifically support BMPs in the City's SWMP.				
l.	Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones?	☐	☐	☐	■
	Discussion:				

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a.	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	■
	Discussion: The proposed parking regulations are not related to this topic and could not result in impacts to an established community.				
b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	■
	Discussion: The proposed parking regulations will not conflict with other City codes, plans or regulations and consistent with policies of the City's General Plan Land Use, Circulation and Conservation Elements.				

	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?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				

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)	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion: XI a. – b. 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)	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				

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)	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion: XII. a. – e. The proposed parking regulations could not directly or indirectly result in creating noise or affect noise sensitive uses.				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 4)	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion:

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)	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion: XIII a. – c. The proposed parking regulations could not affect population growth since they are development standards that will not result in new development, nor could the project affect or result in displacement of housing.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion:

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion:

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)	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion: XIV a. – e. The proposed regulations do not affect public services.

b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10)	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Schools?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion				
d. Parks?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10)	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				

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?	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion: XV a. – b. The proposed regulations are not applicable to recreation services or facilities.

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?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of 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?	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion: XVI a. – f. The proposed regulations do not affect or impact traffic circulation, congestion, air traffic or alternative transportation since no development will result from this code amendment and the amendment will not change or impact circulation in the City.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to a level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
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? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Result in inadequate emergency access? Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■
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. Discussion:	☐	☐	☐	■

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion: XVII a. – g. The proposed parking regulations are not applicable and do not impact utilities or service systems.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	■

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	■
Discussion:				

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 range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	■

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

Discussion: The proposed parking amendments do not directly affect biological resources, however indirect beneficial impacts to water quality will benefit the ecology of plants or animals.

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)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion: The proposed project may result in cumulative beneficial impacts to the environment. See XVII a. above.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? ☐ ☐ ☐ ■

Discussion: The proposed regulations are intended to help reduce the potential for direct or indirect environmental impacts since the regulations will encourage reduced impervious surfaces and facilitate Low-Impact Development storm water management.

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 that may have been used in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

Reference #	Document Title	Available for Review at:
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	2005 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Urban Water Management Plan 2005	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
10	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
11	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
12	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
13	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446
14	Draft Bike Plan, 2009	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446

ORDINANCE NO. XXX N.S.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES AMENDING TITLE 21 (ZONING) OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE TO MODIFY CHAPTER 21.22 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE (CODE AMENDMENT 13-001)

WHEREAS, the City of El Paso de Robles Zoning Ordinance is amended from time to time to clarify language, correct errors and respond to changing circumstances; and

WHEREAS, this Code Amendment is intended to provide options to reduce the amount of impervious surfaces associated with development for required parking spaces and parking lots to implement "Low-Impact Development" practices to help manage storm water; and

WHEREAS, the proposed parking amendments include re-organizing Chapter 21.22 and substantive amendments which encompass:

- Condense land uses categories for uses that have similar parking demands;
- Reduce the number of parking spaces for certain commercial uses such as general office, retail and restaurants to 1 parking space per 300 square feet of gross floor area;
- Add the land use "Wine Production" under manufacturing with a parking ratio of one parking space per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area;
- Allow for a 30 percent parking space reduction for lodging for accessory uses such as restaurants or conference rooms within the same development;
- Add motorcycle parking provisions of one parking space per 20 vehicle parking spaces and a reduction of vehicle spaces if a project includes five or more motorcycle spaces;
- Increase the number of compact parking spaces permitted in parking lots from 25 percent to 30 percent;
- Add a provision for warehouse and storage buildings over 10,000 square feet whereby applicants may apply for a Conditional Use Permit to reduce the number of parking spaces, if it can be demonstrated that the parking demand is less than required;
- Allow studios and one-bedroom residential units to provide one parking space per unit if the parking space surface material is constructed from porous materials;
- Allow for alternative "porous" surface materials for parking lots and parking spaces;
- Decrease the size of parking lot drive aisles from 27 feet wide to 24 feet wide.

WHEREAS, the City has prepared an ordinance to amend the Zoning Code to modify the above parking regulations; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) an Initial Study was prepared, and it was determined that this project could not result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, a draft Negative Declaration was adopted for this project; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting on April 23, 2013 the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the proposed Code Amendment and took the following actions regarding this ordinance:

a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for this ordinance;

b. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on the proposed ordinance;

c. In accordance with CEQA, recommended the City Council adopt a Negative Declaration for the proposed ordinance;

d. Recommended that the City Council adopt the proposed ordinance; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of May 21, 2013, the City Council conducted a public hearing on the proposed Code Amendment and took the following actions regarding this ordinance:

a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for this ordinance;

b. Considered the recommendation of the Planning Commission regarding this ordinance amendment and concurred with the Planning Commission's recommendation.

c. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on the proposed ordinance amendment;

d. Based on its independent judgment and in accordance with CEQA, the City Council adopted a Negative Declaration for this ordinance.

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, hereby finds as follows:

1. The above stated facts of this ordinance amendment are true and correct.

2. This ordinance amendment is consistent with the City's General Plan.

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

SECTION 1: Chapter 21.22 of the Zoning Ordinance is hereby amended to incorporate the text shown in 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 3. 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 . 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 May 21, 2013 and passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles on the 21st day of May 2013 by the following roll call vote, to wit:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

_____
Duane Picanco, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

Chapter 21.22 – Off-Street Parking Regulations

Sections:

21.22.010 – Purpose.

The purpose of off-street parking regulations is to ensure there is sufficient parking available for land uses permitted in the City.

21.22.020 – Application.

Off-street parking facilities shall be provided for any new or expanded building established after the effective date of this code or subsequent amendments.

21.22.030 – Parking provisions of Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan.

Buildings or land uses within the boundaries of the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan are subject to the parking requirements of said specific plan.

21.22.040 - Parking space requirements.

The number of required spaces for land uses are as set forth in Table 21.22.01. These provisions are established as the maximum number of parking spaces required and permitted. Where the calculation of the number of spaces required results in a fractional number, any fraction equaling one-half or more shall be rounded up to the next whole number.

Table 21.22.01
Off-Street Parking Spaces Required

Land Use		Number of Off-street Parking Spaces
Residential	Single Family	2 per residence
	Multi-Family	1.5 spaces per studio or 1 bedroom (or 1space per studio or 1 bedroom if the parking space surface is constructed from porous concrete or porous pavement) 2 space per 2 or more bedrooms 1 guest space per 5 units.
Commercial, Industrial, and other Non-Residential Uses	General Commercial (e.g. retail, office, personal services) and Service Commercial (e.g. equipment rental, contractor services)	3 spaces per 1000 gross square feet Exceptions: • Free-standing medical office and clinics: 4 per 1,000 gross square feet • Assembly uses (e.g. meeting rooms, churches, theatres, etc. with floor area 3,000 square feet or larger) 10 per 1,000 net square feet in the assembly seating area • Free-standing restaurant, including fast food: 5 per 1,000 gross square feet • Gas stations: 2 spaces plus any additional spaces for ancillary uses such as a mini-mart or auto repair • Auto repair, installation, and carwash: 3 per service bay (see note #3, below)
	Lodging	Hotels/Motels: 1 space per room and 1 space per employee on the maximum shift. • Accessory uses open to public (e.g. restaurant, conference rooms: see specific parking requirement per use and reduce combined parking requirements by 30% RV Parks: as determined through PD/CUP process Bed & Breakfast: 2 spaces for manager/residents, and 1 per guest room
	Warehouse and Storage	1 per 1,000 gross square feet Exceptions: • Mini-Storage: 1 per 3,000 gross square feet • Wine Storage: 1 per 5,000 gross square feet
	Manufacturing	1/500 Exception: Wine Production Facility: 1/1000

Notes:
1. Where specific parking requirements are not listed, an interpretation of parking impacts and spaces needed based on a similar use may be determined by the Community Development Director.
2. Where calculation of the number of spaces required results in a fractional number, any fraction equaling one-half or more shall be rounded to the next highest whole number.
3. Automotive service bay is defined as an employee work area within a building where no more than 2 vehicles may be serviced (e.g. 2 stalls of approximately 10 feet by 20 feet in size.
4. A Conditional Use Permit to reduce the number of parking spaces required may be considered for warehouse, storage and/or manufacturing buildings that are 10,000 s.f. or larger, if demonstrated that parking demand is less than required standard.

21.22.050 – Bicycle Parking Spaces.

A. Multi-family development with 10 or more units shall provide a minimum of two (2) bicycle rack spaces and two (2) bicycle rack spaces for each additional increment of 10 units on site.

B. Non-residential development shall provide a minimum of two (2) bicycle rack spaces for each 20,000 square feet of building footprint on site. In addition, for sites with 50,000 square feet or more building footprint, two (2) secured locker bike parking facilities shall be provided for each increment of 50,000 square feet of building footprint on site.

C. For parking lots that require 20 or more parking spaces, a 5 percent reduction in parking spaces shall be allowed in exchange for providing 4 bike rack spaces.

21.22.060 – Motorcycle Parking Spaces.

One motorcycle parking space shall be provided for each 20 vehicle spaces required Motorcycle spaces shall be a minimum of 6 feet wide and 10 feet long. Projects that provide more motorcycle spaces than required may reduce the required car spaces at the rate of one car space for each five motorcycle spaces.

21.22.070 - Mixed-use and joint use parking standards.

A. In a mixed-use development (per above), the combined parking requirements may be reduced by a minimum of 33 percent (e.g. residential and non-residential uses within the same building or on the same parcel) unless it is demonstrated that a further reduction in parking spaces is merited due to a reduced parking demand, as approved by the Planning Commission.

B. Up to eighty percent of the parking facilities required by this chapter for a church or for an auditorium incidental to an educational institution may be supplied by parking facilities used primarily for daytime use.

21.22.080 – Parking space, lot, driveway and landscaping design standards.

A. Parking Space Size. Parking spaces and drive aisle shall be designed in compliance with the provisions in Table 21.22.02.

Table 21.22.02
Parking Space Standards

Zone	Width	Length
Single-Family Residential - covered spaces (e.g. garage or carport)[1]	10 feet	20 feet
All other zones – uncovered spaces[2]	9 feet	18 feet
• Compact spaces may be provided for up to 30% of required spaces	8 feet	16 feet
• Parallel spaces		22 feet

[1] The width of enclosed spaces may be measured from the outer wall of a garage or the outer edge of a support post for a carport. Garage door openings shall be at least 8 feet in width for a one-car opening and 16 feet for a two-car opening.

[2] A 2 foot overhang for bumpers may be permitted into landscaping or walkways provided that minimum widths for disabled access are maintained.

B. Spaces for Handicapped. Handicapped spaces shall be provided as required by state statute.

C. Parking Lot Design.

1. Parking spaces stall and drive aisles shall be designed in compliance with the provisions in Table 21.22.03

Table 21.22.03
Parking Lot Stall and Aisle Standards

Parking Angle	Stall Depth	Aisle Width	Traffic Direction
0	9 feet	12 feet	One Way
30	16 feet 4 inches	12 feet	One Way
45	18 fee 9 inches	14 feet	One Way
60	19 fee 10 inches	18 feet	One Way
90	18 feet	24 feet	Two Way

2. Parking spaces shall not have front-to-back or side-to-side grades that exceed 5% slope.

3. Parking lot surface materials shall minimize impervious surfaces and be constructed from permanent materials such as asphalt, porous asphalt, concrete, porous concrete, pavers or turf block. An exception may be approved by the Planning Commission to allow non-permanent parking lot materials such as decomposed granite or other suitable materials on a case-by-case basis for uses such as interim overflow parking lots or very low intensity agricultural- or rural-oriented land uses, or for parking spaces in a rear yard for residential use if it is in addition to primary parking spaces.

4. Parking lot drainage shall be maintained on individual parking lot sites and shall be conveyed to on-site landscape areas and/or detention facilities such as bioretention facilities.

5. Parking lot perimeter curbing shall incorporate inlets and outlets to direct surface runoff into and out of bioretention and/or landscape areas. Flat edge curbing is acceptable if wheel stops are provided.

6. Driveways that serve five or more residences or any non-residential land uses shall be designed so that vehicles may not back out of parking spaces directly onto a street or highway.

7. Directional signs shall be installed for one-way driveways and ramps to indicate one-way circulation.

8. Parking areas, driveways, maneuvering aisles, ramps and turnaround areas shall be kept free of obstructions at all times.

9. Wheel stops shall be installed for parking spaces at least 2 feet from any adjacent walkway, sidewalk, street or alley.

10. Parking lots with 6 or more parking spaces shall be screened from view from any adjacent residentially zoned or developed property on all sides of the parking lot. Screening materials may include solid opaque fencing (except for chain link with slats), masonry, or earth berms in combination with landscaping.

11. Tandem parking may be permitted upon approval by the Development Review Committee. As part of the review, the Development Review Committee should consider whether tandem parking is appropriate for the specified use and site.

12. The location and design of all street or alley entrances and exits to off-street parking facilities shall be subject to the approval of the city engineer.

13. All parking spaces shall be striped in a manner clearly showing the layout of the spaces.

14. The parking facilities required by this chapter shall be only for the temporary parking of vehicles used in conjunction with the uses they serve.

D. Driveways.

1. Single-family residential. No more than four residential dwelling units may be served by a driveway, whether the driveway serves a single parcel or several adjoining parcels. (Exception: Second units developed in accordance with Chapter 21.16D shall not be included in this calculation.) Consideration of development potential of adjoining properties that may be served by the same access shall be included in the calculation of the number of dwelling units to be served. The minimum driveway width is 12 feet.

   The minimum back-up distance between a garage or carport shall be 25 feet to a sidewalk or side property line. Garages and carports that back up to a paved alley may include the 20 foot wide alley in back up distance measurement.

2. Multi-family residential development. Residential development consisting of five or more residential dwelling units and non-residential development shall have a minimum driveway width of 24 feet, and a vertical clearance of 13 feet 5 inches.

3. Turnarounds and turnouts shall comply with the current version of the California Fire Code and the current edition of the Public Works Department Standard Details and Specifications.

4. Driveways shall be constructed with permanent surfacing with materials such as asphalt, porous asphalt, concrete, porous concrete, bricks, pavers or turf block. Driveways exceeding 150 feet in length shall comply with the California Fire Code Section for turnarounds (see section HS-20 Truck Loading). Driveway drainage shall be conveyed to on-site landscape.

5. Driveways shall not exceed a maximum slope of 15%, and must have a vertical clearance of 13 feet 6 inches. Driveways should have either a continuous cross slope that conveys runoff to adjacent landscaping or a crowned surface which conveys each side to landscape areas.

6. Common driveways shared by more than one lot shall be allowed when proper easements or agreements have been executed and filed with the city, and recorded with the County Recorder. The driveway shall not be more than five hundred feet from the street or alley to the parking area served.

7. Driveway exceptions. Where topography or other physical factors such as existing setbacks, lot dimensions and oak trees, combine to make development in accordance with driveway standards infeasible, the Development Review Committee may grant exceptions to the gradient and driveway width requirements, subject to any mitigation measures necessary to assure adequate fire protection. The fire department reserves the right to require that residential fire sprinkler systems be installed when emergency access is restricted.

E. Landscaping.

1. Irrigated perimeter landscaping shall be provided along property frontages and interior property lines in all multi-family and commercial zones. Landscaping shall be a minimum 10 feet deep along the front property line, 5 feet along street side property lines, and 3 feet deep adjacent to side (interior) property lines.

2. In addition to perimeter landscaping required elsewhere, 8 square feet of landscape area shall be provided for every parking space in parking lots with 4 or more spaces. Emphasis shall be given to shade tree installation to inhibit heat buildup in parking areas. In parking areas with 20 or more cars, the design shall demonstrate a minimum of 25% shade cover within five years through selection of shade tree species.

3. Design of landscaping for parking areas in all zones (except R-1) is subject to Development Review Committee approval.

4. Landscape areas shall be designed to function as bioretention areas designed to filter, store and infiltrate storm water, utilizing mulch, soil and plant root systems, to retain, degrade and absorb pollutants. These can include bioretention swales, rain gardens or storm water planters. The use of an engineered soil mix and appropriate vegetation is important to facilitate bioretention functions. Where

infiltration into underlying native soils is not appropriate, a perforated underdrain can convey treated runoff to a storm drain or surface drainage.

21.22.090 - Provisions for Off-Site Parking

Off-street parking facilities shall be located on the lot on which the principal land use is located unless such spaces cannot reasonably be located on such lot. In such a case, parking spaces may be located on any land within 300 feet of the property with the principal land use; provided, that the following conditions are met:

A. A written agreement between the owner of the property with the parking spaces and the principal land user assuring the retention of the parking spaces for the principal use shall be properly drawn and executed by the parties concerned, approved as to form by the city attorney and shall be recorded in the office of the county recorder and copies filed with the city prior to issuance of a building permit or certificate of occupancy for the principal use. The term of such an agreement shall be a minimum of fifteen years.

B. The principal use shall be permitted to continue only as long as its parking requirements are met.

21.22.100 - Off-street loading requirements.

Every building or part thereof erected or occupied for retail business, service, manufacturing, storage, warehousing, hotel, mortuary or any other use similarly involving the receipt or distribution by vehicles of space in accordance with the following requirements:

A. Within any commercial zoning district, one loading space for each 10,000 square feet of gross floor area;

B. Within any industrial zoning district, one loading space for each 15,000 square feet of gross floor area;

C. For the purpose of this section, an off-street loading space, exclusive of adequate access drives and maneuvering space, shall have minimum dimensions of 12 feet by 40 feet and an overhead clearance of 14 feet in height above the alley or street grade;

Attachment 4
Public Hearing Notice

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

LEGAL NEWSPAPER NOTICES

PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL
PROJECT NOTICING

Newspaper: Tribune

Date of Publication: March 25, 2013

Hearing Date: April 23, 2013
(Planning Commission)

Project: Notice of Intent to Recommend Adoption of a Negative Declaration and approval of an amendment to Chapter 21.22 – Off-Street Parking Regulations

CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE OF INTENT OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 21.22 - OFF-STREET PARKING REGULATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF EL PASO DE ROBLES

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles will hold a Public Hearing on Tuesday, April 23, 2013, at 7:30 p.m. at the City of El Paso de Robles, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California, in the City Council Chambers, to consider recommending adoption of a Negative Declaration in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the following project:

Code Amendment (CA 13-001) Chapter 21.22 - Off-Street Parking Regulations. The proposed code amendment will apply to all property within the City limits, outside of the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan Area. Substantive changes in the parking regulations are related to reducing the number of parking spaces required for certain land uses, parking lot driveway width reduction, and inclusion of alternative materials permitted for parking surfaces consistent with "Low-Impact Development" practices.

The public review period for the Negative Declaration (ND) is from March 25, 2013 through April 13, 2013. The proposed ND and Code Amendment may be reviewed at the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California or on the City's website at www.prcity.com. Copies may be purchased for the cost of reproduction.

Written comments on the proposed Code Amendment and corresponding ND may be mailed to the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446 or emailed to the City 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 contact Susan DeCarli at (805) 237-3970 or sdecarli@prcity.com.

If you challenge this project 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.

Susan DeCarli
Planning Manager
March 25, 2013

7016697

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

Signed: _____
Theresa Variano

forms\newsaffi.691