

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
October 8, 2013

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Barth, Garcia, Gregory, Holstine, Nash, Rollins, and Vanderlip

ABSENT: None

PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: None

STAFF BRIEFING: None

AGENDA ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE TABLED OR RE-SCHEDULED: None

PRESENTATIONS: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Public Workshop – Conceptual Site Design Beechwood Specific Plan

For the Planning Commission to conduct a public workshop and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding design principles to be incorporated into the overall site design for the Beechwood Area.

Open Public Hearing.

Speakers:

- Kerrin West: Studio 81 Architects – made a presentation for the project on behalf of the applicants.
- Jerry Camacho: opposed to wall along Meadowlark, said that traffic on Meadowlark already travels at high speeds.
- Jerry Dillard: opposed to project: cited water, traffic, impact on services.
- Wayne Montgomery: opposed to project: cited water impact.
- David Parry: supports project but is opposed to the proposed density as being too high.
- Steve Hollister: supports project.
- Kathy Barnett: supports project; questions the proposed density as being justifiable; opposes wall along Meadowlark Road; does not support placement of garages behind homes; wants more condo-miniums, community center, and a large park to serve the entire area rather than several pocket parks.
- Arthur Huebner: as a future parent of small children, prefers that lots back up to major streets with walls so that children do not run into a busy street.
- Jay Huebner: applicant, noted that, discounting 10 acres of land designated for Residential Multi-Family, 20 units per acre (required by Housing Element), the overall density of the project is about 4.0 units per acre – not substantially different from that in surrounding neighborhoods.

- Linda Midkiff: noted that traffic is presently steady on Meadowlark Road east of Oriole Way.
- Ray Harrod: applicant, supports reduction of amount of land designated for multi-family, 20 units per acre; maintained that if home faced a wall on the north side of Meadowlark Road, they would not sell.
- Tom Erskine: applicant, explained aspects of the project.

Action:

Commissioners discussed the project and formulated the following recommendations to the City Council for principles to be incorporated into the design of the project.

1. Block Length: Break up larger blocks with more connector streets and/or pedestrian paths to link the central park area with the outer reaches of the planning area, particularly in the southeast and northeast portions of the site. Add a connector street in the southeast portion between the multi-family and single family areas to facilitate connectivity to the commercial area. Some of these paths will run between homes and could cause some units/lots to be “lost”. 7-0 in favor.
2. Meadowlark Road Frontage: Homes should back up to Meadowlark Road with a decorative block wall or decorative fencing, to be enhanced with columns or “step in/out” jogs and a Charolais Road-style parkway with substantial landscaping. 6-1 in favor.
3. Beechwood Drive Frontage: Homes south of Silver Oak Drive should attempt to mirror the pattern on the east side of the street with some homes fronting onto the street and others siding onto the street. Homes north of Silver Oak Drive and opposite Virginia Peterson School should back up to Beechwood Drive with a decorative block wall or decorative fencing, to be enhanced with columns or “step in/out” jogs and Charolais Road-style parkway with substantial landscaping across from the school to encourage a more pedestrian friendly (kids walking to school) environment. Additionally, the park shown on the DeLuca property should be relocated to the corner of Beechwood Drive and the East-West Central Drive. 7-0 in favor.
4. Airport Road Frontage: Single family homes should back up to Airport Road with a decorative block wall or decorative fencing, to be enhanced with columns or “step in/out” jogs and a Charolais Road-style parkway. Multi-family complexes in the southeast portion of the site should be arranged so that units face Airport Road. 7-0 in favor.
5. Creston Road Frontage: Single family homes should back up to Creston Road with decorative block wall or decorative fencing, to be enhanced with columns or “step in/out” jogs and a Charolais Road-style parkway. Multi-family residential and commercial should face Creston Road. 7-0 in favor.
6. East-West Central Drive: Single family homes may back up to and side-on to this road with decorative block wall or decorative fencing, to be enhanced with columns or “step in/out” jogs, but the parkway should be widened, especially near the estate homes (on the cul-de-sac)

and on the west end on the De Luca property to make the linear parks more-usable. 6-1 in favor.

7. Residential Multi-Family, 20 Units per Acre:

- a. The three small areas (0.5 – 1.0 acre) north of the East-West Central Drive) should be eliminated. 7-0 in favor.
- b. With the decrease in the Regional Housing Need Allocation for low and very low income units (from in 1,094 units in 2001 to 200 units in 2012), the amount of RMF-20 land should be decreased from the present 200 unit requirement for the Beechwood Specific Plan Area via the upcoming Housing Element update and the general plan amendment for this project. Staff will prepare options for reductions.

Commissioner Gregory excused himself from the meeting.

- 8. Parks and Open Space: The parks and open space areas should supplement proposed trails and informal play areas with basic amenities to such as playgrounds, picnic/barbecue areas, and benches. Consideration should be given to combining detention basins/LID areas with ballfields, even if informal in nature. 6-0 in favor.

Note: Although one Commissioner recommended more amenities for the project (e.g., community center, sports fields, etc.), other Commissioners were not in favor of considering community centers or restrooms due to maintenance issues, the nature of multiple owners, and HOA complications.

- 9. Density: Commissioners advised the applicants to consider the changes described above and incorporate those recommendations that would result an improved project. The applicants were also asked to be prepared to defend the use of 5,000 sq ft lots for the following reasons:
 - a. Existing Topographical and grading challenges;
 - b. Surrounding neighborhoods have lot sizes of 7000 – 8000 sq ft;
 - c. Lot sizes capable of accommodating a SF home, garage and open space thereby resulting in a “Best Use of Land”, well-planned subdivision that “works”. 5-1 in favor.

OTHER SCHEDULED MATTERS - NONE

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE – NONE

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- 2. Development Review Committee Minutes (for approval)
 - a. September 9, 2013
 - b. September 16, 2013
 - c. September 23, 2013

Action: A motion was made by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Barth and passed 6-0-0 (Commissioners Gregory abstained from voting), to approve all minutes as presented.

- 3. Other Committee Reports:
 - a. Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee: No report.
 - b. Main Street Program: Commissioner Holstine provided a report.
 - c. Airport Advisory Committee: Commissioner Rollins provided a report.
 - d. Measure T Bond Oversight Committee: No report.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

- 4. September 10, 2013

Action: A motion was made by Commissioner Holstine, seconded by Commissioner Garcia and passed 6-0-0 (Commissioners Gregory and abstained from voting), to approve the Planning Commission minutes as presented.

REVIEW OF CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS

- 5. September 17, 2013: Reviewed by Commissioner Holstine

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

STAFF COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT to the Development Review Committee Meeting of Monday, October 14, 2013 at 3:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles;

subsequent adjournment to the City Council Meeting of Tuesday, October 15, 2013 at 7:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles;

subsequent adjournment to the Joint Planning Commission/City Council Breakfast of Friday, October 18, 2013 at 7:00 am at Touch of Paso Restaurant, 1414 Pine Street, Paso Robles;

subsequent adjournment to the Development Review Committee Meeting of Monday, October 21, 2013 at 3:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles;

subsequent adjournment to the Planning Commission Meeting of Tuesday, October 22, 2013 at 7:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles;

subsequent adjournment to the Development Review Committee Meeting on Monday, October 28, 2013 at 3:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles;

subsequent adjournment to the City Council Meeting of Tuesday, October 29, 2013 at 7:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles;

subsequent adjournment to the Development Review Committee Meeting on Monday, November 4, 2013 at 3:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles;

THESE MINUTES ARE NEITHER OFFICIAL NOR ARE THEY A PERMANENT PART OF THE RECORD UNTIL APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AT THEIR NEXT REGULAR MEETING.