

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.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
October 22, 2013

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Barth, Gregory and Vanderlip

ABSENT: Garcia, Holstine, Nash and Rollins

PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: None

STAFF BRIEFING: Due to lack of a quorum, all agenda items need to be continued to the Planning Commission's meeting of November 12, 2013.

AGENDA ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE TABLED OR RE-SCHEDULED: Items 1 and 2

PRESENTATIONS: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. General Plan Amendment 2013-002 – Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan

For the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council for a City-initiated amendment to the Land Use Element of the General Plan to amend the Land Use Element's Land Use Map (Figure LU-6) to redesignate 60 lots developed with urban uses located in the historic downtown (between Vine Street and the UP Railroad and between 10th and 21st Streets) to more accurately reflect the applicable zoning established by the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan.

Open Public Hearing.

Speakers: None

Closed Public Hearing.

Action:

A motion was made by Commissioner Gregory, seconded by Commissioner Barth, and passed 3-0-4 (Commissioners Garcia, Holstine, Nash and Rollins absent), to continue the public hearing to the Commission's meeting of November 12, 2013.

2. Draft Climate Action Plan

For the Planning Commission to consider the draft Climate Action Plan and environmental determination and make a recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed draft "qualified" Climate Action Plan and draft Negative Declaration.

Open Public Hearing.

Speakers: None

Closed Public Hearing.

Action:

A motion was made by Commissioner Gregory, seconded by Commissioner Barth, and passed 3-0-4 (Commissioners Garcia, Holstine, Nash and Rollins absent), to continue the public hearing to the Commission’s meeting of November 12, 2013.

OTHER SCHEDULED MATTERS - NONE

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE – NONE

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- 3. Development Review Committee Minutes (for approval)
 - a. October 7, 2013
 - b. October 14, 2013

Action: A motion was made by Commissioner Vanderlip, seconded by Commissioner Barth and passed 3-0-4 (Commissioners Garcia, Holstine, Nash and Rollins absent), to continue these items to the Commission’s meeting of November 12, 2013.

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

Action: A motion was made by Commissioner Vanderlip, seconded by Commissioner Barth and passed 3-0-4 (Commissioners Garcia, Holstine, Nash and Rollins absent), to continue these reports to the Commission’s meeting of November 12, 2013.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

5. October 8, 2013

Action: A motion was made by Commissioner Vanderlip, seconded by Commissioner Barth and passed 3-0-4 (Commissioners Garcia, Holstine, Nash and Rollins absent), to continue these minutes to the Commission's meeting of November 12, 2013.

REVIEW OF CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS

6. October 15, 2013

Action: A motion was made by Commissioner Vanderlip, seconded by Commissioner Barth and passed 3-0-4 (Commissioners Garcia, Holstine, Nash and Rollins absent), to continue this item to the Commission's meeting of November 12, 2013.

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

STAFF COMMENTS

Any writing or document pertaining to an open session item on this agenda which is distributed to a majority of the Planning Commission after the posting of this agenda will be available for public inspection at the time the subject writing or document is distributed. The writing or document will be available for public review in the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA, during normal business hours, and may be posted on the City's web site at <http://www.prcity.com/government/planning/commission/agendas.asp>.

All persons desiring to speak on an agenda item are asked to fill out *Speaker Information Cards* and place them at the Staff Table prior to public discussion of that item. Each individual speaker will be limited to a presentation total of three (3) minutes per item.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT Any individual, who because of a disability needs special assistance to attend or participate in this meeting, may request assistance by contacting the City Clerk's Office (805) 237-3960. Whenever possible, requests should be made four (4) working days in advance of the meeting.

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

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

subsequent adjournment to the City Council Meeting of Tuesday, November 5, 2013 at 7:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles;

subsequent adjournment to the Planning Commission Meeting, November 12, 2013 at 7:30 pm at Paso Robles City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles;

Planning Related Appeal Process

Decisions or determinations by the City's staff, Development Review Committee (DRC) or Planning Commission can be appealed by any interested person (applicant, neighbor, public official, or other interested party). The appeal process is described by Chapter 21.23.A of the City's Municipal Code, and is summarized as follows:

- a. An appeal of a staff determination or interpretation will be heard by the Planning Commission. There is no charge to the appealing party.
- b. The DRC is a subcommittee of the Planning Commission. Their role is to review design details as outlined in Chapter 21.23 B of the Municipal Code. Any decision, determination or recommendation of the DRC may be appealed to the full Planning Commission. There is no charge to the appealing party. In the absence of an appeal to the City Council, the Planning Commission is the final authority on Lot Line Adjustments, Parcel and Subdivision Maps, Conditional Use Permits, Planned Developments, design details and Zoning Code interpretations. Decisions and determinations by the Planning Commission are appeal able to the City Council. Appeals to the City Council require a \$200 fee deposit to be applied toward actual City costs to prepare the appeal (staff time to prepare a report that adequately responds to the appeal, report printing, and required public notices), as adopted by City Council Resolution No. 06-128. Appellants are hereby notified that the actual cost of an appeal may exceed the \$200 deposit and that they will be billed for any additional amounts necessary to cover actual City costs.

When must an appeal be filed?

An appeal must be filed within fifteen (15) calendar days of the decision. Upon receipt of an appeal, the matter will be scheduled for consideration before the appeal body as soon as feasible. Appeal applications can be obtained from the City's website at www.prcity.com, anyone in the Community Development Department or by calling (805) 237-3970.

What is the effect of filing an appeal?

If an appeal is filed, the body considering the appeal will consider the request as if it were a new application. Opportunities will be provided for all interested parties to speak and/or provide evidence to support approval or denial of the appeal.

There is no penalty for filing an appeal. The City cannot and will not penalize anyone for filing an appeal. Each application for a land use or other entitlement is handled on a "first-come-first-served" basis. (The City keeps a "log" of applications filed, and any of the public is welcome to confirm the order of processing for each application.)

How Can I Get More Information on Appeals?

Please check the City's website at www.prcity.com, call the Community Development Department at (805) 237-3970, or stop by City Hall at 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446.

THE PASO ROBLES PLANNING ACRONYM GLOSSARY

ADT:	Average daily trips made by vehicles or persons in a 24-hour period
ALUP:	Airport Land Use Plan
APCD:	Air Pollution Control District
BMP:	Best Management Practice, Bike Master Plan
CAP:	Climate Action Plan
CC&Rs:	Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (private agreements among property owners; the City has no authority to enforce these)
CDBG:	Community Development Block Grant (a federal grant program designed to benefit low and moderate income persons)
CEQA:	California Environmental Quality Act
CFD:	Community Facilities District
SLOCOG:	San Luis Obispo Council of Governments
CUP:	Conditional Use Permit
DRC:	Development Review Committee (a subcommittee of the Planning Commission)
EIR:	Environmental Impact Report
Ex Parte:	Communication between Planning Commissioners and applicants outside of a public meeting
FEMA:	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GHG:	Greenhouse gas
Greenfield:	A large area, usually at the edge of the City, in which properties are either mostly vacant or in agricultural use, but is planned for urban or suburban development
HOME:	Home Investment Partnership Act (a federal program to assist housing for low and moderate income households)
HCP:	Habitat Conservation Plan
HCD:	State Department of Housing & Community Development
HUD:	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
LAFCO:	Local Agency Formation Commission
LID:	Low Impact Development (measures to reduce rainwater runoff impacts)
LLA:	Landscaping and Lighting District
LOS:	Level of Service (a measurement of traffic efficiency used by CalTrans)
MOU:	Memorandum of Understanding
MND:	Mitigated Negative Declaration
NEG DEC:	Negative Declaration (a CEQA statement that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment)
NEPA:	National Environmental Policy Act
PD:	Planned Development/development plan
PUD:	Planned Unit Development (a type of condominium development in which the land beneath a residential unit is owned in fee, as opposed to air space ownership)
SOI:	Sphere of Influence
TOT:	Transient Occupancy Tax
Variance:	A form of relief from zoning development regulations based on physical constraints of a property that prevents development of the same type of buildings allowed on other properties within the same zone and in the same neighborhood
VMT:	Vehicle Miles Traveled