

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Warren Frace, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: City Hillside Grading Ordinance Amendment

DATE: August 9, 2016

Needs: For the Planning Commission to consider making a recommendation to the City Council regarding a comprehensive amendment to the "Grading Ordinance" (Zoning Ordinance sections 21.14A and 21.16E).

Facts:

1. Residential development grading regulations are included in the City's Zoning Ordinance, within two separate sections consisting of 13 pages: Section 21.14A Hillside Development District, and Section 21.16E R-1 District Regulations, provided in Attachment 2.
2. Regulations pertaining to grading and development have been modified and expanded several times since the initial Hillside Development Ordinance was adopted in 1982.
3. Amendments to hillside grading and development standards have occurred in response to changes in development preferences and comfort level in the City's discretionary review process.
4. The current hillside grading regulations apply to development proposed on land in the Hillside Overlay District (see Attachment 1, Hillside District Overlay Map), and property with slopes that are 10% or greater.
(Slope = Rise / Run, for example a 1 ft. rise / 10 ft. run = 10% slope.)
5. The grading regulations prohibit mass or pad grading for property covered under the ordinance.
6. The development community has expressed interest in updating the City's grading regulations.
7. Over 2015, staff met with local engineers and toured numerous subdivisions to better understand the effects of the Grading Ordinance.
8. Any amendment to the grading ordinance will require an environmental review, and Planning Commission and City Council hearings.

9. On September 1, 2015, the City Council considered a staff report on Grading Ordinance issuance and options. At the meeting the City Council directed that a Blue Ribbon advisory committee be formed to make recommendations on potential amendments to the Grading Ordinance.
10. At the September 15, 2015 City Council meeting, the Council appointed the following people to serve on the Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee:
 - Councilmember Gregory
 - Councilmember Hamon
 - Planning Commissioner Barth
 - Planning Commissioner Vanderlip
 - Christy Gabler – civil engineer
 - Brandon Maderos – landscape architect
 - Joe Chouinard – civil engineer
 - John Kudla – civil engineer (alternate)
 - Larry Warner – land use consultant (alternate)
11. The Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee and staff have met five times since October 2015 to review the Grading Ordinance and develop recommendations.
12. At the February 24, 2016 meeting the Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee made a consensus recommendation supporting a comprehensive revision to the Grading Ordinance.
13. On April 5, 2016, the City Council reviewed the Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee recommendation and forwarded it to Planning Commission for review and hearing without changes.

Analysis and Conclusion:

The current Grading Ordinance establishes a Hillside Development District with the stated purpose, "to establish development that conserves the natural character of hillside areas, preserves and enhances the scenic amenities of the City and minimizes environmental impacts resulting from extensive grading in visually sensitive areas." The Hillside Grading regulations include the following development standards:

- Formulas for calculating slope.
- Grading restrictions for sites with slopes over 10%.
- Lot size increases based on slope.
- Restrictions on the heights of graded slope banks and retaining walls.
- Prohibition of creating padded (flat) lots and "stair step mass grading."
- Methods to mitigate visual impacts that may result from grading.

Attachment 1, Section 21.14A (Hillside Development District), includes a map designating where grading standards apply. The Hillside regulations are referenced in the R-1 Single-Family District Standards. Most of the areas within the City that are included in the Hillside District have been built out with the exception of Chandler Ranch and a few infill areas of undeveloped land. Larger areas yet to be developed with slopes over 10% include the Olsen, Beechwood, and Borkey Specific Plan areas.

The R-1 Standards provide details on how grading standards are implemented in terms of calculating average slope and maximum density, and applying it to determine the “building envelope” for development. In general, the minimum lot size for new parcels are required to be larger as slope increases. This is a fairly universal approach to reducing grading impacts on steeper slopes. Table 21.16E.090 below establishes the minimum lot sizes based on slope.

**Table 21.16E.090
Minimum Lot Size Per Zoning District**

Slope	R-1	R-1, B-1	R-1, B-2	R-1, B-3	R-1, B-4	R-1, B-5
(percent)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)
0—4	7,000	7,500	10,000 (¼ acre +/-)	20,000 (½ acre +/-)	1 acre (43,560 sf)	2 acres (87,120 sf)
5—9	10,000	10,000	10,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
10—14	12,500	12,500	12,500	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
15—24	15,000	15,000	15,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
25—34	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres

In determining the minimum lot size, an applicant would need to determine the average slope of the developable area of a property. To calculate the “average slope”, the following formula is used. This method for determining average slope is unique to Paso Robles.

$$\frac{I \times L \times 0.0023}{A}$$

Where:

- I = Contour interval in feet. Contour intervals shall not exceed five feet.
- L = Combined length of contour lines measured within the net developable area.
- 0.0023 = A constant that converts square feet into acres and expresses slope in percent.
- A = Acreage of net developable area.

Other communities often determine average slope by measuring the property “rise” (number of contour intervals) divided by the length or “run” of the area measured.

Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee Review

Over the course of five meetings the Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee completed a thorough review of the Grading Ordinance including the review of grading policies in other communities. The committee reviewed City GIS slope mapping and demonstrations of the latest computer modeling techniques.



January 27, 2016 Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee meeting

The main issues the Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee identified were:

- Complexity of the ordinance.
- Blanket restriction of pad grading.
- Unnecessary restrictions on a relatively few, small infill sites.
- Definition of terminology
- Simplification of performance standards and landscape requirements.
- Need to have separate and flexible grading requirements for specific plans.

Pad Grading Restriction

The Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee’s primary concern with the existing ordinance is the blanket restriction of “mass” and “pad” grading, whereby several lots are

graded together in a uniform pattern. This grading technique is typically used in “production” or semi-custom home construction. Without the use of mass grading, subdivision with lots smaller than ½ acre may have awkward slopes between adjacent properties and/or streets. Often, small steep lots add to the cost of construction, since stepped foundations and other custom architectural solutions are required to absorb slope. This also limits the ability of builders to use stock building plans. Rear lot and cross lot drainage patterns also complicate tract design and long term maintenance. In general, non-padded lots (natural slope lots) with stepped house foundations work best on larger “estate” lots with custom construction. On smaller lots, production housing projects, this restriction likely is constraining housing production and affordability.

Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee Recommendation

The Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee is recommending by consensus a comprehensive amendment to the Grading Ordinance consistent with a draft ordinance contained in Attachments 2 (clean copy) and 3 (marked-up copy). Overall, the Grading Ordinance would be reduced from 22 pages down to 13 pages.

The key Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee recommendations include:

1. Alternative digital slope mapping methodology.
2. Definitions of terminology.
3. New Hillside Development District mapping with separate standards for:
 - a. Infill Hillside Overlay District
 - b. Other Zoning District (Theater Drive area / Airport area)
 - c. Specific Plans
4. New pad grading allowance for existing lots.
5. Ridgeline protection requirements for specific plan areas.
6. 3D computer modeling of slopes on “challenging” sites.
7. Removal of mass grading prohibition and replacement with the following standard:

Where mass or pad grading can be conducted in a manner consistent with the purpose and intent of this chapter and such grading is necessary for the reasonable use of the property, the goal shall be to minimize exposed slopes and retaining wall heights and to install mitigating landscaping.
8. Creation of single grading performance standards table.
9. Consolidation and simplification of the landscape requirements.
10. Removal of redundant and antiquated sections.

Policy

Reference: Paso Robles General Plan, Zoning Ordinance sections 21.14A and 21.16E (Grading Ordinance)

Fiscal

Impact: None.

Options: After consideration of the staff report, the Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee recommendation and public testimony, the Planning Commission may consider the following options:


- a. Recommended approval of the Grading Ordinance amendment by approving the following:
 1. Approve draft Resolution A, recommending, consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act, the City Council certify a Negative Declaration for the proposed project; and
 2. Approve draft Resolution B, recommending the City Council adopt an ordinance amending Zoning Ordinance sections 21.14A and 21.16E (Grading Ordinance) amendment as recommended by the Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee.
- b. Refer the item back to staff and / or Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee for additional analysis.
- c. Recommend additional / alternative amendments to the Grading Ordinance.
- d. Recommend the City Council take no action on the proposed amendment.

Attachments:

1. 1982 Map of Existing Hillside Overlay District
2. Proposed Update of Hillside Overlay District
3. Draft Resolution A - Recommendation to Certify Negative Declaration
4. Draft Resolution B - Recommendation to Amend Grading Ordinance
5. Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee's February 24, 2016 ordinance amendment recommendation (strike-through and underline version).
6. Proposed Initial Study - Negative Declaration

Attachment 1 – Existing Hillside Overlay District (1982)


FIGURE 21.14A.020



SHADED AREAS ARE WITHIN THE HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

* See the Union/46 Specific Plan for more detail. (The Trowbridge, Pemberton, and Shinn properties are within the Hillside Dev't District.)

Attachment 2 - Proposed Update of Hillside Overlay District



Attachment 3

Recommendation to Certify Negative Declaration

DRAFT RESOLUTION A

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL CERTIFY A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE RESIDENTIAL GRADING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT / ZONE CHANGE 15-005

APPLICANT – CITY OF PASO ROBLES 2016 GRADING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

WHEREAS, the City of Paso Robles has initiated an amendment to the City's Zoning Ordinance consisting of a comprehensive amendment to the City's Residential Grading Ordinance (Zoning Ordinance sections 21.14A and 21.16E) (Project); and

WHEREAS, the City Council appointed a Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee to review the existing Grading Ordinance and recommend changes to improve the City's review and permitting process; and

WHEREAS, the City's Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee has recommended the following amendments to the City Council;

1. Alternative digital slope mapping methodology.
2. Definitions of terminology.
3. New Hillside Development District mapping with separate standards for:
 - a. Infill Hillside Overlay District
 - b. Other Zoning District (Theater Drive area / Airport area)
 - c. Specific Plans
4. New pad grading allowance for existing lots.
5. Ridgeline protection requirements for specific plan areas.
6. 3D computer modeling of slopes on "challenging" sites.
7. Removal of mass grading prohibition and replacement with a flexible performance standard.
8. Creation of single grading performance standards table.
9. Consolidation and simplification of the landscape requirements.
10. Removal of redundant and antiquated sections; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq., and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study and a Draft Negative Declaration (ND) was prepared and circulated for a 20-

day public review period beginning on August 2, 2016 through August 22, 2016. The Draft ND/Initial Study dated August 2, 2016 is on file at the Paso Robles Community Development Department and available on line at: <http://www.prcity.com/government/departments/commdev/>; and

WHEREAS, the Negative Declaration found the Project would not have any impact on the environment and therefore no mitigation measures are proposed; and

WHEREAS, public notice of the proposed Draft ND was posted as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, (##/no) public comments have been received on the proposed Draft ND, that was publically noticed, circulated and posted as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on August 9, 2016, to consider the Initial Study and the draft ND prepared for the proposed Project, and to accept public testimony on the proposed Project and environmental determination.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of Paso Robles, as follows:

Section 1. All of the recitals above are true and correct and incorporated herein.

Section 2. Based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study / Negative Declaration prepared for this project and testimony received at the public hearing, the Planning Commission finds that there is no substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that there would be a significant impact on the environment. These findings are based on an independent review of the Initial Study, the Negative Declaration, and all comments received regarding the Negative Declaration, and based on the whole record. The Planning Commission finds that the Negative Declaration was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, that there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment, and the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission.

Section 3. The Planning Commission, based on its independent judgment and analysis, does hereby recommend adoption of the Negative Declaration for the Project, attached hereto as Exhibit A and B, in accordance with the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA. Exhibits A and B are hereby incorporated into this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 9th day of July, 2016, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Bob Rollins, Chairman

ATTEST:

Warren Frace, Secretary of the Planning Commission

Exhibit A - Negative Declaration Notice of Intent

Exhibit B – Initial Study

Exhibit A

CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT CERTIFIED NEGATIVE DECLARATION TRIBAL NOTIFICATION CONSISTENT WITH AB 52

Notice is hereby given that the City of Paso Robles will consider adoption of a Negative Declaration in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for the project described below:

Project Title: Residential Grading Ordinance Amendment
File Number: Zone Change 15-005
Applicant: City of Paso Robles
Project Location: City Wide Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Project Description: Residential Grading Ordinance Amendment / Zone Change 15-005:

The project consists of a comprehensive amendment to the City's Residential Grading Ordinance (Zoning Ordinance sections 21.14A and 21.6E) based on the recommendation from the City's Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee which include.

1. Alternative digital slope mapping methodology. 2. Definitions of terminology. 3. New Hillside Development District mapping with separate standards for infill Hillside Overlay District, b. Other Zoning District (Theater Drive area / Airport area), c. Specific Plans, 4. New pad grading allowance for existing lots., 5. Ridgeline protection requirements for specific plan areas. 6. 3D computer modeling of slopes on "challenging" sites. 7. Removal of mass grading prohibition and replacement with a more flexible standard allowing case by case design and appearance review of grading. 8. Creation of single grading performance standards table. 9. Consolidation and simplification of the landscape requirements. 10. Removal of redundant and antiquated sections.

The Public Review Period for the proposed Negative Declaration will commence on August 2, 2016, and end at the City Council. The Planning Commission and City Council will conduct public hearings and consider adopting a Negative Declaration for this project on the following dates:

Planning Commission: Tuesday, August 9, 2016

The hearing will take place in the Conference Room at the Paso Robles Library/City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California, at the hour of 7:30 pm.

FINDING

The City of Paso Robles has reviewed the above project in accordance with the City of Paso Robles' Rules and Procedures for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act and has determined that an Environmental Impact Report need not be prepared because:

- The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures described on the attached sheet and hereby made a part of Negative Declaration have been added to the project.

The Initial Study which provides the basis for this determination is available at the City of Paso Robles, Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446. **The ND is also available on the City website at: <http://www.prcity.com/government/departments/commdev/index.asp>.**

NOTICE

The public is invited to provide written comment on the Draft Negative Declaration and to provide oral comment at the public hearings noted above. The appropriateness of the Draft Negative Declaration will be reconsidered in light of the comments received.

Questions about and comments on the proposed project and Negative Declaration may be mailed to the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446 or e-mailed to wfrace@prcity.com provided that any comments are received prior to the time of the City Council hearing.


Warren Frace Community Development Director

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.


- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature:



Date

Exhibit B – Initial Study
Refer to Attachment 6 of staff report

Attachment 4

Recommendation to Amend Grading Ordinance

DRAFT RESOLUTION B

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE RESIDENTIAL GRADING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT / ZONE CHANGE 15-005

APPLICANT – CITY OF PASO ROBLES 2016 GRADING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

WHEREAS, the City of Paso Robles has initiated an amendment to the City's Zoning Ordinance consisting of a comprehensive amendment to the City's Residential Grading Ordinance (Zoning Ordinance sections 21.14A and 21.16E) (Project); and

WHEREAS, the City Council appointed a Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee to review the existing Grading Ordinance and recommend changes to improve the City's review and permitting process; and

WHEREAS, the City's Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee has recommended the following amendments to the City Council;

1. Alternative digital slope mapping methodology.
2. Definitions of terminology.
3. New Hillside Development District mapping with separate standards for:
 - a. Infill Hillside Overlay District
 - b. Other Zoning District (Theater Drive area / Airport area)
 - c. Specific Plans
4. New pad grading allowance for existing lots.
5. Ridgeline protection requirements for specific plan areas.
6. 3D computer modeling of slopes on "challenging" sites.
7. Removal of mass grading prohibition and replacement with a flexible performance standard.
8. Creation of single grading performance standards table.
9. Consolidation and simplification of the landscape requirements.
10. Removal of redundant and antiquated sections; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Grading Ordinance amendments are consistent with the Goals and Policies of the General Plan Land Use Element and Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed and recommended the City Council approve the Negative Declaration prepared for the Project; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Paso Robles, as follows:

Section 1. All of the above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. Based on the facts and analysis presented to it, including all written and oral testimony, the Planning Commission hereby makes following findings regarding Zoning Ordinance Amendment 15-005:

- a. The Zoning Ordinance Amendment is consistent with the Goals and Policies of the General Plan Land Use Element and Housing Element to protect scenic views and provide adequate housing supply for all income categories.
- b. Zoning Ordinance Amendment 15-005 would provide for orderly development within the City.

Section 3. Based on all of the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles recommends that the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles approve Zoning Ordinance Amendment 15-005 by adopting an ordinance to amend the Municipal Code (Grading Ordinance) as attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference:

- Repeal and replace Section 21.14A as shown on the Exhibit A
- Repeal and replace Section 21.16E as shown on the Exhibit B

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Paso Robles this 9th day of August 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

Bob Rollins, Chairman

ATTEST:

Warren Frace, Planning Commission Secretary

Exhibit A - Repeal and replace Section 21.14A
Exhibit B - Repeal and replace Section 21.16E

Exhibit A - Repeal and Replace Section 21.14A

Chapter 21.14A - HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

21.14A.010 - Purpose.

The purpose of the Hillside Development District is to establish development standards that conserve the natural character of hillside areas, preserve and enhance the scenic amenities of the City and minimize the environmental impact resulting from extensive grading in visually sensitive areas.

The Hillside Development District is not a grading code; compliance with these hillside development standards does not in any way imply that the resultant development is safe from erosion, land slippage or other hazards related to development on land with significant slopes, cuts or fills. Any development in hillside areas shall be performed in a manner consistent with recommendations of licensed civil engineer and subject to approval of the City Engineer.

(Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)

21.14A.020 - Applicability.

A. The Hillside Development District is established as an overlay district on the properties shown on Figure 21.14A.020 and over all properties, including properties outside of the hillside development district boundaries, where the average natural (ungraded) slope of the net developable areas of a property is 10% or greater.

1. The average slope of the net developable area of a property shall consist of the gross acreage of a property, minus the following:
 - a. Any dedication necessary to provide for the full rights-of-way of arterial and/or collector streets, as designated by the circulation element of the general plan, adjacent to and/or within a proposed subdivision, parcel map or lot line adjustment, in accordance with adopted standards for city streets;
 - b. Any areas of the site with natural slopes of 35% or greater;
 - c. Any areas of the site within the outer driplines of a compact grouping of 10 or more oak trees ("mature" as defined in Chapter 10.01 of this code), where driplines between trees in the grouping are separated by 10 feet or less;
 - d. Any areas of the site within the floodway of the Salinas River.
2. Average slope of the net developable area shall be calculated using the following formula:

Average slope =	$\frac{i \times L \times 0.0023}{A}$
-----------------	--------------------------------------

Where:

i = Contour interval in feet. Contour intervals shall not exceed five (5) feet.

L = Combined length of contour lines measured within the net developable area.

0.0023 = A constant that converts square feet into acres and expresses slope in percent.

A = Acreage of net developable area.

- B. Alternatively, a slope analysis map may be developed and presented to display:
1. slope ranges listed in Chapter 21.16E.030
 2. surface boundary, reflecting all exceptions listed in Chapter 21.14A.020

3. labeled existing ground contours with an interval of at least two feet
 4. This slope map is presented with the statistics of the surface created, including average slope.
- C. The hillside development standards are in addition to those development standards established within Chapter 21.16 (district use tables) except where the development standards for the primary district, as listed in the district use tables, are more restrictive than the development standards for hillside areas.
 - D. Where necessary to accomplish the purposes of this chapter, the City Council, Planning Commission and Development Review Committee and Community Development Director may impose additional conditions which may serve to limit the types and intensities of land uses to achieve the purpose and intent of this chapter.
 - E. Where a slope map reveals that a proposed tentative tract map has areas that fall under several slope categories, and that one or more of these areas are relatively small or narrow, the planning commission and/or City Council may apply the standards applicable to the nearest predominant slope category to ensure that strict compliance with the minimum lot size, width and depth requirements would not result in a subdivision with non-uniform lot areas or non-orderly development.

(Ord. 807 N.S. § 1, 2001; Ord. 635 N.S. Exh. A (part), 1992; Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)

21.14A.025 – Definitions

- A. **Hillside:** The term **Hillside** pertains to those areas with average slopes over 10%.
- B. **Ridgeline:** A **ridgeline** is a geological feature consisting of a line formed against the horizon by hills or bluffs. **Ridgelines** are typically considered significant when visible from beyond the project site
- C. **Mass Grading:** **Mass grading** is the excavation or deposition (cut and fill) of earthwork across a parcel for the construction of multiple buildings or other improvements. Mass grading usually involves the movement of earthen materials across existing or proposed property lines for the purpose of balancing the overall earthwork. Typically **massing grading** would involve grading multiple single-family residential parcels within a tract.
- D. **Viewshed:** A **viewshed** is the geographical area that is typically visible from a location beyond a project site. It includes all surrounding points that are in line of sight with that location and excludes points that are beyond the horizon or obstructed by terrain and other features (e.g., buildings, trees).
- E. **Pad Grading:** **Pad grading** is the excavation or deposition (cut and fill) of earthwork to create a relatively flat area on a single parcel for the construction of improvements.
- F. **Native Slope:** **Native slope** is the existing gradient of a land surface prior to human disturbance.
- G. **Contour Grading:** **Contour grading** is the design of earthwork to blend the constructed landform with the surrounding landforms to create a more visually appealing fit.
- H. **Developable Area:** **Developable area** shall be defined as that area used for streets, driveways, graded pads for improvements, and graded slopes.
- I. **Slope Banding:** **Banding** is the subdivision of a contour map into bands of topography that fall into distinct categories or areas of similar gradient. See slope categories below.

K. Slope Categories: Slope categories for determining lot sizes, widths and depths shall be determined by the category of the natural (ungraded) slope of the developable area of the lot. For this purpose, the following slope categories are established:

- 0 to 4.99 percent,
- 5 to 9.99 percent,
- 10 to 14.99 percent,
- 15 to 24.99 percent, and
- 25 to 34.99 percent.

21.14A.030 - Standards for hillside grading


Within the Hillside Development Districts identified on Figure 21.14A.020, the requirements and standards for the creation of new lots, via tract or parcel maps, the reconfiguration of existing lots via lot line adjustment, or the development of existing lots shall be as follows in the respective primary zoning districts:

- A. Within the Infill Hillside Overlay District, as specified within the R-1 district regulations (Section 21.16.020);
- B. Within other zoning districts, the standards specified within the R-1 district regulations (Section 21.16.020) shall be used as guidelines, and may be used as the basis for requirements by the Planning Commission and City Council.
- C. Within the Chandler Ranch, Borkey, Olsen and Beechwood Specific Plan Areas the standards specified within the R-1 district regulations (Section 21.16.020) shall be used as guidelines for the preparation of individual specific plan grading standards. The City Council shall find the specific plan grading standards are consistent with the intent of the R-1 district regulations.

It is recognized that the minimum lot sizes, widths, depths and development standards prescribed for the R-1 district may not be appropriate for hillside development within other zoning districts. Therefore, where necessary to accomplish the purposes of this chapter, the Planning Commission and City Council may require minimum lot sizes, widths, depths and development standards which are greater (more restrictive) than those prescribed by the primary district regulations other than the R-1 district. In no instance shall lot sizes or development standards be less than those prescribed in either the R-1 district or the other primary zone district, whichever is more restrictive.

(Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)

Figure 21.14A.020



B. Other Zoning Districts

C. Specific Plan Areas


A. Infill Hillside Overlay District

B. Other Zoning Districts

C. Specific Plan Areas

LEGEND

- City Limits
- GRADING DISTRICT**
- Infill Hillside
- Specific Plan



21.14A.040 - Standards applicable to existing hillside lots.

Within the Infill Hillside District, the following requirements and standards for development of already-created lots shall be in addition to those required in the regulations for the primary zoning districts:

- A. Those existing hillside lots which were created prior to the effective date of the ordinance (1989) codified in this chapter shall incorporate into their development all of the above-referenced standards for development of already-created lots, to the maximum extent feasible.
- B. It is not the intent of these regulations to preclude development of an existing and legally recognized parcel, and the Planning Commission and City Council may modify these standards to allow reasonable development of existing parcels where such modifications can be found by the Planning Commission and City Council to be consistent with the purpose and intent of these regulations.
- C. Individual pad grading shall be permitted on an existing lot with an average slope less than 15%.
- D. Individual pad grading may be approved by the Development Review Committee on existing lots with an average slope over 15% based on review of grading plans, slope landscape plan and preliminary architectural elevations.
- E. Development Review Committee approval, in accordance with Chapters 21.23A and 21.23B, shall be obtained prior to issuance of grading and building permits on lots with average slopes over 15%.

(Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)

21.14A.045 - Ridgelines.

Subdivisions shall be designed to minimize landform alteration as viewed from outside the site. Landscaping and contour grading shall be used to mitigate the visual effects of grading. Each Specific Plan shall include grading policies for the protection of prominent ridgelines.

21.14A.060 - Development Review Committee requirements.

A. Applications for development review of development on hillside lots shall consist of the plans (including topographic detail), drawings and other information to explain a development project as required in the City's standardized development handbook. Additional information shall be provided when it is determined by the Community Development Director to be necessary to illustrate the applicant's intent and/or impacts resulting from a specific project design element.

B. On particularly challenging sites, the Community Development Director, Development Review Committee, or Planning Commission may require 3D computer modeling of the raw grading landforms to better describe the land surface. Additional architectural rendering of site features and landscaping may be submitted at applicant's discretion.

(Ord. 635 N.S. Exh. A (part), 1992; Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)

Exhibit B - Repeal and Replace Section 21.16E

Article I. - SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL GRADING STANDARDS

21.16E.010 - Purpose.

The purpose of the R-1 district is to provide a district reserved for the development of single-family residential (one dwelling unit per lot) neighborhoods and compatible land uses, in both hillside and non-hillside areas.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A (A), 1989)

21.16E.020 - Applicability of hillside regulations.

The infill hillside overlay district is defined in Chapter 21.14A. The overlay district defines geographic areas subject to hillside development standards when average slope of the net developable area of the property exceeds 10%.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A (B), 1989)

21.16E.030 - Planned development overlay district applicability.

- A. The planned development overlay district (Chapter 21.16A) may be used as an overlay district to the R-1 district for the purposes of modifying the R-1 development standards contained within this chapter in order to create a subdivision with uniform lot areas and/or dimensions or to cluster lots in order to provide common open space.
- B. The number of single-family lots that may be created on a property via a subdivision or parcel map in the R-1, PD zoning district may be determined via application of density factors to the net developable acreage of a property via the two-step process outlined in Section 21.14.A.020.
- C. Determine Maximum Density for Average Slope. The maximum density, (single-family lots per acre) of a property proposed for development shall be determined by multiplying the property's net developable acreage by the maximum number of dwelling units (single-family lots) per net developable acre listed in the table below for the average slope of the net developable area.

Average Slope of Net Developable Area (%)	Maximum number of dwelling units (single-family lots) per net developable acre					
	R-1,PD	R-1,B-1,PD	R-1,B-2,PD	R-1,B-3,PD	R-1,B-4,PD	R-1,B-5,PD
0-4.99	4.2	4.0	3.3	1.7	0.9	0.45
5-9.99	3.3	3.3	3.3	1.7	0.9	0.45
10-14.99	2.7	2.7	2.7	1.7	0.9	0.45
15-24.99	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.7	0.9	0.45
25-34.99	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.9	0.45

Exceptions.

- a. On properties where the land use element of the general plan establishes maximum densities at one, two or three units per acre (i.e., RSF-1, RSF-2 and RSF-3 land use categories), maximum densities shall not exceed that established by the general plan.
- b. On properties that have been assigned zoning that includes a density factor appended to the base zoning district (e.g., R-1, PD2, which allows up to two single-family lots per acre), maximum densities shall not exceed the appended density factor.

(Ord. 771 N.S. Exh. A, 1999; Ord. 635 N.S. Exh. A (part), 1992; Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(C), 1989)

Article II. - New Single-Family Residential Lots

21.16E.050 - Applicability.

The minimum standards set out in this article shall apply to the creation of new lots via parcel or tract maps or the reconfiguration of existing lots via lot line adjustments consistent with the requirements of Section 21.14A.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E) (part), 1989)

21.16E.060 - Maximum developable slope.

No new lots shall be created which would necessitate the placement of building foundations upon natural slopes of 35% or greater. An applicant may be required to demonstrate that a lot has an adequate buildable area, in a manner subject to the approval of the Planning Commission and/or City Council. Exception: The Development Review Committee may approve decks and similar features on slopes over 35% if a finding can be made that there will be no changes or negative impacts to the native slope.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(1), 1989)

21.16E.090 - Lot sizes.

Minimum lot sizes shall be as set out in Table 21.16E.090. (Note: lot sizes are shown in square feet, unless otherwise noted. Lot sizes do not include fee or easement dedications for public street purposes.)

**TABLE 21.16E.090
MINIMUM LOT SIZE PER ZONING DISTRICT**

Slope	R-1	R-1, B-1	R-1, B-2	R-1, B-3	R-1, B-4	R-1, B-5
(percent)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)
0-4.99	7,000	7,500	10,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
5-9.99	10,000	10,000	10,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
10-14.99	12,500	12,500	12,500	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
15-24.99	15,000	15,000	15,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
25-34.99	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(4), 1989)

21.16E.100 - Lot widths.

Minimum lot widths shall be as set forth in Table 21.16E.100. Lot widths shall be measured at the front building setback line for all lots and shall not include driveway strips for flag lots.

**TABLE 21.16E.100
MINIMUM LOT WIDTH PER ZONING DISTRICT**

Slope	R-1	R-1, B-1	R-1, B-2	R-1, B-3	R-1, B-4	R-1, B-5
(percent)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)
0-4.99	70	70	80	100	100	100
5-9.99	80	80	80	100	100	100
10-14.99	100	100	100	100	100	100
15-24.99	120	120	120	120	120	120
25-34.99	150	150	150	150	150	150

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(5), 1989)

21.16E.120 - Buildability Demonstration.

A. As part of an application for a tract or parcel map or lot line adjustment, it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director, that the new lots to be created are buildable in a manner consistent with this code. For the purpose of demonstrating that lots are buildable, detailed drawings of conceptual site and grading plans for individual lots may be required by the Community Development Director to be submitted with the application.

B. The number and location of existing trees, especially oak trees, shall be a consideration in the design and sizing of lots. Oak tree preservation is a high priority for the City of El Paso de Robles, and parcels shall be configured in a manner designed to preclude future conflicts between creation of an adequate building envelope and the preservation of oak trees consistent with the City's Oak Tree Ordinance.

(Ord. 797 N.S. § 1 (part), 2000; Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(7), 1989)

21.16E.130 - Flag lots.

The driveway strips for flag lots may not be used for calculation of minimum lot size.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(8), 1989)

21.16E.140 - Grading limitations.

The following grading standards shall apply:

- A. Preliminary grading plans shall be submitted with every application for a subdivision map and may be required for submittal of parcel maps and lot line adjustment applications.
- B. Where mass or pad grading can be conducted in a manner consistent with the purpose and intent of this chapter and such grading is necessary for the reasonable use of the property. The goal shall be to minimize exposed slopes and retaining wall heights and to install mitigating landscaping.
- C. The vertical height of graded slopes and/or exterior retaining walls to create pads shall be limited as specified in Table 21.16E.140-1. The maximum vertical height of a graded slope or combination of graded slope and the exposed face of an exterior retaining wall used to create a pad shall be related to the size of the lot and shall not exceed the following limits.

Table 21.16E.140-1

Lot Size (sq ft)	Side / Front Yards			Rear Yards			All Yards
	2:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)	3:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)	Retaining Walls ** Vertical Wall Face (feet)	2:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)	3:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)	Retaining Walls ** Vertical Wall Face (feet)	≥ 4:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)
≤ 7,000	4	6	4	6	10	6	unlimited
7,001 – 9,999	8	10	4	8	12	6	unlimited
≥ 10,000	12	15	4	12	18	6	unlimited

** Multiple retaining walls may be permitted consistent with Figure 21.16E.020A


The graded slopes and / or retaining walls between two adjacent lots should be constructed on the lower lot. Between two adjacent lots, property lines must be located at the top of slopes.

Setbacks from property lines to graded slopes shall be consistent with California Building Code.

- E. All retaining walls to create building pads shall be constructed of masonry materials.
- F. The exposed face of a building stem wall shall not exceed nine (9) feet in average height and shall be landscaped and/or screened in a manner subject to approval of the Development Review Committee.
- G. Usable Yards. All lots shall provide a usable, unobstructed natural or manufactured (graded) area ten (10) feet in depth. "Usable" means that the slope is not more than five (5) percent. Where a residential building is designed to be built into existing natural slopes, this requirement may be met by providing either a five (5) foot wide usable manufactured area no less than the full width of a dwelling unit, or a deck a minimum of ten (10) feet in depth and no less than the full width of a dwelling unit. When the standard cannot be met, an alternative useable area may be approved by the DRC.
- H. The underside of decks that are three feet or higher above grade shall be screened with landscaping and/or architectural features.

FIGURE 21.16E.020A

HORIZONTAL DISTANCE BETWEEN
EXTERIOR RETAINING WALLS



In this illustration, "x" is greater than "y."
The walls shall be separated by "x" feet.

21.16E.145 – Visual Mitigation Measures

A. Contour Grading

1. The overall shape, height and grade of graded slopes shall not exceed 2:1; 3:1 slopes are preferred. (Exception: The City Engineer may approve steeper cut slopes for construction of streets, where a registered soils engineer recommends such approval.)
2. Slope grading design shall be based on the concepts of "contour grading," a technique that strives to maintain the pre-existing landform or to replicate natural landform patterns in the case of extensive grading.
3. The crest of all graded slopes in excess of six (6) feet vertical height shall be rounded. Where graded slopes intersect, the ends of each slope shall be horizontally rounded and blended.

B. Slope Landscape, Maintenance and Fencing

1. All graded slopes with vertical heights of three (3) feet or greater shall be provided with planting materials and an irrigation system that are under the control of a single property owner or under the jurisdiction of a common maintenance organization. The owner shall be responsible for the installation and maintenance of the irrigation.
2. A Conceptual Slope Landscape, maintenance and fencing plan shall be submitted with any map, development plan or site plan that proposed cut or fill slopes with vertical heights of three feet or greater. The plan shall be prepared by a landscape architect or qualified professional, reviewed and approved by the Development Review Committee, and contain the following minimum information:
 - a. Identification of all manufactured slopes that are visible from a public street.
 - b. Conceptual Landscape planting plans including:
 - i. Adequate mixture of trees, shrubs and groundcover to assure complete landscape coverage, soil stabilization and to promote varying height and mass of landscaping.
 - ii. Minimum of one tree for every 500 square feet of slope area.
 - iii. Use of drought tolerant, native plant species when possible. Plantings should be compatible with the natural vegetation and that on surrounding properties.
 - iv. Planting within 30 feet of buildings should be fire-resistant.
 - c. Conceptual irrigation plan.
 - d. Phasing plan for the timing of landscaping and irrigation installation.
 - e. Identify the proposed future maintenance mechanism or parties responsible for short term and long term maintenance.
 - f. Color and materials for retaining walls.
 - g. Provide location, construction detail, materials and heights for all fencing located on and along slopes.
 - i. Transparent view fencing should be used along the top on slopes exceeding 10 feet in height.
 - ii. Fencing should be placed at the top of manufactured slopes.
3. Final landscape, irrigation and fencing installation plans shall be submitted concurrently with residential building permits applications for lots with slopes identified on the Conceptual Slope Landscape Plan. All landscaping, irrigation and fencing shall be installed prior to final inspection.

(Ord. 807 N.S. § 2, 2001; Ord. 797 N.S. § 1 (part), 2000; Ord. 747 N.S. § 2, 1998; Ord. 727 N.S. Exh. A, 1997; Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(9), 1989)

21.16E.150 - Oak tree preservation.

Creation of new lots and streets shall be designed to protect oak trees in a manner consistent with the city's oak tree preservation ordinance (Chapter 10.01).

(Ord. 797 N.S. § 1 (part), 2000; Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(10), 1989)

21.16E.160 - Utilities.

- A. All utility service lines shall be under-grounded.
- B. Transformers, control points and other utility housings shall be located so as to minimize their visual impact and shall be screened in a manner approved by the architectural review committee.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(11), 1989)

21.16E.170 - Hillside street standard.

Use of the hillside street standard shall be subject to Planning Commission or City Council approval in conjunction with applications for tract maps, parcel maps, or a waiver of street improvements to be approved as specified in Chapter 21.23A.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(12), 1989)

Attachment 5

Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee's Recommended Amendments (with mark-ups)

Chapter 21.14A - HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

Sections:

21.14A.010 - Purpose.

The purpose of the Hillside Development District is to establish development standards that conserve the natural character of hillside areas, preserve and enhance the scenic amenities of the City and minimize the environmental impact resulting from extensive grading in visually sensitive areas.

The Hillside Development District is not a grading code; compliance with these hillside development standards does not in any way imply that the resultant development is safe from erosion, land slippage or other hazards related to development on land with significant slopes, cuts or fills. Any development in hillside areas shall be performed in a manner consistent with recommendations of licensed civil engineers and subject to approval of the City Engineer.

(Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)

21.14A.020 - Applicability.

A. The Hillside Development District is established as an overlay district on the properties shown on Figure 21.14A.020 and over all properties, including properties outside of the hillside development district boundaries, where the average natural (ungraded) slope of the net developable areas of a property is ~~ten percent (10%)~~ or greater.

1. The average slope of the net developable area of a property shall consist of the gross acreage of a property, minus the following:
 - a. Any dedication necessary to provide for the full rights-of-way of arterial and/or collector streets, as designated by the circulation element of the general plan, adjacent to and/or within a proposed subdivision, parcel map or lot line adjustment, in accordance with adopted standards for city streets;
 - b. Any areas of the site with natural slopes of ~~thirty-five~~ 35% percent or greater;
 - c. Any areas of the site within the outer driplines of a compact grouping of ~~ten-10~~ or more oak trees ("mature" as defined in Chapter 10.01 of this code), where driplines between trees in the grouping are separated by ~~ten-10~~ feet or less;
 - d. Any areas of the site within the floodway of the Salinas River.
2. Average slope of the net developable area shall be calculated using the following formula:

Average slope =	$\frac{H \times L \times 0.0023}{A}$
-----------------	--------------------------------------

Where:

H = Contour interval in feet. Contour intervals shall not exceed ~~five-five~~ (5) feet.

L = Combined length of contour lines measured within the net developable area.

0.0023 = A constant that converts square feet into acres and expresses slope in percent.

A = Acreage of net developable area.

- B. Alternatively, a 3D surface slope analysis map may be rendered developed and a slope map presented to display:
1. slope ranges listed in Chapter 21.16E.030
 2. surface boundary, reflecting all exceptions listed in Chapter 21.14A.020
 3. labeled existing ground contours with an interval of at least two feet
 4. This slope map is presented with the statistics of the surface created, including average slope.
- C. The hillside development standards are in addition to those development standards established within Chapter 21.16 (district use tables) except where the development standards for the primary district, as listed in the district use tables, are more restrictive than the development standards for hillside areas.
- ED. Where necessary to accomplish the purposes of this chapter, the City Council, Planning Commission and Development Review Committee and Community Development Director may impose additional conditions which may serve to limit the types and intensities of land uses to achieve the purpose and intent of this chapter.
- E. Where a slope map reveals that a proposed tentative tract map has areas that fall under several slope categories, and that one or more of these areas are relatively small or narrow, the planning commission and/or City Council may apply the standards applicable to the nearest predominant slope category to ensure that strict compliance with the minimum lot size, width and depth requirements would not result in a subdivision with non-uniform lot areas or non-orderly development.

(Ord. 807 N.S. § 1, 2001; Ord. 635 N.S. Exh. A (part), 1992; Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)

21.14A.025 – Definitions

- A. **Hillside:** The term **Hillside** pertains to those areas with average slopes over 10%.
- B. **Ridgeline:** A **ridgeline** is a geological feature consisting of a line formed against the horizon by hills or bluffs. **Ridgelines** are typically considered significant when visible from beyond the project site
- C. **Mass Grading:** **Mass grading** is the excavation or deposition (cut and fill) of earthwork across a parcel for the construction of multiple buildings or other improvements. Mass grading usually involves the movement of earthen materials across existing or proposed property lines for the purpose of balancing the overall earthwork. Typically **massing grading** would involve grading multiple single-family residential parcels within a tract.
- D. **Viewshed:** A **viewshed** is the geographical area that is typically visible from a location beyond a project site. It includes all surrounding points that are in line of sight with that location and excludes points that are beyond the horizon or obstructed by terrain and other features (e.g., buildings, trees).
- E. **Pad Grading:** **Pad grading** is the excavation or deposition (cut and fill) of earthwork to create a relatively flat area on a single parcel for the construction of improvements.
- F. **Native Slope:** **Native** slope is the existing gradient of a land surface prior to human disturbance.
- G. **Contour Grading:** **Contour grading** is the design of earthwork to blend the constructed landform with the surrounding landforms to create a more visually appealing fit.

H. **Developable Area:** **Developable area** shall be defined as that area used for streets, driveways, graded pads for improvements, and graded slopes.

I. **Slope Banding:** **Banding** is the subdivision of a contour map into bands of topography that fall into distinct categories or areas of similar gradient. See slope categories below.

K. **Slope Categories:** Slope categories for determining lot sizes, widths and depths shall be determined by the category of the natural (ungraded) slope of the developable area of the lot. For this purpose, the following slope categories are established:

- ~~zero~~ 0 to ~~four~~ 4.99 percent,
- ~~five~~ 5 to ~~nine~~ 9.99 percent,
- ~~ten~~ 10 to ~~fourteen~~ 14.99 percent,
- ~~fifteen~~ 15 to ~~twenty-four~~ 24.99 percent, and
- ~~twenty-five~~ 25 to ~~thirty-four~~ 34.99 percent.

21.14A.030 - Standards for ~~the creation and development of hillside lots.~~hillside grading


Within the Hillside ~~Development~~ development—~~Districts identified on Figure 21.14A.020~~, the requirements and standards for the creation of new lots, via tract or parcel maps, the reconfiguration of existing lots via lot line adjustment, or the development of existing lots shall be as follows in the respective primary zoning districts:

- A. Within the Infill Hillside Overlay District, as specified within the R-1 district regulations (Section 21.16.020);
- B. Within other zoning districts, the standards specified within the R-1 district regulations (Section 21.16.020) shall be used as guidelines, and may be used as the basis for requirements by the Planning Commission and City Council.
- C. Within the Chandler Ranch, Borkey, Olsen and Beechwood Specific Plan Areas the standards specified within the R-1 district regulations (Section 21.16.020) shall be used as guidelines for the preparation of individual specific plan grading standards. The City Council shall find the specific plan grading standards are consistent with the intent of the R-1 district regulations.

It is recognized that the minimum lot sizes, widths, depths and development standards prescribed for the R-1 district may not be appropriate for hillside development within other zoning districts. Therefore, where necessary to accomplish the purposes of this chapter, the Planning Commission and City Council may require minimum lot sizes, widths, depths and development standards which are greater (more restrictive) than those prescribed by the primary district regulations other than the R-1 district. In no instance shall lot sizes or development standards be less than those prescribed in either the R-1 district or the other primary zone district, whichever is more restrictive.

(Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)

Figure 21.14A.020



B. Other Zoning Districts

C. Specific Plan Areas

A. Infill Hillside Overlay District

B. Other Zoning Districts

C. Specific Plan Areas

LEGEND

- City Limits
- GRADING DISTRICT**
- Infill Hillside
- Specific Plan





FIGURE 21.14A.020



A: Within the R-1 District, as specified within the R-1 district regulations (Section 21.16.020);

~~B. Within other zoning districts, the standards specified within the R-1 district regulations (Section 21.16.020) shall be used as guidelines, and may be used as the basis for requirements by the Planning Commission and City Council.~~

~~It is recognized that the minimum lot sizes, widths, depths and development standards prescribed for the R-1 district may not be appropriate for hillside development within other zoning districts. Therefore, where necessary to accomplish the purposes of this chapter, the Planning Commission and City Council may require minimum lot sizes, widths, depths and development standards which are greater (more restrictive) than those prescribed by the primary district regulations other than the R-1 district. In no instance shall lot sizes or development standards be less than those prescribed in either the R-1 district or the other primary zone district, whichever is more restrictive.~~

~~(Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)~~

21.14A.040 - Standards applicable to existing hillside lots.

Within the ~~hillside Infill Hillside development district~~District, the following requirements and standards for development of already-created lots shall be in addition to those required in the regulations for the primary zoning districts:

- A. Those existing hillside lots which were created prior to the effective date of the ordinance (~~1989~~) codified in this chapter shall incorporate into their development all of the above-referenced standards for development of already-created lots, to the maximum extent feasible.
- B. It is not the intent of these regulations to preclude development of an existing and legally recognized parcel, and the ~~planning Planning commission Commission~~ and ~~city City council Council~~ may modify these standards to allow reasonable development of existing parcels where such modifications can be found by the Planning Commission and City Council to be consistent with the purpose and intent of these regulations.
- C. ~~Individual pad grading shall be permitted on an existing lot with an average slope less than 15%.~~
- D. ~~Individual pad grading may be approved by the Development Review Committee on existing lots with an average slope exceed 14.99 over 15% based on review of grading plans, slope landscape plan and preliminary architectural elevations.~~
- E. ~~Development Review Committee approval, in accordance with Chapters 21.23A and 21.23B, shall be obtained prior to issuance of grading and building permits on lots with average slopes over 14.9915%.~~

~~(Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)~~

~~21.164EA.180045 - Vistas~~Ridgelines.

~~Subdivisions shall be designed to minimize landform alteration as viewed from outside the site. Landscaping and contour grading shall be used to mitigate the visual effects of grading for streets. Each Specific Plan shall include grading policies for the protection of prominent ridgelines.~~

~~21.14A.050 - Permit requirements for development of hillside lots.~~

~~Development review approval, in accordance with Chapters 21.23A and 21.23B, shall be obtained prior to issuance of grading and building permits on hillside lots.~~

~~(Ord. 635 N.S. Exh. A (part), 1992; Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)~~

21.14A.060 - ~~Development review~~ Development -Review Committee requirements.

A. Applications for development review of development on hillside lots shall consist of the plans (including topographic detail), drawings and other information to explain a development project as required in the ~~city's~~ City's standardized development handbook. Additional information shall be provided when it is determined by the ~~community~~ Community development ~~director~~ Director to be necessary to illustrate the applicant's intent and/or impacts resulting from a specific project design element.

B. On particularly challenging sites, the Community Development Director, Development Review Committee, or Planning Commission may require 3D computer modeling of the raw grading landforms to better describe the land surface. Additional architectural rendering of site features and landscaping may be submitted at applicant's discretion.

(Ord. 635 N.S. Exh. A (part), 1992; Ord. 571 N.S. § 1 Exh. A (part), 1989)

Article I. - ~~GENERALLY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL GRADING STANDARDS~~

21.16E.010 - Purpose.

The purpose of the R-1 district is to provide a district reserved for the development of single-family residential (one dwelling unit per lot) neighborhoods and compatible land uses, in both hillside and non-hillside areas.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A (A), 1989)

21.16E.020 - Applicability of hillside regulations.

The infill hillside overlay district is defined in Chapter 21.14A. The overlay district defines geographic areas subject to hillside development standards when average slope of the net developable area of the property exceeds 9.9910%. ~~Properties defined in this chapter in terms of degree of existing topographic slope are also subject to the same hillside development standards.~~

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A (B), 1989)

21.16E.030 - Planned development overlay district applicability.

A. The planned development overlay district (Chapter 21.16A) may be used as an overlay district to the R-1 district for the purposes of modifying the R-1 development standards contained within this chapter in order to create a subdivision with uniform lot areas and/or dimensions or to cluster lots in order to provide common open space.

B. [CG1]The number of single-family lots that may be created on a property via a subdivision or parcel map in the R-1, PD zoning district may be determined via application of density factors to the net developable acreage of a property via the two-step process outlined in ~~this subsection~~Section 21.14.A.020.

~~1. Step 1: Determine net developable acreage of a property. The area eligible for calculation of density shall consist of the acreage of a parcel, minus the following:~~

~~a. Any dedication necessary to provide for the full rights of way of arterial and/or collector streets, as designated by the circulation element of the general plan, adjacent to and/or within a proposed subdivision, parcel map or lot line adjustment, in accordance with adopted standards for city streets;~~

~~b. Any areas of the site with natural slopes of thirty-five percent or greater;~~

~~c. Any areas of the site within the outer driplines of a compact grouping of ten or more oak trees ("mature" as defined in Chapter 10.01 of this code), where driplines between trees in the grouping are separated by ten feet or less;~~

~~d. Any areas of the site within the floodway of the Salinas River.~~

~~2. Step 2: Determine maximum density.~~

~~a. Determine Average Slope of Net Developable Area. General plan policy provides that densities be decreased as the underlying slope increases. Prior to applying the maximum densities allowed under a property's land use category to the net developable acreage, the average slope of the net developable acreage shall be calculated using the following formula:~~

Average slope:	$I \times L \times 0.0023$ A
---------------------------	--

~~Where:~~

~~I = Contour interval in feet. Contour intervals shall not exceed five feet.~~

~~L = Combined length of contour lines measured within the net developable area.~~

~~0.0023 = A constant that converts square feet into acres and expresses slope in percent.~~

~~A = Acreage of net developable area.~~

~~b. Alternatively, a 3D surface may be rendered and a slope map presented to display:~~

~~— slope ranges listed in Chapter 21.16E.030~~

~~— surface boundary, reflecting all exceptions listed in Chapter 21.14A.020~~

~~— labeled existing ground contours with an interval of at least two feet~~

~~— This slope map is presented with the statistics of the surface created, including average slope.~~

b.c. Determine Maximum Density for Average Slope. The maximum density, (single-family lots per acre) of a property proposed for development shall be determined by multiplying the property's net developable acreage by the maximum number of dwelling units (single-family lots) per net developable acre listed in the table below for the average slope of the net developable area.

Average Slope of Net Developable Area (%)	Maximum number of dwelling units (single-family lots) per net developable acre					
	R-1,PD	R-1,B-1,PD	R-1,B-2,PD	R-1,B-3,PD	R-1,B-4,PD	R-1,B-5,PD
0-4.99	4.2	4.0	3.3	1.7	0.9	0.45
5-9.99	3.3	3.3	3.3	1.7	0.9	0.45
10-14.99	2.7	2.7	2.7	1.7	0.9	0.45
15-24.99	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.7	0.9	0.45
25-34.99	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.9	0.45

~~31.~~ Exceptions.

- a. On properties where the land use element of the general plan establishes maximum densities at one, two or three units per acre (i.e., RSF-1, RSF-2 and RSF-3 land use categories), maximum densities shall not exceed that established by the general plan.
- b. On properties that have been assigned zoning that includes a density factor appended to the base zoning district (e.g., R-1, PD2, which allows up to two single-family lots per acre), maximum densities shall not exceed the appended density factor.

(Ord. 771 N.S. Exh. A, 1999; Ord. 635 N.S. Exh. A (part), 1992; Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(C), 1989)

~~21.16E.040 – Permitted uses.~~

~~Uses permitted by right and subject to approval of a conditional use permit in the R-1 district shall be as listed in Section 21.16.200. As noted in Table 21.16.200, accessory crop production, which includes dry and irrigated farming, orchards, and vineyards, shall be a permitted use when all of the following conditions are met:~~

~~A. It is accessory to a single-family dwelling;~~

~~B. There are no commercially applied pesticides, which could impact surrounding properties transmitted through surface runoff, ground water infiltration or air emissions; and~~

~~C. There are no use of audible pest control methods.~~

(Ord. 743 N.S. § 16, 1998; Ord. 703 N.S. § 6, 1995; Ord. 673 N.S. § B, 1994; Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(D), (Table 21.16.020-1), 1989)

Article II. - New Single-Family Residential Lots

21.16E.050 - Applicability.

The minimum standards set out in this article shall apply to the creation of new lots via parcel or tract maps or the reconfiguration of existing lots via lot line adjustments consistent with the requirements of Section 21.14A. ~~(Note: Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 21.20.150 (Lots less than minimum size), all lots which do not conform to the size, width or depth and maximum developable slope standards [WF2] contained within this chapter, but which were legally created prior to the effective date of the ordinance amending this chapter, are still legal lots and may be developed, subject to compliance with the current development standards of the zoning code.)~~

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E) (part), 1989)

21.16E.060 - Maximum developable slope.

No new lots shall be created which would necessitate the placement of building [CG3] foundations upon natural slopes of ~~thirty five percent~~ 35% or greater. An applicant-subdivider may be required to demonstrate that a lot has an adequate buildable area, in a manner subject to the approval of the planning-Planning

~~commission-Commission and/or city-City council-Council. Exception: The Development Review Committee may approve decks and similar features on slopes over 35% if a finding can be made that there will be no changes or negative impacts to the native slope.~~

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(1), 1989)

~~21.16E.070 – Effect of slope on lot sizes, widths and depths.~~

~~A. Lot[WF4] sizes, widths and depths shall be determined by the category of the natural (ungraded) slope of the developable area of the lot. For this purpose, the following slope categories are established:~~

~~zero to four percent,~~

~~five to nine percent,~~

~~ten to fourteen percent,~~

~~fifteen to twenty-four percent, and~~

~~twenty-five to thirty-four percent.~~

~~B. For new lots to be created by tract maps, parcel maps and lot line adjustments, "developable area" shall be defined as that area used for [CC5]pads, benches, driveways and graded slopes for buildings and [WF6]driveways.~~

~~C. Where [WF7] a proposed lot has more than one slope category, the developable area shall be determined by plotting a dimensioned building envelope on the proposed lot. (A separate detailed map or survey information may be required by the city planner for this purpose.) The building envelope shall represent the horizontal extent of pads, benches, driveways and graded slopes for buildings and driveways. If any portion of the building envelope overlays a natural slope of a steeper slope category, the lot size, width and depth requirements of the steeper category shall apply. It is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that a particular building envelope will feasibly accommodate the horizontal extent of pads, benches, driveways and graded slopes for buildings and [CC8]driveways.~~

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(2), 1989)

~~21.16E.080 – Slope determination.~~

~~A. A slope map shall be prepared for each application for a tentative tract map, tentative parcel map, and lot line adjustment. The slope map shall consist of a copy of the proposed tentative tract or parcel map or lot line adjustment map and shall show the following:~~

~~1. Contour intervals of two feet except where the slope is thirty percent or greater, in which case five-foot intervals shall be shown;~~

~~2. The percent of slope shall be determined as the vertical rise divided by the horizontal run, where the run is perpendicular to the contour lines, multiplied by one hundred;~~

~~3. The slope percent categories identified in this chapter for determining lot size, width and depths shall be overlaid on the map so that the boundaries of the categories are clearly delineated.~~

~~B. Where a slope map reveals that a proposed tentative tract map has areas that fall under several slope categories, and that one or more of these areas are relatively small or narrow, the planning commission and/or city council may apply the standards applicable to the nearest predominant slope category to ensure that strict compliance with the minimum lot size, width and depth requirements would not result in a subdivision with nonuniform lot areas or nonorderly development.~~

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(3), 1989)

~~21.16E.090 - Lot sizes.~~

Minimum lot sizes shall be as set out in Table 21.16E.090. (Note: lot sizes are shown in square feet, unless otherwise noted. Lot sizes do not include fee or easement dedications for public street purposes.)

|

~~21.16E.100 - Lot widths~~

~~Minimum lot widths shall be as set forth in Table 21.16E.100. Lot widths shall be measured at the front building setback line for all lots and shall not include driveway strips for flag lots.~~

**TABLE 21.16E.090
MINIMUM LOT SIZE PER ZONING DISTRICT**

Slope[CG9]	R-1	R-1, B-1	R-1, B-2	R-1, B-3	R-1, B-4	R-1, B-5
(percent)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)
0-4.990—4	7,000	7,500	10,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
5-9.995—9	10,000	10,000	10,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
10-14.9910—14	12,500	12,500	12,500	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
15-24.9915—24	15,000	15,000	15,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres
25-34.9925—34	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	1 acre	2 acres

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(4), 1989)

21.16E.100 - Lot widths.

Minimum lot widths shall be as set forth in Table 21.16E.100. Lot widths shall be measured at the front building setback line for all lots and shall not include driveway strips for flag lots.

**TABLE 21.16E.100
MINIMUM LOT WIDTH PER ZONING DISTRICT**

Slope[CG10]	R-1	R-1, B-1	R-1, B-2	R-1, B-3	R-1, B-4	R-1, B-5
(percent)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)	(sq. ft.)
0-4.990—4	70	70	80	100	100	100
5-9.995—9	80	80	80	100	100	100
10-14.9910—14	100	100	100	100	100	100

15-24.9915—24	120	120	120	120	120	120
25-34.9925—34	150	150	150	150	150	150

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(5), 1989)

~~21.16E.110 – Lot depths[CC11].~~

~~The minimum depth of any lot shall be one hundred feet where the natural (ungraded) slope beneath the developable area of a lot is less than ten percent, and shall be one hundred twenty feet where the natural (ungraded) slope beneath the developable area of a lot is ten percent or greater.~~

~~(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(6), 1989)~~

21.16E.120 - Buildability ~~demonstration~~Demonstration.

A. As part of an application for a tract or parcel map or lot line adjustment, it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the ~~city planner~~Community Development Director, that the new lots to be created are buildable in a manner consistent with this code. ~~the city does not in any way warrant that it will be economically feasible to build on any property.~~ For the purpose of demonstrating that lots are buildable, detailed drawings of conceptual site and grading plans for individual lots may be required by the ~~city planner~~Community Development Director to be submitted with the application.

B. The number and location of existing trees, especially oak trees, shall be a consideration in the design and sizing of lots. Oak tree preservation is a high priority for the ~~city~~City of El Paso de Robles, and parcels shall be configured in a manner designed to preclude future conflicts between creation of an adequate building envelope and the preservation of oak trees consistent with the City's Oak Tree Ordinance.

(Ord. 797 N.S. § 1 (part), 2000; Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(7), 1989)

21.16E.130 - Flag lots.

The driveway strips for flag lots may not be used for calculation of minimum lot size ~~but shall be ineligible for calculation of minimum lot widths and depths.~~

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(8), 1989)

21.16E.140 - Grading limitations.

The following grading standards shall apply:

A. Preliminary grading plans shall be submitted with every application for a subdivision map and may be required for submittal of parcel maps and lot line adjustment applications.

B. Where mass or pad grading can be conducted in a manner consistent with the purpose and intent of this chapter and such grading is necessary for the reasonable use of the property. The goal shall be to minimize exposed slopes and retaining wall heights and to install mitigating landscaping. (12/16/15 John Falkenstien wording).

~~“Stair step mass grading” and padding shall be prohibited avoided. In general, the extent of cut and fill grading shall be minimized. on all lots located within the hillside development district, as defined by Section 21.14A.020. Outside of the hillside development district, the extent of cut and fill grading shall be minimized. Where large scale mass grading or padding can be accomplished in a manner consistent with the purpose and intent of this chapter and such grading is necessary for the reasonable use of the property, extraordinary efforts shall be made to minimize exposed slope and retaining wall heights and to install mitigating landscaping. [CG12]~~

~~Exceptions: In the hillside development district, padding may be authorized as part of site plan review required by Section 21.23B.030 in the following situations:~~

- ~~1. On lots with areas one acre or larger (gross area, including half of the width of the right of way of adjacent streets) where the development review committee finds that the proposed pad does not create adverse visual impacts to other properties or to the public at large, when viewed from public streets and other vantage points open to the public (which could include private property designated for commercial use); and~~
- ~~2. Where the natural slope of the developable area of a lot, which includes the area under the footprint of a dwelling, necessary areas around the footprint for drainage (as specified by the adopted version of the Uniform Building Code codified in Title 17 of this Code) and usable yard, and a driveway, is less than ten percent, padding may be permitted, subject to the following conditions:
 - ~~(a) all graded slopes and retaining walls shall conform with the vertical height limits set forth in subsection D, of this section; and~~
 - ~~(b) a setback, no less than ten feet in width, from all interior property lines (those not abutting a street), in which there shall be no graded slopes or retaining walls, shall be provided.~~~~

~~G. Benching shall be encouraged and may be required as a construction technique in order to minimize the extent of grading and height of both retaining and stem walls.~~

~~DC.~~ The vertical height of graded slopes and/or exterior retaining walls to create pads ~~or benches~~ shall be limited as specified in ~~Table 21.16E.140-1~~ ~~this subsection~~. The maximum vertical height of a graded slope or combination of graded slope and the exposed face of an exterior retaining wall used to create a pad ~~or a bench~~ shall be related to the size of the lot and shall not exceed the following limits.

Table 21.16E.140-1

Lot Size (sq ft)	Side / Front Yards			Rear Yards			All Yards
	2:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)	3:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)	Retaining Walls ** Vertical Wall Face (feet)	2:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)	3:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)	Retaining Walls ** Vertical Wall Face (feet)	≥ 4:1 Slope Max Vertical Change (feet)
≤ 7,000	4	6	4	6	10	6	unlimited
7,001 – 9,999	8	10	4	8	12	6	unlimited
≥ 10,000[CG13]	12	15	4	12	18	6	unlimited

**** Multiple retaining walls may be permitted consistent with Figure 21.16E.020A**

The graded elevation differences slopes and / or retaining walls between two adjacent lots should be developed constructed on the lower lot.

(Between two adjacent lots, property lines must be located at the top of slopes.)

Setbacks from property lines to graded slopes shall be consistent with California Building Code.

1. Between two side yards or between a side and a rear yard:

- a. For each lot, the maximum height of the exposed face of an exterior retaining wall shall not exceed four feet. If more than one retaining wall is used, the minimum horizontal distance between the exposed faces shall be equal to, or greater than, the height of the exposed face of the higher of two adjacent walls. See Figure 21.16E.020A for a graphic example of this requirement.
- b. The average maximum height of a graded slope, series of exterior retaining walls, or combination of both shall be limited as follows:

Lot Size (sq ft)	Vertical Change (feet)
≤ 7,000	4
7,001 – 9,999	8
≥ 10,000[CG14]	12

i. Four feet on lots with areas of seven thousand square feet or less;

ii. Eight feet on lots with areas of ten thousand square feet or less;

iii. Twelve feet on lots with areas greater than ten thousand square feet.

Notes:

(1) The average height for all graded slopes is based on the standard ratio of two horizontal units to one vertical unit for graded slopes and shall be determined in the manner indicated in Figure 21.16E.020B. The average maximum heights of graded slopes may be increased proportionately if lower ratios such as three to one or four to one are utilized; please see Figure 21.16E.020C for an illustration of the proportionate change. [CG15]

(2) The heights of graded slopes on each individual lot shall, except as provided herein, be evaluated independent of the heights of cut and/or fill slopes on adjacent parcels.

~~(3) Where graded slopes are located on adjacent lots such that the combined height of graded slopes across adjacent lots exceeds twelve feet, a flat (zero to five percent) bench to be a minimum of ten feet wide shall be provided. Said bench shall be placed between the adjacent lots and between the adjacent slopes in order to accommodate fencing, drainage facilities, maintenance access and landscaping. The bench shall be heavily landscaped in a manner to be approved by the development review committee, with the intent of mitigating the visual impact of two adjacent slopes.~~

~~2. Between two rear yards:~~

- ~~a. For each lot, the maximum height of the exposed face of an exterior retaining wall shall not exceed six feet. If more than one retaining wall is used, the minimum horizontal distance between the exposed faces shall be equal to, or greater than, the height of the exposed face of the higher of two adjacent walls. See Figure 21.16E.020A for a graphic example of this requirement.~~
- ~~b. The average maximum height of a grade slope, series of exterior retaining walls, or combination of both shall be limited as follows:~~

<u>Vertical Change (feet)</u>	<u>Lot Size (sq ft)</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>≤ 7,000</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>7,001—9,999</u>
<u>12</u>	<u>≥ 10,000[CG16]</u>

~~i. Six feet on lots with areas of seven thousand square feet or less;~~

~~ii. Eight feet on lots with areas of ten thousand square feet or less;~~

~~iii. Twelve feet on lots with areas greater than ten thousand square feet.~~

~~Notes:~~

~~(1) The average height for all graded slopes is based on the standard ratio of two horizontal units to one vertical unit for graded slopes and shall be determined in the manner indicated in Figure 21.16E.020B. The average maximum heights of graded slopes may be increased proportionately if lower ratios such as three to one or four to one are utilized; please see Figure 21.16E.020C for an illustration of the proportionate change.~~

~~(2) The heights of graded slopes on each individual lot shall, except as provided herein, be evaluated independent of the heights of cut and/or fill slopes on adjacent parcels.~~

~~(3) Where graded slopes are located on adjacent lots such that the combined height of graded slopes across adjacent lots exceeds twelve feet, a flat (zero to five percent) bench to be a minimum of ten feet wide shall be provided. Said bench shall be placed between the adjacent lots and between the adjacent slopes in order to accommodate fencing, drainage facilities, maintenance access and landscaping. The bench shall be heavily landscaped in a manner to be approved by the development review committee, with the intent of mitigating the visual impact of two adjacent slopes.~~

~~3. Notes:~~


- ~~a. Where streets are parallel with contour lines, the regulations set out in this subsection may require that downhill lots be graded to drain to a drainage easement in the rear of the downhill lots instead of draining to the street.~~
- ~~b. Benching, raised (stem) wall foundations, interior retaining walls, and similar construction methods may be required in order to comply with the limits set out in this subsection for vertical height of graded slopes and/or exterior retaining walls for pads or benches.~~

~~c. Gravity/Crib Wall Option. If the applicant can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the planning commission/development review committee that use of a gravity or crib wall will reduce the amount of grading/landform modification and will provide a suitable alternative to a terraced retaining wall (series of two or more retaining walls on a single slope), the planning commission/development review committee shall consider and may approve use of a gravity or crib wall design for side and/or rear yard locations. The maximum acceptable height of the gravity/crib wall, and the individual design factors of such walls (for example, whether or not a bench and/or landscaping is required), shall be evaluated on a case by case basis. The extent to which the wall would be in public view shall be a consideration for the planning commission/development review committee.~~

- E. All retaining walls to create building pads shall be constructed of masonry materials.
- F. The exposed face of a building stem wall shall not exceed nine (9) feet in average height and shall be ~~heavily~~ landscaped and/or screened in a manner subject to approval of the ~~city~~ Development Review Committee~~council or its designee~~.
- G. Usable Rear Yard, For All Lots, Regardless of Locations. In the rear yard of all lots~~All lots shall provide, a usable, unobstructed natural or manufactured (graded) area ten (10) feet in depth shall be provided. "Usable" means that the slope is is a minimum of two percent but not more than five (5) percent. Where a residential building is designed to be built into existing natural slopes, this requirement may be met by providing either a five (5)- foot wide usable manufactured area no less than the full width of a dwelling unit, or a deck a minimum of ten (10) feet in depth and no less than the full width of a dwelling unit. When the standard cannot be met, an alternative useable area may be approved by the DRC.~~
- H. The underside of decks that are three feet or higher above grade shall be screened with landscaping and/or architectural features.~~such as wooden lattice.~~

FIGURE 21.16E.020A

HORIZONTAL DISTANCE BETWEEN
EXTERIOR RETAINING WALLS



In this illustration, "x" is greater than "y."
The walls shall be separated by "x" feet.

21.16E.145 – Visual Mitigation Measures

A. Contour Grading

- G1. The overall shape, height and grade of graded slopes shall not exceed ~~two horizontal units to one vertical unit~~ 2:1; ~~four three to one~~ 3:1 slopes are preferred. (Exception: The City Engineer may approve steeper cut slopes for construction of streets, where a registered soils engineer recommends such approval.) [CG17]
- H2. Slope grading design shall be based on the concepts of "contour grading," a technique that strives to maintain the pre-existing landform or to replicate natural landform patterns in the case of extensive grading.
- t-3 The crest of all graded slopes in excess of ~~eight six~~ (6) feet vertical height shall be rounded. Where graded slopes intersect, the ends of each slope shall be horizontally rounded and blended.

B. Slope Landscape, Maintenance and Fencing

1. All graded slopes with vertical heights of three (3) feet or greater shall be provided with ~~landscaping planting~~ materials and an irrigation systems that are under the control of a single property owner or under the jurisdiction of a ~~homeowner's association~~ common maintenance organization. The owner shall be responsible for the installation and maintenance of the irrigation. [CG18].
2. A [WF19] Conceptual Slope Landscape, maintenance and fencing plan shall be submitted with any map, development plan or site plan that proposed cut or fill slopes with vertical heights of three feet or greater. The plan shall be prepared by a landscape architect or qualified professional, reviewed and approved by the Development Review Committee, and contain the following minimum information:
 - a. Identification of all manufactured slopes that are visible from a public street.
 - b. Conceptual Landscape planting plans including:
 - i. Adequate mixture of trees, shrubs and groundcover to assure complete landscape coverage, soil stabilization and to promote varying height and mass of landscaping.
 - ii. Minimum of one tree for every ~~five hundred~~ 500 square feet of slope area.
 - iii. Use of drought tolerant, native plant species when possible. Plantings should be compatible with the natural vegetation and that on surrounding properties.
 - iv. Planting within ~~thirty~~ 30 feet of buildings should be fire-resistant.
 - c. Conceptual irrigation plan.
 - d. Phasing plan for the timing of landscaping and irrigation installation.
 - e. Identify the proposed future maintenance mechanism or parties responsible for short term and long term maintenance.
 - f. Color and materials for retaining walls.
 - g. Provide location, construction detail, materials and heights for all fencing located on and along slopes.
 - i. Transparent ~~v~~view fencing should be used along the top on slopes exceeding 10 feet in height.
 - ii. Fencing should ~~not~~ be placed at the ~~base~~ top of manufactured slopes.
3. Final landscape, irrigation and fencing installation plans shall be submitted concurrently with residential building permits applications for lots with slopes identified on the

Conceptual Slope Landscape Plan. All landscaping, irrigation and fencing shall be installed prior to final inspection.

~~K. All grading activities are subject to specific erosion control measures required by the city engineer. Grading plans shall be prepared by a California-licensed engineer. (Exception: If a California-licensed architect prepared the structural plans for a building, the architect may prepare the grading plans[WF20].-) [CG21]~~

~~L. Manufactured Slopes:~~

~~1. Multi-Parcel Grading. These requirements apply when a grading permit is submitted for more than one lot or parcel (located outside of the hillside development district).~~

~~a. All Manufactured Slopes Requiring a Grading Permit. All manufactured slopes shall be prepared and maintained with erosion protection. This control shall consist of hydroseeding[CC22] and other materials approved by the city engineer and director of community development to be completed within one month of the grading operation unless granted an extension by the city engineer. Soil amendment and soil preparation may be required by the city engineer prior to hydroseeding to ensure the establishment of the plant material. Hydromulch seeds should be applied following the first measurable rainfall in the fall of the year or a temporary irrigation method may be required to ensure germination and minimum growth. If the natural rainfall fails to provide adequate moisture for germination, supplemental irrigation and replanting may be required.~~

~~b. Manufactured Slopes Visible From a Public Street. Manufactured slopes determined by the planning division to be visible from a public street will be required to install landscaping in addition to the hydroseeding[CC23] prescribed above. If there is a question regarding the visibility of a slope, the planning division may defer the determination to the development review committee. The additional landscaping must be installed prior to certificate of occupancy for associated building construction.~~

~~c. Plan Required. A landscaping plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the development review committee. The landscaping plan shall be designed by a landscape architect. Soil amendment, plant material, installation and irrigation shall be included in the landscape plan. New landscaping shall incorporate plant species, which meet the following criteria:~~

~~(A) New vegetation should be compatible with natural vegetation and that on surrounding properties.~~

~~(B) All planting within thirty feet of buildings should be fire-retardant.~~

~~(C) For water conservation purposes, drought-resistant species are encouraged.~~

~~ii. Quantity of Vegetation. Manufactured slopes shall be planted and irrigated per the following standards:~~

~~(A) Groundcover. Manufactured slopes shall be planted with groundcover materials for erosion control. Groundcover may be as hydromulch or planted from rooted cuttings.~~

~~(B) Trees and Shrubs. Manufactured slopes have a mixture of trees and shrubs incorporated within groundcover to assure soil stabilization and to promote varying height and mass of landscaping. However, within the private portions of single-family lots, sloped areas which are less than eight feet in height are not required to be planted with shrubs, and sloped areas less than five feet in height are not required to be planted with trees.~~

~~There shall be a minimum of one tree for every five hundred square feet of slope area. If permanent groundcover is applied as a hydromulch, there shall be a minimum of one shrub for every one hundred twenty-five square feet of slope area. If rooted cuttings are utilized as groundcover, there shall be one shrub for every three hundred square feet of slope area. There should be a mix of one-gallon to fifteen-gallon trees and shrubs to promote varying height and mass of landscaping. Box-sized trees require retaining walls on slopes to prevent slope failure.~~

~~iii. Landscaping Installation. The landscape architect that prepared the landscaping plan shall supervise the installation of soil amendments, landscaping materials, and irrigation system to insure that the required work is done per the approved plan. The landscape architect shall provide the city of El Paso de Robles with a written confirmation that the soil amendments, landscaping materials, and irrigation system are installed per the plan approved by the city.~~

~~2. Individual Lot Grading. These requirements apply when a grading permit is submitted for a single lot.~~

~~a. All Manufactured Slopes Requiring a Grading Permit. All manufactured slopes shall be prepared and maintained with erosion protection as prescribed in subsection (L)(1)(a) of this section.~~

~~b. Manufactured Slopes Visible From a Public Street. Manufactured slopes determined by the planning division to be visible from a public street will be required to install landscaping as prescribed in subsection (L)(1)(b) of this section. However, a landscape architect is not required to design the landscaping plan. Applicants are encouraged to consult a landscape professional when designing the landscape plan.~~

~~M. 1. Usable [WF24] Rear Yard, For All Lots, Regardless of Location. In the rear yard of all lots, a usable, unobstructed natural or manufactured (graded) area ten feet in depth shall be provided. "Usable" means that the slope is a minimum of two percent but not more than five percent. Where a residential building is designed to be built into existing natural slopes, this requirement may be met by providing either a five-foot wide usable manufactured area no less than the full width of a dwelling unit, or a deck a minimum of ten feet in depth and no less than the full width of a dwelling unit. The underside of decks that are three feet or higher above grade shall be screened with landscaping and/or architectural features such as wooden lattice.~~

~~Exception: The planning commission, development review committee or staff shall consider and may approve proposals for the usable rear yard requirement to be met by designating an equivalent (in area as noted above) side yard (or a combination of rear and side yard). The minimum dimension for any usable yard area shall be ten feet.~~

~~2. For Lots That are Adjacent to, and Elevated Above, an Arterial or Collector Street, as Designated by the Circulation Element of the General Plan.~~

~~a. Where a dwelling unit is placed on a manufactured pad, and the average height of the manufactured slopes for this pad in the rear or street side yard adjacent to an arterial or collector street is ten feet or more, the dwelling unit shall be set back a minimum of fifteen feet from the top of the manufactured slope.~~

~~b. Where a residential building is designed to be built into existing natural slopes, and a deck is proposed to be the means to meet the usable yard requirement described in subsection (M)(1) of this section, if the rear yard is adjacent to an arterial or collector street, the underside of such a deck, regardless of height above grade, shall be screened with landscaping and/or architectural features such as wooden lattice. Alternative solutions may be proposed to the development review committee (DRC).~~


~~The DRC shall have the authority to limit the proposed size and dimensions of any deck, but not less than the minimum dimensions of ten feet of depth and full width of the dwelling unit, if it finds that a proposed deck of greater depth and width would create negative visual impacts.~~

~~c. The requirements of subsections (M)(2)(a) and (M)(2)(b) of this section shall be applied to all lots created by tentative subdivision (tract) maps, tentative parcel maps or lot line adjustments that are approved after July 1, 1998. On any lot created prior to that date, the development review committee shall review a site plan application and require grading and landscaping treatment appropriate to the size and dimensions of the lot with the intent of reducing visual impacts.~~

(Ord. 807 N.S. § 2, 2001; Ord. 797 N.S. § 1 (part), 2000; Ord. 747 N.S. § 2, 1998; Ord. 727 N.S. Exh. A, 1997; Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(9), 1989)

FIGURE 21.16E.020A

HORIZONTAL DISTANCE BETWEEN
EXTERIOR RETAINING WALLS



In this illustration, "x" is greater than "y."
The walls shall be separated by "x" feet.

21.16E.150 - Oak tree preservation.

Creation of new lots and streets shall be designed to protect oak trees in a manner consistent with the city's oak tree preservation ordinance (Chapter 10.01).

(Ord. 797 N.S. § 1 (part), 2000: Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(10), 1989)

21.16E.160 - Utilities.

- A. All utility service lines shall be under-grounded.

- B. Transformers, control points and other utility housings shall be located so as to minimize their visual impact and shall be screened in a manner approved by the architectural review committee.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(11), 1989)



21.16E.170 - Hillside street standard.

Use of the hillside street standard shall be subject to Planning Commission or City Council approval in conjunction with applications for tract maps, parcel maps, or a waiver of street improvements to be approved as specified in Chapter 21.23A.

(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(12), 1989)

FIGURE 21.16E.020B

METHOD OF DETERMINATION OF
AVERAGE HEIGHT OF GRADED SLOPE




The average height of the graded slope area is determined by the average heights of the graded slope as measured at two points at either end of a pad or bench in a direction perpendicular to the edge of the pad or bench.

In the above figure, the average height of the spaced graded slope is:

$$\frac{\text{vertical height from A to B} + \text{vertical height from C to D}}{2}$$

FIGURE 21.16E.020.C



~~21.16E.180 - Viotas.~~

~~Subdivisions shall be designed to minimize landform alteration as viewed from outside the site. Landscaping shall be used to mitigate the visual effects of grading for streets.~~

~~(Ord. 572 N.S. § 2 Exh. A(E)(13), 1989)~~

Attachment 6

Initial Study - Negative Declaration

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM CITY OF PASO ROBLES

1. **PROJECT TITLE:** Residential Grading Ordinance Amendment / Zone Change 15-005

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

Contact: Warren Frace
Phone: (805) 237-3970
Email: wfrace@prcity.com

3. **PROJECT LOCATION:** City Wide Zoning Ordinance Amendment

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

Contact Person: Warren Frace
Community Development Director

Phone: (805) 239-3970
Email: wfrace@prcity.com

5. **GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS:** Residential Suburban and Residential Single Family Land Uses

6. **ZONING:** R1 (Residential Single Family) and Residential Agriculture zones

7. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Residential Grading Ordinance Amendment / Zone Change 15-005:

The project consists of a comprehensive amendment to the City's Residential Grading Ordinance (Zoning Ordinance sections 21.14A and 21.6E) based on the recommendation from the City's Grading Ordinance Advisory Committee which include.


1. Alternative digital slope mapping methodology.
2. Definitions of terminology.
3. New Hillside Development District mapping with separate standards for:
 - a. Infill Hillside Overlay District
 - b. Other Zoning District (Theater Drive area / Airport area)
 - c. Specific Plans
4. New pad grading allowance for existing lots.
5. Ridgeline protection requirements for specific plan areas.
6. 3D computer modeling of slopes on "challenging" sites.
7. Removal of mass grading prohibition and replacement with a more flexible standard allowing case by case design and appearance review of grading.

8. Creation of single grading performance standards table.
9. Consolidation and simplification of the landscape requirements.
10. Removal of redundant and antiquated sections.

The project will affect all areas with single-family residential zoning designations.

8. **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:** The project will primarily affected vacant and under-utilized single-family residential land within the City limits. These site are typically characterized with gentle to moderate slopes and with typical vegetation consisting of non-native grasslands and oak savannahs. The Grading Ordinance will be applied to tentative tract map and specific plan approval processes that require CEQA review and Planning Commission public hearings.
9. **OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED):** None.

Location Map



ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.


- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature:



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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project will allow additional grading in hillside areas, but includes section 21.4A.045 requiring to protection of prominent "Ridgelines."				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project will allow additional grading in hillside areas, but includes a comprehensive design review process for proposed residential grading to minimize impacts to scenic resources such as native trees or unique geologic features.				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project will allow additional grading in hillside areas, but includes a comprehensive design review process for proposed residential grading to minimize impacts to scenic resources and requires contour grading and landscaping of cut and fills to minimize the visual impact of grading.				
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project would not create or alter light sources or standards.				

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project is not located on agriculturally zoned land and there are no agricultural activities taking place on the site.				
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Refer to Section II.a.				
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Code section 4526), or timberland zoned
Timberland Production (as defined by
Government Code section 5114(g))?

Discussion: The project is not located on agriculturally zoned land and there are no agricultural activities taking place on the site.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Areas with native oak woodlands are currently designated with single-family residential zoning. The amended grading ordinance would require grading and development impacts to these woodlands to be minimized.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: This project would not result in the conversion of farmland or forest land.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Grading operations have the potential to create PM-10 emission (dust) that could result in violations of air quality standards. The City's current review and approval process for all grading permits require standard performance measures to ensure compliance with Air Pollution Control District (APCD) dust mitigation requirements. All future grading projects approved under an amended Grading Ordinance would be subject to these standards.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Refer to section III.b.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Refer to section III.b.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment will not create or affect odor issues.				

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-d): The project will primarily affected vacant and under-utilized single-family residential land within the City limits. These site are typically characterized with gentle to moderate slopes and with typical vegetation consisting of non-native grasslands and oak savannahs. There is the possibility that some of these site contain sensitive habitat areas. The Grading Ordinance will be applied to tentative tract map and specific plan approval processes that require CEQA review for potential biological impacts which will be either avoided or mitigated on a project specific basis.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion (e) Areas with native oak woodlands are currently designated with single-family residential zoning. The amended grading ordinance would require grading and development impacts to oak trees and woodlands to be minimized. The City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance provides a process for property owners to apply for removing oak trees. The review and approval of oak tree removals associated with new development requires approval by the City Council. The two oak trees on this site will either be allowed to be removed by the City Council, or required to be protected, therefore conflicts related to the City's Oak Tree

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Preservation Ordinance is less than significant.				

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion Refer to Section IV.d.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-d):

Any grading operation within the City of Paso Robles has the potential to disturb Native American cultural resources. The amendments to the Grading Ordinance do not increase the significance of this risk. The Grading Ordinance will be applied to tentative tract map and specific plan approval processes that require CEQA review for potential cultural resource impacts which will be either avoided or mitigated on a project specific basis

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

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment does not change the potential for impacts that may result from fault rupture in the City of Paso Robles as identified and addressed in the General Plan EIR, pg. 4.5-8. There are two known fault zones on either side of the Salinas Rivers valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley, and grazes the City on its western boundary. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and is situated about 30 miles east of Paso Robles. The

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

City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the Uniform Building Code to all new development within the City. Review of available information and examinations indicate that neither of these faults is active with respect to ground rupture in Paso Robles. Soils and geotechnical reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standard conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within City limits.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
(Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment does not change the potential for exposure to ground shaking. The General Plan EIR identified impacts resulting from ground shaking as less than significant and provided mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the design of this project including adequate structural design and not constructing over active or potentially active faults.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure,
including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 &
3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment does not change the potential for exposure to liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events and soil conditions. To implement the EIR's mitigation measures to reduce this potential impact, the City has a standard condition to require submittal of soils and geotechnical reports, which include site-specific analysis of liquefaction potential for all building permits for new construction, and incorporation of the recommendations of said reports into the design of the project

- | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iv. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment does not change the potential for exposure to landslides. Soil engineering reports are required for all grading permits which would identify and mitigate any landslide risks.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss
of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment does not change the potential for soil erosion. A geotechnical/ soils analysis will be required prior to issuance of building permits that will evaluate the site specific soil stability and suitability of grading and retaining walls proposed. This study will determine the necessary grading techniques that will ensure that potential impacts due to soil stability will not occur. An erosion control plan shall be required to be approved by the City Engineer prior to commencement of any site grading operations.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment does not change the potential for exposure to geologic unit or soil that is unstable. Soil engineering reports are required for all grading permits which would identify and mitigate any risks

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment does not change the potential for exposure to expansive soils. Soil engineering reports are required for all grading permits which would identify and mitigate any risks.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: New homes in single-family residential zones are required to be served by the City's sanitary sewer system, therefore there is no impact.

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-b): The Grading Ordinance amendment would not have a significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-d): The Grading Ordinance amendment would not create a hazard, or use/produce hazardous materials.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion (e): The Grading Ordinance amendment would not change the safety hazard for people residing now or in the future within the Airport area.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion (f): There are no know private air strips in the vicinity, therefore there is no impact.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion (g,h):

The Grading Ordinance amendment would not change the exposure risk for wildland fires or alter evacuation plans.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., Would the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? Would decreased rainfall infiltration or groundwater recharge reduce stream baseflow? (Source: 7)				
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion (a-f): Any grading operation within the City of Paso Robles has the potential to alter drainage patterns and affect stormwater runoff quality. The amendments to the Grading Ordinance do not increase the significance of this risk. The Grading Ordinance will be applied to tentative tract map and specific plan approval processes that require CEQA review and grading permits that will be subject to drainage review and stormwater quality standards which will either avoid or mitigate impacts on a project specific basis				
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion (g-j): Hillside grading areas are typically outside of the 100-year flood hazard zones.				
k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion (k-l): Any grading operation within the City of Paso Robles has the potential to alter drainage patterns and affect stormwater runoff quality. The amendments to the Grading Ordinance do not increase the significance of this risk. The Grading Ordinance will be applied to tentative tract map and specific plan approval processes that require CEQA review and grading permits that will be subject to drainage review and stormwater quality standards which will either avoid or mitigate impacts on a project specific basis				

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment will not create an impact.				

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion:

The proposed Grading Ordinance amendments are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The project will primarily affect vacant and under-utilized single-family residential land within the City limits. These sites are typically characterized with gentle to moderate slopes and with typical vegetation consisting of non-native grasslands and oak savannahs. There is the possibility that some of these sites contain sensitive habitat areas. The Grading Ordinance will be applied to tentative tract map and specific plan approval processes that require CEQA review for potential biological impacts which will be either

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

avoided or mitigated on a project specific basis

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
(Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-b): The Grading Ordinance amendment will not affect the availability of mineral resources..

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: The Grading Ordinance amendment will not change noise exposure levels within the City. Individual grading permits and grading operations would be required to comply with the standards of the City's noise ordinance. | | | | |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: Refer to section XII.a. | | | | |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: See section XII.a. | | | | |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: See section XII.a. | | | | |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 4)				

Discussion: See section XII.a.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-c):

The Grading Ordinance is consistent with City’s General Plan and would not increase or decrease the housing or population assumptions of the General Plan.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Fire protection? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-e):

The Grading Ordinance is consistent with City’s General Plan and would not increase or decrease the public service demand assumptions of the General Plan...

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

XV. RECREATION

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-b):

The Grading Ordinance is consistent with City’s General Plan and would not increase or decrease the recreation service demand assumptions of the General Plan.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures or effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-f):

The Grading Ordinance is consistent with City's General Plan and would not increase or decrease the transportation / traffic assumptions of the General Plan

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-g):

The Grading Ordinance is consistent with City's General Plan and would not increase or decrease the utility services assumptions of the General Plan..

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

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance is consistent with City's General Plan and would not increase or decrease the development impact assumptions of the General Plan. .

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance is consistent with City's General Plan and would not increase or decrease the development impact assumptions of the General Plan.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The Grading Ordinance is consistent with City's General Plan and would not increase or decrease the development impact assumptions of the General Plan. .

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
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