



CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES

"The Pass of the Oaks"

Development Review Committee Minutes

June 3, 2024, 3:30 p.m.

Large Conference Room - 2nd Floor

1000 SPRING ST

Paso Robles, CA 93446

Commissioners Present: Chair Pro Tem Covarrubias, Commissioner Marlow, Commissioner Connally

A. **CALL TO ORDER**

B. **ROLL CALL**

Staff present: Warren Frace, Darren Nash, Dante Pecchenino, David Athey, Katie Banister, and City consultant Carol Florence

Applicants and others present: Tracy Zinn (planner), Mark Taylor (architect), John Semcken, Rob Miller, Suzanne Behr, Justin Gronendyke, Taylor Talt, Commerce Construction Team

C. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. **Item 1**

File #: P20-0075 / GPA20-01 / RZN20-04 / PD20-14 / OTR21-08

Requested Action: DRC Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Application: The Landing Paso Robles is the reuse plan for the Paso Robles Boy's School. Phase 1 would include: 310,800-square-foot cold-storage warehouse; 175,000-square-foot/350-room hotel and conference center; 47,000-square foot industrial park; and 16,000 square feet of retail space.

Location: 4545 Airport Road

Presentation: Tracey Zinn, Project Planner for Majestic, presented the following project description to the DRC:

The project would be constructed in two phases. Phase 1 encompasses approximately 45 acres of the site with construction of 797,366 SF of development including the following components:

- *Cold Storage Warehouse @ 310,800 SF (located on Lot 40 in the northwest corner of the site):*

- *Hotel/Conference Center @ 175,000 SF/350 keys (located in the northeast corner of the site):*
- *Industrial Park @ 47,000 SF (located on Lots 3 & 4 & adjacent to the hotel/conference center);*
- *Retail @ 16,000 SF (located on Lot 14 south of the Industrial Park lots & 'B' Street);*
- *Stormwater Basin (located on Lot 44 in the southwest corner of the site).*

An alternative Phase I project would include the following:

- *Cold Storage Warehouse @ 310,800 SF (located on Lot 43, south of Lot 40)*

Discussion: Following the presentation, was discussion between the DRC members, applicant team, and staff related to the following list of comments:

1. Will demolition occur all at once?
2. Clearly define Phase I of the project and subsequent phases.
3. Define "maker space".
4. Is the proposed parking quantity in compliance with the standards?
5. Describe the type of fencing on the project.
 1. Concern regarding the architectural appropriateness of the fence design.
 2. Is there a need for a fence at the stormwater basin? If so, define.
 3. No chain link that is visible to the public (currently, proposed between Bldgs. 2 & 3 at the truck docks)
 4. See draft *Design Guidelines* for details.
6. The staff report Table 1 (source: DEIR) needs to be checked for accuracy.
7. When will there be details with regard to the landscape architecture?
 1. Phase I warehouse building plus R/W improvements.
 2. What happens to the remainder on the non-built site in the interim?
8. If Phase I is 310K SF (either Bldg. 1 or 4), how many tenants are anticipated for this building?
9. Will there be integration of the "airport" theme into the project's architecture or art?
10. Lighting and concern for light glare and spill. Check compliance with night sky ordinance.
11. Has the project been to the Airport Land Use Commission?
12. If the VTTM is phased, what are the implications/design for the overall drainage system?
13. Define/describe the level of frontage improvements.
14. Clarify the list of entitlements and expectations for today's DRC decision/recommendation. ☐ General Plan Amendment; ☐ Zone Change; ☐ Vesting Tentative Tract Map; ☐ Conceptual Master Development Plan; ☐ Specific Development Plan for Phase 1; ☐ Oak Tree Removal Permit; and a ☐ Development Agreement.

15. Circulation Plan and need to realign Dry Creek Rd. Comment made by Commissioner Connally.
16. Provide more details, e.g., renderings/perspectives of the Phase I development.
17. Define the Development Agreement, its timing, and review/recommendations by the Planning Commission.

Action: The DRC recommended the project proceed with the schedule outlined by Staff, which would include scheduling for a future Planning Commission meeting, subject to providing additional clarification to the questions and comments outlined above as part of the staff report to the Planning Commission.

D. ADJOURNMENT

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL OR A PERMANENT PART OF THE RECORDS UNTIL APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL AT A FUTURE REGULAR MEETING