

From: Jeff Carr <>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:33 PM
To: Katie Banister
Subject: Re: Comments for DRC Sept 18, 2023, Item 2

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

OK. Thanks. I will look at this information. --- It just seemed to me that the DRC's "concerns" are not enough. They can be concerned all day--and that won't get more parking on that property. Why didn't city staff and DRC suggest changes be made to bring parking up to the requirements?

Else--if the developer is asking for concessions, then detail them so people can understand exactly what they want. It all seemed vague and uncertain. You mention the low-income senior deed restriction on 1 unit--Yes, I remember that being mentioned but I didn't see the direct connection between that and the lack of parking. You mention on 1 chart that it 'entitles the project to 2 concessions/incentives--but not exactly what that would be.

Would it allow the developer to be short as much parking as they are now? Or maybe that entitles them to 2 less parking spaces ONLY. But they want the zoning change too. Nothing was made clear yesterday.

From my point of view--the meeting didn't really serve much of a purpose---when the requests (concessions) aren't clear AND the DRC doesn't address the problems other than expressing concerns. At this point--I see this development needing significant change. Nothing presented yesterday at the DRC meeting told me otherwise.

-Jeff

On 9/19/2023 3:00 PM, Katie Banister wrote:

Mr. Carr,

Thank you for your comments; they will be included with the staff report to the Planning Commission and City Council, who will both review the project at upcoming meetings. Approval for this project will ultimately be up to the City Council's discretion.

We do not produce a staff report for any item under DRC consideration. We only provide the project plans and then a presentation of issues during the meeting. For complex items like the project at 1745 Spring Street, the DRC is a first look at the architecture and design of the project, which at times requires an overview of other issues that are relevant to a project. A full analysis of all issues will be included in the written staff report for Planning Commission and City Council.

For the Tobin James project yesterday, the DRC asked questions and made minor requests for more information to be provided at the future Planning Commission meeting. They did not request significant design changes (as they did for this project back in January). Like yourself, the DRC members are concerned about parking, for which the applicant has requested a concession due to the project including the dedication of a unit to a very low income household via a 55-year recorded deed restriction (12.5% of all residential units in the project). I would draw your attention to California [GOV](#)

[Code Sections 65915-65918](#) (Density Bonuses and Other Incentives) for an understanding of the City's obligation to approve concessions and incentives associated with projects that offer affordable units. This article is written in plain English and also includes a discussion of relevant case law, and may also be helpful: https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/density_bonus_law_-_what_are_incentives_concessions_and_waivers.pdf?1667860893

The project is requesting the application of the Resort/Lodging Overlay District to only the subject property, which is not the larger effort to expand the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan area (the HCOG recommendation). For more information about the Resort overlay, please see [PRMC Chapter 21.18C](#).

I will include you in future notices for hearings for this project, which are tentatively scheduled for October and November. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

Sincerely,
Katie Banister
Associate Planner
City of Paso Robles
805-237-3970
805-227-7200 X7746 Direct
www.prcity.com

From: Jeff Carr <>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 7:41 AM
To: Planning <planning@prcity.com>
Subject: Comments for DRC Sept 18, 2023, Item 2

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello,

I'm commenting on Item 2 of the DRC agenda for September 18, 2023; i.e.,

File #: P22-0076 / PD22-11 / CUP23-07 / RZN23-01 --- Tobin James project

First--**I request a copy of the city's presentation charts for this item.** It's not clear to me why the information from those charts are not included early with agenda-- as they hold significant information related to the discussion item.

I was surprised by all the changes and concessions requested for this item. It's not clear how the requests are being defended, and that needs to be made more clear. The DRC all seemed to have concerns especially about parking, but I never heard any strong guidance regarding the items from the committee members.

From what I heard, the parking proposals for this development are unacceptable. I understand that parking requirements are minimal in the city, but not having at least 1 fixed 'on-property' parking space for each hotel room and residence seems irresponsible. Even that might be inadequate, but it was my understanding that it is required as a minimum. If not, it should be. Anything less will only cause future conflict for tenants of this property, for the nearby neighborhood, and I expect for the city as well.

And there are also staff parking requirements and also the needs of the commercial facilities that should be considered.

Attachment 5

Then there is the requested zoning change. The only defense I heard is that it might be part of a proposal being worked for zoning changes in the area. That was unclear. Perhaps this is in the HCOC effort. But the results of that effort, from my understanding, have not yet been fully vetted and reviewed. I understand they will be going to council--but had hoped there would be another chance for a complete and comprehensive review with the Planning Commission and the public. I've yet to see public concerns of this effort addressed by the city; e.g., from the one and only workshop by HCOC. **A draft of these proposed zoning changes should be on the website now for ongoing public review.**

It's difficult to understand how a hotel with rooms and windows facing Spring Street, maybe the most traffic congested street in Paso Robles--is a good idea. Regardless, it's not clear that the request for a zoning waiver at this point has been adequately explained or defended.

Then there was discussion of the overall architecture. Of all in attendance, surprisingly it was the architect (from what I could tell) that seemed most critical of the current design. I wanted to hear how the changes address the specific concerns regarding compatibility brought up by the DRC at the previous review--and as documented in those meeting minutes. It's not clear what if any modifications will be made in the design--but I didn't hear any strong guidance from the DRC on the matter.

Overall, at yesterday's meeting, it wasn't clear what recommendation or guidance was being offered by the DRC to the developers on this project. I feel it deserved more, and I will be watching for any subsequent review of this item at the DRC or the Planning Commission.

Jeff Carr--Paso Robles, CA