PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT

SUBJECT: Review of a new two-story 23,951-square foot residential care facility with 35 private rooms; project includes a request for a 15 percent parking reduction, a fence height exception to allow a fence and retaining wall with a combined maximum height of 12 feet within portions of the side yard, where 9 feet is normally allowed, and an increase to the maximum floor area ratio to 0.5 where 0.4 is normally allowed.

PROJECT ADDRESS: 1691 Fredericks Street
BY: Kyle Bell, Associate Planner
Phone Number: (805) 781-7524
E-mail: kbell@slocity.org

FILE NUMBER: ARCH-0073-2020 & USE-0203-2020
FROM: Tyler Corey, Principal Planner

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the Draft Resolution (Attachment 1) that approves the project subject to findings and conditions of approval.

SITE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Tim Ronda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>R-1 (Low Density Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>~47,916 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Status</td>
<td>Categorically exempt from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines § 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

The proposed project consists of a two-story 23,951 square foot residential care facility with 35 private rooms, accommodating up to 40 residents. The project is proposed on a vacant parcel associated with a separate lot line adjustment application (SBDV-0076-2020) to establish a flag lot with access from Fredericks Street. The project proposes shared parking facilities with the adjacent religious facility (Mt. Carmel Lutheran Church) and daycare facility (Love to Learn). The project includes a request to provide a floor area ratio of 0.5, where 0.4 is normally allowed in the R-1 zone\(^1\) and a request for a parking reduction of approximately 15 percent for the shared parking facilities between this project and the adjacent religious facility and daycare. The proposed site improvements include parking and site access upgrades, landscaping upgrades, and a new trash enclosure (Attachment 2, Project Plans).

\(^1\) Zoning Regulations Section 17.16.020 Table 2-4: R-1 Zone Development Standards. Maximum FAR 0.4. Maximum FAR may be increased up to 0.50 if consistent with Section 17.16.030.A (Requirements and Findings for FAR Increase in R-1 Zone). See also Section 17.70.060 (FAR Measurement and Exceptions)
1.0 COMMISSION’S PURVIEW

The Planning Commission’s (PC) purview is to review the project for consistency with the General Plan, Zoning Regulations, Community Design Guidelines (CDG) and applicable City development standards and guidelines. PC review is required for projects which include more than 10,000 square feet of commercial space (ARCH-0073-2020) as well as the associated Minor Use Permit (USE-0203-2020) requesting to establish a residential care facility within the R-1 zone.

![Figure 1: Rendering of project design from interior parking lot](Image)

2.0 PROJECT STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Details</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Allowed/Required*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>~130</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Story Setbacks (FAR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>~130</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height of Structures</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Building Coverage</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>In-Lieu fee</td>
<td>On-site or In-Lieu fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Parking Spaces</td>
<td>73 (15% Reduction)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicle Parking</td>
<td>2 EV Ready &amp; 5 EV Capable</td>
<td>2 EV Ready &amp; 5 EV Capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2019 Zoning Regulations

3.0 PREVIOUS REVIEW

On August 3, 2020, the Architectural Review Commission (ARC) reviewed the project plans for consistency with the CDG. During their review, the ARC recommended that the Planning
Commission find the project consistent with the CDG (6-0) (Attachment 3, ARC Staff Report and Meeting Minutes).

The Tree Committee (TC) reviewed the project on September 28, 2020 for consistency with the Tree Ordinance (Municipal Code § 12.24) (Attachment 4, TC Report and Minutes). During their review, the TC provided three directional items to address specific concerns regarding the replanting plan (which are identified as Condition No. 13) and recommended that the Planning Commission find the project consistent with the Tree Ordinance for removal of the 6 trees (4-0-3).

4.0 PROJECT ANALYSIS

The proposed improvements must conform to the standards and limitations of the Zoning Regulations and Engineering Standards and be consistent with the applicable CDG. Staff has evaluated the project’s consistency with relevant requirements and has found it to be in substantial compliance, as discussed in this analysis.

4.1 Consistency with the General Plan

The Land Use Element designates the subject property as Low Density Residential intended to provide for low density residential development having locations and forms that provide a sense of both individual identity and neighborhood cohesion for the households occupying them. The Housing Element encourages the creation of housing for those with special housing needs such as facilities for aging in place in locations where public transit and commercial services are available. The City has a limited number of residential care facilities and special housing geared toward the elderly. As of 2019, the City had 20 facilities providing housing for the elderly.

4.2 Consistency with the Zoning Regulations

In accordance with Table 2-1 of the Zoning Regulations, residential care facilities require a Minor Use Permit to be constructed within the R-1 zone. Minor Use Permits require specific findings regarding General Plan consistency, neighborhood compatibility, findings for health, safety and welfare, and findings for site suitability regarding design, traffic generation, and public services. The project design complies with lot coverage, setbacks, and building height requirements for the R-1 zone (see Section 2.0 Project Statistics).

Residential Care Facility: Residential Care Facilities are licensed by the State to provide permanent living accommodations and 24-hour primarily non-medical care and supervision for persons in need of personal services, supervision, protection, or assistance for sustaining the activities of daily living. Living accommodations are shared living quarters with or without separate kitchen or bathroom facilities for each room or unit. This classification includes facilities that are operated for profit as well as those operated by public or not-for-profit institutions, including hospices, nursing homes, convalescent facilities, and group homes for minors, persons with disabilities, and people in recovery from alcohol or drug addictions.

The project has been designed to provide a physical separation of the facility from the low density neighborhood by orienting the building toward the rear of the property, which would protect the privacy between neighboring residential uses and the care facility. The project design incorporates specific design features to minimize potential impacts to and from adjacent properties by orienting open areas for residents internal to the project site.
Floor Area Ratio (FAR): The project includes a request to provide a floor area ratio of 0.5, where 0.4 is normally allowed in the R-1 zone. Zoning Regulation §17.16.030 stipulate that the maximum FAR may be increased from 0.4 to 0.5 if the building design provides a second-story step back (upper story building setback) of at least five feet along the front façade and second-story side setbacks that are at least three feet greater than the minimum required setback\(^2\). The project has been designed to provide upper story step backs of at least 130 feet along the front façade and second-story side setbacks that are at least three feet greater than the minimum required setback, qualifying for the greater FAR of 0.5 (see Section 2.0 Project Statistics for setback dimensions).

Fence Height Exception: The project has been designed to cut into the natural slope of the property, and as a result of the necessary grading for the project, various retaining walls and fences are necessary for access improvements and privacy between uses. Zoning Regulations §17.70.070 states the height of the retaining wall shall be considered as part of the overall height of the fence or wall. Walls or fences must have a minimum spacing of five feet between each other to be considered separate structures for purposes of measuring overall height. Where fences are located on retaining walls within interior side or rear setbacks the combined fence and retaining wall height shall not exceed nine feet from the lower side (Zoning Regulations § 17.70.070.F.3). An exception has been requested from these standards to allow a fence and retaining wall combined maximum height of 12 feet within portions of the side yard, where nine feet is normally allowed\(^3\). The purpose of the exception request is to accommodate the necessary grading and access improvements to the proposed project, as well as protect privacy from adjacent properties to the project site. All fences will appear as six feet in height as viewed from adjacent properties, and the portion of the combined fence and retaining walls that exceed nine feet are located internal to the project site and are sufficiently landscaped.

Parking: The project requires 12 vehicle parking spaces; however, the project is proposing to share parking areas with the adjacent church and daycare, and the total parking required for all intended uses is 86 parking spaces. The applicant is requesting a 15% parking reduction, to reduce the parking requirement to 73 parking spaces. The applicant provided a Parking Demand Study (Attachment 5, Parking Demand Study), which identified that the peak demand of all the combined uses did not exceed 62 parking spaces, and the project provides 73 parking spaces resulting in a surplus of nine parking spaces above estimated parking demand. The project qualifies for a shared parking reduction of up to 20% because the project includes two or more land uses that share common parking areas.

---

\(^2\) **Zoning Regulations § 17.16.030 Additional Regulations:** These regulations are established to encourage development and additions that are compatible with neighborhood character in the R-1 zone. The maximum FAR may be increased from 0.4 to 0.5 if the building design incorporates one of the following: (1) Single-Story. Buildings limited to one story with a maximum height of 14 feet to top of a flat roof and 20 feet to the ridge or peak of a sloped roof (with otherwise permitted exceptions allowed). The allowed single story shall not include mezzanines or lofts. (2) Small Lots. The property is located on a small lot that is less than 5,000 square feet in size. (3) Greater Setbacks. A second-story step back (upper story building setback) of at least five feet along the front façade and second-story side setbacks that are at least three feet greater than the minimum required setback. (4) Garage Location. Provide a detached garage located behind the main dwelling.

\(^3\) **Zoning Regulations § 17.70.070.H Fences, Walls, and Hedges. Director’s Action.** The Director... may grant exceptions to standards of this Section... when there is no practical way to comply with the provisions and no other feasible alternatives will result in better implementation of other Zoning Regulations or General Plan policies while allowing reasonable use of sites. Circumstances where a Director’s Action may be approved include, but are not limited to, issues related to topography and privacy.
and parking is adequate for the proposed project and provides sufficient parking for all uses that will not overlap or coincide to the degree that peak parking demand would exceed the total supply of parking. Condition No. 7 includes a requirement that the property owner record a parking agreement that requires the parking to be operated on a nonexclusive basis, to be open and available to the public for shared use.

### 4.3 Tree Committee Commission Directional Items

The TC recommended three directional items to be reviewed and evaluated prior to the PC taking final action on the project.

**TC Directional Item #1:** Revise the re-planting plan to replace the parking lot trees from London Plane to Chinese Pistashe.

**TC Directional Item #2:** Revise the re-planting plan to replace the driveway trees from Chinese Pistashe to Tristania or Crape Myrtle.

**TC Directional Item #3:** Revise the re-planting plan to move the London Planes to a different part of the site plan to allow a larger planting area.

**Response:** The applicant has agreed to include these changes as a condition of the project. Consistent with the TC’s recommendation, Condition No. 13 has been provided to require that: the re-planting plan replace the London Plane along the parking lot with Chinese Pistashe; replacement of the Chinese Pistashe along the driveway with Tristania or Crape Myrtle; and all London Planes shall be accommodated with larger planting areas, subject to the satisfaction of the City Arborist and Public Works Director.

### 5.0 CONSISTENCY COVID-19 ORDERS AND CURRENT FISCAL CONTINGENCY PLAN

This activity, planning for housing production, is presently allowed under the State and Local emergency orders associated with COVID-19. This Project and associated staff work will be reimbursed by the Developer directly or indirectly through fees and therefore consistent with the guidance of the City’s Fiscal Health Contingency Plan.

### 6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it consists of the development of the project site consistent with policies and standards applicable to development within the residential zone, on a site less than five acres in size, with no value as habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened species, as described in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (Infill Development). The site is within City limits and is served by City 4

---

4 Zoning Regulations Sections 17.72.050.B Shared Parking Reduction. Where a shared parking facility serving more than one use will be provided, the total number of required parking spaces may be reduced by up to 20 percent with Director... if the Director finds that: (1) The peak hours of use will not overlap or coincide to the degree that peak demand for parking spaces from all uses or projects will be greater than the total supply of spaces; (2) The proposed shared parking provided will be adequate to serve each use and/or project; (3) A parking demand study conducted and prepared under procedures set forth by the Director supports the proposed reduction; and (4) In the case of a shared parking facility that serves more than one property, a parking agreement has been prepared and recorded... requiring the parking to be operated on a nonexclusive basis, to be open and available to the public for shared use, short-term parking during normal business hours.
utilities and public services. Based on the project existing topography, size, and design, approval of the project will not result in any significant effects from proximity of Highway 101 related to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

7.0 OTHER DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

The project has been reviewed by various City departments and divisions including: Planning, Engineering, Transportation, Building, Utilities, City Arborist, Natural Resources, and Fire. Staff has not identified any unusual site conditions or circumstances that would require special conditions. Other comments have been incorporated into the draft resolutions as conditions of approval.

8.0 ALTERNATIVES

8.1 Continue the item. An action to continue the item should include a detailed list of additional information or analysis required.

8.2 Deny the project. An action denying the application should include findings that cite the basis for denial and should reference inconsistency with the General Plan, Community Design Guidelines, Zoning Regulations or other policy documents.

9.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Resolution
2. Project Plans
3. ARC Report and Draft Minutes 8.3.20
4. TC Report and Draft Minutes 9.28.20
5. Parking Demand Study
RESOLUTION NO. PC-XXXX-20

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW TWO-STORY 23,951-SQUARE FOOT RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY WITH 35 PRIVATE ROOMS; PROJECT INCLUDES A REQUEST FOR A 15 PERCENT PARKING REDUCTION, A FENCE HEIGHT EXCEPTION TO ALLOW A FENCE AND RETAINING WALL COMBINED MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 12 FEET WITHIN PORTIONS OF THE SIDE YARD, WHERE 9 FEET IS NORMALLY ALLOWED, AND AN INCREASE TO THE MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO TO 0.5 WHERE 0.4 IS NORMALLY ALLOWED. PROJECT IS CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW; AS REPRESENTED IN THE STAFF REPORT AND ATTACHMENTS DATED OCTOBER 28, 2020 (1691 FREDERICKS STREET, ARCH-0073-2020 & USE-0203-2020)

WHEREAS, the Architectural Review Commission of the City of San Luis Obispo conducted a web based public hearing on August 3, 2020, recommending the Planning Commission find the project consistent with the Community Design Guidelines, pursuant to a proceeding instituted under ARCH-0073-2020, Tim Ronda, applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Tree Committee of the City of San Luis Obispo conducted a web based public hearing on September 28, 2020, recommending the Planning Commission find the project consistent with the Tree Ordinance with identified directional items, pursuant to a proceeding instituted under ARCH-0073-2020, Tim Ronda, applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of the City of San Luis Obispo conducted a web based public hearing on October 28, 2020, pursuant to a proceeding instituted under ARCH-0073-2020, and USE-0203-2020, Tim Ronda, applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of the City of San Luis Obispo has duly considered all evidence, including the testimony of the applicant, interested parties, and evaluation and recommendations by staff, presented at said hearing; and

WHEREAS, notices of said public hearings were made at the time and in the manner required by law; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of San Luis Obispo as follows:

SECTION 1. Findings. The Planning Commission hereby grants final approval to the project (ARCH-0073-2020, USE-0203-2020), based on the following findings:

1. The project is consistent with the Housing Element Goal 8 (Special Housing Needs) because the project provides housing for those with special housing needs such as facilities
for aging in place in locations where public transit is readily available and commercial services are accessible within half a mile.

2. As conditioned, the project is consistent with the Zoning Regulations for development in the low-density Residential zone, since the proposed building design complies with all applicable development standards and associated findings for the requested exceptions. The project is consistent and compatible with the development in the immediate vicinity.

**Minor Use Permit Findings**

3. As conditioned, the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the proposed project will not, in the circumstances of this particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity of the proposed use, or detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City because the project has been designed to address noise, glare, and pedestrian traffic through the orientation of the building and internal pedestrian connections to the street and adjacent uses. The project is compatible and consistent with the mix of residential and non-residential uses (religious facilities) in the neighborhood.

4. As conditioned, the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan Housing Element for this location since the project proposes to construct a residential care facility that includes opportunity for housing for the elderly and residential uses that are consistent with activities envisioned by the Low Density Residential Land Use designation.

5. As conditioned, the project complies with all applicable provisions of the Zoning Regulations as described within the property development standards for the R-1 zone. The proposed uses are compatible with the project site and with existing and potential uses in the vicinity which include religious facilities, daycares, and residences.

6. As conditioned, the residential care facility is compatible at this location because the project is located in an area that has been developed with residential and complementary religious facility uses to the east and west. The project is compatible with existing and future land uses in the vicinity because the project has been designed to be oriented toward the rear of the lot and residential open space areas are located internal to the site.

7. The site is physically suitable in terms of public utilities, traffic generation, and public emergency vehicle access, because the proposed project is within an existing developed neighborhood that provides adequate utilities, vehicle parking, and site circulation. The site is adequate for the project in terms of size, configuration, topography, and other applicable features, and has appropriate access to public streets with adequate capacity to accommodate the quantity and type of traffic expected to be generated by the use.

**Development Review Findings**

8. As conditioned, the project is consistent with the Community Design Guidelines for infill development because the architectural style is complementary to the surrounding
neighborhood and is designed consistent with the prevailing building height and setback pattern of the neighborhood.

9. As conditioned, the project design is consistent with the Community Design Guidelines by providing a variety of architectural treatments that add visual interest and articulation to the building design that are compatible with the design and scale of the existing structures in the surrounding neighborhood (CDG, Chapter 5.3).

10. As conditioned, the project respects the privacy of adjacent residences through appropriate building orientation and windows that minimize overlook and do not impair the privacy of the indoor or outdoor living space of neighboring structures.

11. The proposed height, mass and scale of the project will not negatively alter the overall character of the neighborhood or the street’s appearance because the development is designed in a manner that does not deprive reasonable solar access to adjacent properties. The project incorporates vertical and horizontal wall plan offsets, which provide a high-quality and aesthetically pleasing architectural design.

Fence Height Exception Findings

12. As conditioned, the proposed 12-foot combined height for a fence and retaining wall along the north property line is acceptable because the fence provides adequate privacy and safety from the adjacent properties due to the grade differential.

13. As conditioned, the proposed fence’s design, placement, and materials are consistent with the Community Design Guidelines because it is of the same quality as adjacent structures and fences throughout the neighborhood.

14. No public purpose is served by strict compliance with the City’s fence height standards because the retaining walls will not create a visible or tangible obstruction between properties or the public right-of-way because the retaining walls are predominantly visible from within the project site toward the rear of the property that provides a tiered retaining wall with landscaping area between the two walls.

15. As conditioned, the fences will not have any sight distance impacts for vehicles entering and exiting properties since there is adequate clearance between the fence line and the entrances to the street.

Floor Area Ratio Findings

16. The project has been designed to provide upper story step backs that exceed the required thresholds along the front façade and second-story side setbacks that are at least three to five feet greater than the minimum required setback, qualifying for the greater FAR of 0.5 in accordance with Zoning Regulations 17.16.030.

Parking Reduction Findings
17. As conditioned, the project qualifies for a 15 percent parking reduction in accordance with Zoning Regulations Section 17.72.050.C and the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Demand, where the peak hours of use will not overlap or coincide to the degree that peak demand for parking spaces from all uses or projects will be greater than the total supply of spaces.

SECTION 2. Environmental Review. The project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it consists of the development of the project site consistent with policies and standards applicable to development within the residential zone, on a site less than five acres in size, with no value as habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened species, as described in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (Infill Development). The site is within City limits and is served by City utilities and public services. Based on the project existing topography, size, and design, approval of the project will not result in any significant effects from proximity of Highway 101 related to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

SECTION 3. Action. The project conditions of approval do not include mandatory code requirements. Code compliance will be verified during the plan check process, which may include additional requirements applicable to the project. The Planning Commission hereby grants final approval to the project with incorporation of the following conditions:

Planning Division

1. Final project design and construction drawings submitted for a building permit shall be in substantial compliance with the project plans approved by the Planning Commission (ARCH-0073-2020 and USE-0203-2020). A separate, full-size sheet shall be included in working drawings submitted for a building permit that lists all conditions and code requirements of project approval listed as sheet number 2. Reference shall be made in the margin of listed items as to where in plans requirements are addressed. Any change to approved design, colors, materials, landscaping, or other conditions of approval must be approved by the Director or Architectural Review Commission, as deemed appropriate.

2. The Use Permit shall be reviewed by the Community Development Director for compliance with conditions of approval, or to determine whether a modification of the Use Permit is necessary upon significant change to the project description, approved plans, and other supporting documentation submitted with this application or in the event of a change in ownership which may result in deviation from the project description or approved plans. Minor changes to the description may be approved by the Community Development Director; substantial modifications shall require modification of the Use Permit.

3. Plans submitted for a building permit shall call out the colors and materials of all proposed building surfaces and other improvements. Colors and materials shall be consistent with the color and material board submitted with the Development Review application.
4. Plans submitted for a building permit shall include recessed window details or equivalent shadow variation, and all other details including but not limited to awnings, and railings. Plans shall indicate the type of materials for the window frames and mullions, their dimensions, and colors. Plans shall include the materials and dimensions of all lintels, sills, surrounds recesses and other related window features. Plans shall demonstrate the use of high-quality materials for all design features that reflect the architectural style of the project and are compatible with the neighborhood character, to the approval of the Community Development Director.

5. The property owners shall be responsible for maintaining and updating the current parking calculation for the residential and commercial components of the sites that share parking facilities upon the submittal of Planning and Building permits for tenant changes or improvements, and/or each business license, to ensure the site does not become under-parked.

6. Prior to building permit issuance, all affected parties must record a Shared Parking Agreement governing the shared parking to be operated on a nonexclusive basis, to be available to the public for shared use, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

7. Plans submitted for a building permit shall clearly depict the location of all required short and long-term bicycle parking for all intended uses, plans submitted for construction permits shall include bicycle lockers or interior space or other area for the storage of long-term bicycle spaces. Sufficient detail shall be provided about the placement and design of bike racks and lockers to demonstrate compliance with relevant Engineering Standards and Community Design Guidelines, to the satisfaction of the Public Works and Community Development Directors.

8. Plans submitted for a building permit shall clearly depict the location of all required electric vehicle (EV) ready and EV capable parking required for residential uses. Sufficient detail shall be provided about the placement and design of EV equipment and raceway for future supply, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official and the Community Development Director.

9. The locations of all lighting, including bollard style landscaping or path lighting, shall be included in plans submitted for a building permit. All wall-mounted lighting fixtures shall be clearly called out on building elevations included as part of working drawings. All wall-mounted lighting shall complement building architecture. The lighting schedule for the building shall include a graphic representation of the proposed lighting fixtures and cut-sheets on the submitted building plans. The selected fixture(s) shall be shielded to ensure that light is directed downward consistent with the requirements of the City’s Night Sky Preservation standards contained in Chapter §17.70.100 of the Zoning Regulations.

10. Mechanical and electrical equipment shall be located internally to the building. With submittal of working drawings, the applicant shall include sectional views of the building, which clearly show the sizes of any proposed condensers and other mechanical equipment. If any condensers or other mechanical equipment is to be placed on the roof, plans submitted for a building permit shall confirm that parapets and other roof features will adequately screen
them. A line-of-sight diagram may be required to confirm that proposed screening will be adequate. This condition applies to initial construction and later improvements.

11. The storage area for trash and recycling cans shall be screened from the public right-of-way consistent with §17.70.200 of the Zoning Regulations. The subject property shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner at all times, free of excessive leaves, branches, and other landscape material. The applicant shall be responsible for the clean-up of any landscape material in the public right-of-way.

12. The applicant shall submit a landscaping plan containing an irrigation system plan with submittal of working drawings for a building permit. The legend for the landscaping plan shall include the sizes and species of all groundcovers, shrubs, and trees with corresponding symbols for each plant material showing their specific locations on plans. The surfaces and finishes of hardscapes shall be included on the landscaping plan. The landscape plans shall provide mature landscaping along the street frontage of the new structure that is of an evergreen species and a minimum size of 5 gallons, that complements the buildings architecture, subject to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

13. Plans submitted for a building permit shall provide a revised tree re-planting plan that replaces the London Plane trees along the parking lot with Chinese Pistashe, replaces the Chinese Pistashe along the driveway with Tristania or Crape Myrtle, and all London Planes shall be accommodated with larger planting areas, subject to the satisfaction of the City Arborist and Public Works Director.

14. Plans submitted for construction permits shall include elevation and detail drawings of all walls and fences. Fences, walls, and hedges will comply with the development standards described in the Zoning Regulations (§17.70.070 –Fences, Walls, and Hedges), except those identified in the Wall Height Exception attached to the staff report dated October 28, 2020. Walls and fences should remain as low as possible, long expanses of fence or wall surfaces shall be offset and architecturally designed to prevent monotony.

15. The location of any required backflow preventer and double-check assembly shall be shown on all site plans submitted for a building permit, including the landscaping plan. Construction plans shall also include a scaled diagram of the equipment proposed. Where possible, as determined by the Utilities Director, equipment shall be located inside the building within 20 feet of the front property line. Where this is not possible, as determined by the Utilities Director, the back-flow preventer and double-check assembly shall be located in the street yard and screened using a combination of paint color, landscaping and, if deemed appropriate by the Community Development Director, a low wall. The size and configuration of such equipment shall be subject to review and approval by the Utilities and Community Development Directors.

16. Any new proposed signage shall be reviewed by the Planning Division to ensure appropriateness for the site and compliance with the Sign Regulations. Signage shall coordinate with building architecture and the type of land use. The Director may refer signage
to the ARC if it seems excessive or out of character with the project.

_Engineering Division – Public Works/Community Development_

17. The existing lot line shall be adjusted or merged prior to building permit issuance unless all code requirements, access, parking, and easements can be established for the existing underlying property line to remain.

18. The building plan submittal shall show and label all existing and adjusted property lines for reference. The plan shall show and label all existing and proposed easements and easement reservations for reference. The disposition of all public or private easements or easement reservations shall be resolved prior to building permit issuance.

19. Encroachment into the existing public drainage easement from the abandoned Turner Ave. is recognized as a development option. The applicant shall verify that the easement has not been developed with drainage facilities or has been used for public or private drainage purposes. The easement may be abandoned by the appropriate process or quit-claim deed if supported by the City. Otherwise, the designed site improvements may need to honor and or support any existing or future drainage improvements.

20. The existing driveway approach off of Fredericks Street shall be upgraded to comply with City Standards. Current City and ADA standards require a 4’ level sidewalk extension behind the driveway approach or the construction of an alternate alley/street type entrance. If an alternate entrance is proposed or required, the drainage capacity of the curb and gutter shall be evaluated and shall be shown to comply with the City’s Drainage Design Manual.

21. The building plan submittal shall include a complete grading and drainage plan and drainage report. The plan and report shall consider any run-on from the adjoining upslope properties. The plan and report shall show how any drainage from the upslope watershed(s) will be accepted, conveyed, and discharged to an approved outlet in a non-erosive manner.

22. The plans and project drainage report shall show and note compliance with the Drainage Design Manual and Post Construction Stormwater Regulations. Depending upon the pre vs post run-off, increased drainage discharges to the Cal Trans right-of-way may require the written review and approval from Cal Trans.

23. If applicable, an Operation and Maintenance Manual and recorded maintenance agreement will be required in conjunction with the building permit process.

24. The existing drainage system and conveyance from the existing impervious parking surfaces shall be evaluated for any upgrades as a condition of the building permit. The applicant or underlying owner shall repair or maintain any areas where the drainage infrastructure or outlet(s) to the Cal Trans right-of-way have failed prior to or as a condition of the building permit.

25. The building plan submittal shall include a complete site utility plan showing all existing and
proposed site utilities. The applicant shall verify that a gravity sewer is available to the sewer main located in Fredericks or to the existing point of connection. All wire services shall be underground to the new building. The underground services shall be achieved without a net increase in utility poles unless specifically approved by the Community Development Department.

26. The building plan submittal shall show and note compliance with the parking and driveway standards. The paving material for the motorcycle parking and solid waste dumpster truck apron shall be concrete or other approved material.

27. The solid waste facility shall be approved to the satisfaction of the Planning Division, Utilities Department, and San Luis Garbage Company. The enclosure area shall be drained to a suitable outlet to provide for water quality treatment and to control any point source pollution in accordance with the City Engineering Standards.

28. The building plan submittal shall verify consistency between the architectural site plan, civil plans, and landscape plans.

29. OSHA Permits, if required for the building construction height and/or excavation depth shall be presented to the Building Division prior to building permit issuance.

30. Excavations along property lines with existing improvements shall be reviewed and approved by the project soils engineer regarding the sub-adjacent excavations and slope stability. Otherwise, the applicant shall provide any required notifications or improvements in accordance with the California Building Code and prevailing statutes.

31. The City supports the proposed tree removals with compensatory tree plantings to the approval of the City Arborist.

32. The building plan submittal shall show all existing trees, their diameter, species, and disposition. The plan shall include any off-site trees that may be impacted by the proposed overhead or underground construction and utility improvements. Trees to remain may require a tree preservation plan to be approved to the satisfaction of the Planning Division and Public Works Department.

33. The construction plans for sewer and water services shall be in accordance with the engineering design standards in effect at the time the building permit is approved.

34. In order to be reused, any existing sewer laterals proposed to serve the project must pass a video inspection, including repair or replacement, as part of the project. The CCTV inspection shall be submitted during the Building Permit Review Process for review and approval by the Utilities Department prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

35. Provide calculations for the proposed sewer generations based on Section 7 of the City’s 2018...
Engineering Design Standards.

36. The project includes food preparation, therefore, provisions for grease interceptors and FOG (fats, oils, and grease) storage within solid waste enclosure(s) shall be provided with the design. These types of facilities shall also provide an area inside to wash floor mats, equipment, and trash cans. The wash area shall be drained to the sanitary sewer.

37. Building permit submittal shall clarify size of existing and proposed water services and water meters for the project, including fire service.

38. Projects having landscape areas greater than 500 square feet shall provide a Maximum Applied Water Allowance calculation as required by the Water Efficient Landscape Standards; and per the calculator in Chapter 17.70.220 of the City’s Municipal Code.

39. The building permit submittal shall include solid waste services that follow the City’s Development Standards for Solid Waste.

**Indemnification**

40. The applicant shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City and/or its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City and/or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul, the approval by the City of this project, and all actions relating thereto, including but not limited to environmental review (“Indemnified Claims”). The City shall promptly notify the applicant of any Indemnified Claim upon being presented with the Indemnified Claim and the City shall fully cooperate in the defense against an Indemnified Claim.

On motion by Commissioner ___________, seconded by Commissioner _____________, and on the following roll call vote:

**AYES:**
**NOES:**
**REFRAIN:**
**ABSENT:**

The foregoing resolution was passed and adopted this 28th day of October, 2020.

____________________________
Tyler Corey, Secretary
Planning Commission
Item 3
FREDERICKS RESIDENTIAL CARE

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED USE

The project consists of building a two-story, 20,000 square foot residential care facility with 25 private rooms (each with a private bathroom) and up to 40 residents. Meals will be prepared in a common kitchen and served in a common dining room. At full occupancy, it is anticipated there will be five employees during the day and two employees at night. (Excluded equipment areas & stairwell/entryway)

This is an infill project on an existing parcel. The parcel is 1.43 acres. The parcel is located on the west side of the adjacent St. John's Lutheran Church. The site is situated between St. John's Lutheran Church and the St. George United Methodist Church. The parcel is located in the north and is a Jewish community center.

The peak parking demand for the church is 130. In addition, there will be a peak parking demand for the detached living facility. As the peak time of day will not overlap, we request a parking reduction for the city of 25%. This is a request for a 60-space reduction for the city of 60.0 square miles.

GENERAL NOTES

1. Fire protection systems shall be in accordance with the city's and the occupant's building code. The fire protection systems shall be in accordance with the city's building code. The fire protection systems shall be in accordance with the city's building code.

2. The project is an infill project. The parcel is located on the west side of the adjacent St. John's Lutheran Church. The site is situated between St. John's Lutheran Church and the St. George United Methodist Church. The parcel is located in the north and is a Jewish community center.

INCLUSIVE HOUSING & PUBLIC ART

The inclusion of people with disabilities into the building is a key aspect of this project. The inclusion of people with disabilities into the building is a key aspect of this project. The inclusion of people with disabilities into the building is a key aspect of this project.
CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN

8/14/20

CONCEPT NOTES
1. PLANT MATERIAL WAS CHOSEN FOR ITS COMPATIBILITY WITH THE MACRO/MICROCLIMATIC CONDITIONS OF THE REGION AND SITE, TOLERANCE OF WIND, TOLERANCE OF DROUGHT CONDITIONS, LONGEVITY; SCREENING CAPABILITIES; AND OVERALL ATTRACTIVENESS.
2. THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM SHALL BE DESIGNED FOR MAXIMUM WATER EFFICIENCY AND SHALL INCLUDE AN AUTOMATIC CONTROLLER, BACKFLOW PREVENTION DEVICE, AND LOW-GALLONAGE HEADS FOR TURF AND PLANTING AREAS. A DRIP-TYPE SYSTEM SHALL BE USED WHERE APPROPRIATE. TREES SHALL BE IRRIGATED ON SEPARATE BUBBLER SYSTEMS.
3. PLANT MATERIAL QUANTITIES, NARRATIVE SPECIFICATIONS, SITE DETAILS, AND MATERIAL DEFINITIONS WILL BE DETERMINED AND NOTED ON THE CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS.

WATER CONSERVATION STATEMENT
THE CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN, CONCURRENT WITH THE PLANTING AND IRRIGATION CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, PLAN INSTALLATION, RELATED SPECIFICATIONS AND NOTES, QUALIFIES THIS PROJECT AS ONE WHICH EMBRACES THE FOLLOWING CURRENT WATER CONSERVATION TECHNOLOGY AND METHODOLOGIES:
1. UTILIZATION OF STATE OF THE ART IRRIGATION CONTROLLERS, ALLOWING FOR PRECISION INCREMENTAL WATER SCHEDULING IN ALL HYDROZONES.
2. USE OF DRIP-TYPE AND/OR MICROSPRAY SYSTEMS ONLY.
3. INTEGRATED PLANT DESIGN. PLANT PALETTES HAVE BEEN FORMED TO REFLECT PARALLEL WATERING REQUIREMENTS WITHIN EACH HYDROZONE GROUP.
4. PLANTS INSTALLED WITH MOISTURE RETENTIVE SOIL AMENDMENTS, ENABLING STRONG ROOT AND PLANT GROWTH, WITH THE USE OF LESS WATER.
5. 3" DEEP MULCHING OF ALL PLANT BASINS AND PLANTING AREAS, INHIBITING EVAPORATION.
6. USE OF LOW WATER USE PLANTS.
### Proposed Plant Palette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical / Common Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>WUCOLS*</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Scale Trees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercis occidentalis / Western Redbud</td>
<td>24” BOX L</td>
<td>FLOWERING, FALL COLOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos / Monkeybark</td>
<td>24” BOX L</td>
<td>GREENACY FOLIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus calleryana / Ornamental Pear</td>
<td>24” BOX M</td>
<td>FLOWERING, FALL COLOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening / Perimeter Trees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus marina / Strawberry Tree</td>
<td>24” BOX L</td>
<td>FLOWERING, REDDISH BARK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca quinquenervia / Cajut Tree</td>
<td>24” BOX L</td>
<td>UPRIGHT FORM, WHITE BARK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olea europaea / &quot;Tiny Tree&quot; / Fruitless Olive</td>
<td>36” BOX NL</td>
<td>FRUITLESS VARIETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristania conferta / Brisbane Box</td>
<td>24” BOX M</td>
<td>REDDISH BARK, UPRIGHT FORM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Lot Trees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuchsia acuminata / &quot;Bloodgood&quot; / London Plane</td>
<td>15 GAL</td>
<td>CANOPY SHADE TREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitschmania chinensis / Chinese Pistache</td>
<td>24” BOX L</td>
<td>FALL COLOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large Scale Shrubs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittosporum shee / Silver Sheen / Silver Sheen Kohuhu</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>UPRIGHT FORM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus &quot;Betty N&quot; / Carolina Cherry Laurel</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>UPRIGHT FORM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotinus cox / Smokey Bud</td>
<td>15 GAL</td>
<td>BURNINGGY FOLIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa &quot;Iceber&quot; / Iceberg Roses</td>
<td>5 GAL M</td>
<td>VARIOUS FLOWERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Medium Scale Shrubs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agave attenuata / Foxtail Agave</td>
<td>5 GAL L</td>
<td>SUCCULENT, LOW WATER USE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callistemon &quot;Little John&quot; / Dwarf Bottlebrush</td>
<td>5 GAL L</td>
<td>RED FLOWERS, LOW WATER USE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniella carinata / Sussex Blue / Blue Flax Lily</td>
<td>5 GAL M</td>
<td>BLUE-HOKEY STRAW LEAVES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phormium / New Zealand Flax</td>
<td>5 GAL L</td>
<td>COLORFUL ACCENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olea europaea / &quot;Little Olive&quot; / Dwarf Olive</td>
<td>5 GAL V</td>
<td>DRAPE OLIVE, LOW WATER USE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westringia / &quot;Morning Light&quot; / Coastal Rosemary</td>
<td>5 GAL L</td>
<td>VARIEGATED LEAVES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sassafras / Saw</td>
<td>5 GAL L</td>
<td>FLOWERING, LOW WATER USE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Cover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos / Manzanita</td>
<td>1 GAL L</td>
<td>PINNATE WHITE FLOWERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosmarinus officinalis / Rosemary</td>
<td>1 GAL L</td>
<td>FLOWERING, LOW WATER USE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa &quot;Flower Carpet&quot; / Flower Carpet Rose</td>
<td>5 GAL M</td>
<td>FLOWERING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perennials / Accents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achillea millefolium / Yarrow</td>
<td>1 GAL L</td>
<td>YELLOW FLOWERS, LOW WATER USE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anigozanthos / Kangaroo Paw</td>
<td>1 GAL L</td>
<td>LOW WATER USE, LOW FOLIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kniphofia / Red Hot Poker</td>
<td>1 GAL L</td>
<td>FLOWERING, LOW WATER USE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavandula / Lavender</td>
<td>1 GAL L</td>
<td>PURPLE FLOWERS, LOW WATER USE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ornamental Grasses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calamagrostis &quot;Karl Foerster&quot; / Feather Reed Grass</td>
<td>1 GAL M</td>
<td>FLOWERING WITH TAN STALKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limania sp / Diermat / Breeze / Breeze Mat Rush</td>
<td>1 GAL L</td>
<td>GREEN FOLIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bioswale Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex praegracilis / Western Meadow Sedge</td>
<td>1 GAL M</td>
<td>LOW WATER USE MEADOW GRASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leymus condensatus &quot;Canyon Prince&quot; / Wild Rye</td>
<td>1 GAL L</td>
<td>BLUE FOLIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WUCOLS* (WATER USE CLASSIFICATIONS OF LANDSCAPE SPECIES) IS A GUIDE TO HELP IDENTIFY IRRIGATION WATER NEEDS OF PLANT SPECIES. DEVELOPED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES, 2000.

---

### Preliminary MAWA / ETWU Calculations

**San Luis Obispo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of City</th>
<th>E.T. (inches/year)</th>
<th>Overhead Landscape Area (ft²)</th>
<th>Drip Landscape Area (ft²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>4,972</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydrozones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrozone</th>
<th>Select System From the Dropdown List</th>
<th>Plant Water Use Type (s) (low, medium, high)</th>
<th>Plant Factor (PF)</th>
<th>Hydrozone Area (HA) (ft²) Without SLA</th>
<th>Enter Irrigation Efficiency (IE)</th>
<th>[PF x HA (ft²)]IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>Drip</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4,972</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>drip</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>Drip</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETWU** = 58,084 Gallons

**ETWU complies with MAWA**

**San Luis Obispo Name of City**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43.86 E.T.</th>
<th>0 Overhead Landscape Area (ft²)</th>
<th>4,972 Drip Landscape Area (ft²)</th>
<th>0 SLA (ft²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

### Plant Photos

![Plant Photos](image1)

---

**PRELIMINARY MAWA / ETWU CALCULATIONS**

---
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Architectural Review Commission Report

From: Shawna Scott, Senior Planner

By: Kyle Bell, Associate Planner

Project Address: 1691 Fredericks

Applicant: Tim Ronda, Studio Design Group

For more information contact: Kyle Bell at 781-7524 or kbell@slocity.org

1.0 Project Description and Setting

The proposed project consists of a two-story 23,951 square foot residential care facility with 35 private rooms, accommodating up to 40 residents. The project is proposed on a vacant parcel and is combined with a lot line adjustment to establish a flag lot with access from Fredericks Street. The project includes shared parking facilities with the adjacent religious facility (Mt. Carmel Lutheran Church) and daycare facility (Love to Learn). The project includes a request to provide a floor area ratio of 0.5, where 0.4 is normally allowed in the R-1 zone and a request for a parking reduction of approximately 15 percent for the shared parking facilities between this project and the adjacent religious facility and daycare. The proposed site improvements include parking and site access upgrades, landscaping upgrades, and a new trash enclosure (Attachment 1, Project Plans).

General Location: The project site is located on an existing 26,759 square foot lot associated with a lot line adjustment that will increase the lot area to 47,916 square feet and provide for direct access off of Fredericks Street. The property is a downward sloping lot from west to east, with an average cross slope of less than 10%.

Present Use: Vacant parcel

Zoning: Low-Density Residential (R-1)

General Plan: Low-Density Residential

Surrounding Uses:
- East: Religious Facility
- West: Religious Facility and Daycare
- North: Single Family Residences
- South: Highway 101

---

1. Zoning Regulations Section 17.16.020 Table 2-4: R-1 Zone Development Standards. Maximum FAR 0.4, Maximum FAR may be increased up to 0.50 if consistent with Section 17.16.030.A (Requirements and Findings for FAR Increase in R-1 Zone). See also Section 17.70.060 (FAR Measurement and Exceptions)
2.0 PROPOSED DESIGN

Architecture: Contemporary design
Design details: Hip roof system, large eave overhangs, interior courtyard, upper level balconies, floor to ceiling windows, upper level planters, covered awning entry feature
Materials: Smooth finish stucco, horizontal wood siding, shingle roofing, and metal railings
Colors: Primary rust color stucco, grey and beige accent colors, and dark brown windows & door trim

3.0 FOCUS OF REVIEW

The ARC’s role is to 1) review the proposed project in terms of its consistency with the Community Design Guidelines (CDG) and applicable City Standards and 2) provide comments and recommendations to the Planning Commission.

Community Design Guidelines: https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=2104

4.0 COMMUNITY DESIGN GUIDELINES/DISCUSSION ITEMS

The proposed development must be consistent with the requirements of the General Plan, Zoning Regulations, and CDG. Staff has identified the discussion items below related to consistency with CDG Chapters 2 (General Design Principles), and Chapter 5.3 (Infill Development). The Infill Development guidelines apply to multi-family structures that are constructed on vacant parcels between existing residential units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlighted Sections</th>
<th>Discussion Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 – General Design Principles</td>
<td>The project site is located on a parcel zoned R-1, with nonresidential uses to the east, west, and south and residential uses to the north. The CDG state that each project should be designed with careful consideration of site character and constraints and minimize changes to natural features. The ARC should discuss how the project fits in with the best examples of appropriate site design and architecture in the vicinity of the site. The ARC should discuss whether the project site activities are logically oriented so that the project will operate efficiently and effectively for all users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.1 - Site Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5.3 – Infill Development

§ 3.1.B.2 Neighborhood Compatibility

The CDG notes that infill development guidelines are intended to provide for infill projects of high architectural quality that are compatible with existing development and should be compatible in scale, siting, detailing and overall character with adjacent buildings, where infill development occurs adjacent to older homes, the height and bulk of the new construction can have a negative impact on adjacent small scale buildings. The ARC should discuss whether the development provides sufficient design factors to contribute to neighborhood compatibility; design theme, building scale/size, setbacks and massing, colors, textures, and building materials.

5.0 PROJECT STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Details</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Allowed/Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>~130</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>0.5²</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height of Structures</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Building Coverage</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>In-Lieu fee</td>
<td>On-site or In-Lieu fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>In-Lieu fee</td>
<td>On-site or In-Lieu fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Parking Spaces</td>
<td>73 (15% Reduction)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicle Parking</td>
<td>2 EV Ready &amp; 5 EV Capable</td>
<td>2 EV Ready &amp; 5 EV Capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Status</td>
<td>Categorically exempt from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.0 ACTION ALTERNATIVES

6.1 Recommend approval of the project based on consistency with the CDG. An action recommending approval of the application will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for final action. This action may include recommendations for conditions to address consistency

² Zoning Regulations Section 17.16.030: These regulations are established to encourage development and additions that are compatible with neighborhood character in the R-1 zone. The maximum FAR may be increased from 0.4 to 0.5 if the building design incorporates one of the following: (1) Single-Story. Buildings limited to one story with a maximum height of 14 feet to top of a flat roof and 20 feet to the ridge or peak of a sloped roof (with otherwise permitted exceptions allowed). The allowed single story shall not include mezzanines or lofts. (2) Small Lots. The property is located on a small lot that is less than 5,000 square feet in size. (3) Greater Setbacks. A second-story step back (upper story building setback) of at least five feet along the front façade and second-story side setbacks that are at least three feet greater than the minimum required setback. (4) Garage Location. Provide a detached garage located behind the main dwelling.
with the Community Design Guidelines.

6.2 Continue the project. An action continuing the application should include direction to the applicant and staff on pertinent issues.

6.3 Recommend denial the project. An action denying the application should include findings that cite the basis for denial and should reference inconsistency with the General Plan, CDG, Zoning Regulations or other policy documents.

7.0 ATTACHMENTS

7.1 Project Plans
CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Commission was called to order on Monday, August 3, 2020 at 5:02 p.m. via teleconference, by Chair Allen Root.

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Richard Beller, Michael DeMartini, Mandi Pickens, Micah Smith, Vice Chair Christie Withers and Chair Allen Root

Absent: None

Staff: Senior Planner Shawna Scott and Deputy City Clerk Megan Wilbanks

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

--End of Public Comment--

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES


ACTION: MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BELLER, SECOND BY VICE CHAIR WITHERS CARRIED 6-0-0, to approve the minutes of the Architectural Review Commission meetings of July 6, 2020.

ACTION: MOTION BY COMMISSIONER SMITH, SECOND BY COMMISSIONER PICKENS CARRIED 6-0-0, to approve the minutes of the Architectural Review Commission meetings of July 20, 2020.
PUBLIC HEARING

2. **Project Address: 1691 Fredericks; Case # ARCH-0073-2020 & SBDV-0076-2020; Zone R-1; Tim Ronda, applicant.** Review of a new two-story 23,951-square foot residential care facility with 35 private rooms; project includes a request for a 20 percent parking reduction, a fence height exception to allow a fence and retaining wall combined maximum height of 12 feet within portions of the side yard, where 9 feet is normally allowed, and an increase to the maximum floor area ratio to 0.5 where 0.4 is normally allowed. Project is categorically exempt from environmental review (CEQA).

   Associate Planner Kyle Bell presented the staff report and responded to Commissioner inquiries.

   Applicant representative, Tim Ronda with Studio Design Group Architects, responded to Commissioner inquiries.

   **Public Comments:**
   None

   --End of Public Comment--

   **ACTION:** MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BELLER, SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DEMARTINI CARRIED 6-0-0, to find the project consistent with the Community Design Guidelines and recommend that the Planning Commission approve the project as presented.

3. **Project Address: 207 Higuera; Case # ARCH-0090-2020; Zone C-R-MU; 207 Higuera LLC, applicant.** Review of a Mixed-Use Development comprised of 16 one-bedroom dwellings and 390 square-feet of non-residential space. The applicant requests a Density Bonus of eight percent as an Affordable Housing Incentive; and exceptions from development standards to reduce the number of required vehicle parking spaces by one, and to reduce the number of required bicycle parking spaces for the residential component to one long-term space per unit. The project is categorically exempt from environmental review (CEQA).

   Assistant Planner Walter Oetzell presented the staff report and responded to Commissioner inquiries.

   Applicant representative, Jesse Skidmore with Ten Over Studio, responded to Commissioner inquiries.

   **Public Comments:**
   Harry Hamilton

   --End of Public Comment--
ACTION: MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BELLER, SECOND BY VICE CHAIR WITHERS CARRIED 6-0-0, to continue the project to a date uncertain with the following direction to the applicant:

- Enhance the buffer between the street and parking lot and the attractiveness of the parking area
- Consider converting the extra motorcycle space to provide landscape planting area;
- Provide design details (including colors and materials) for a low screening wall (about 3 feet in height) at the parking area frontage;
- Consider “wrapping” the wall “around the corners” of the frontage to enhance the attractiveness of the screening and landscape area;
- Provide credible design details for the transformer (e.g. dimensions and clear areas required by PG&E) to inform the landscape plan at the southwest corner of the parking area
- Consider the interface with neighboring property to the north and south (e.g. potential future fencing neighbors may install)
- Utilize alternative paving materials and treatments to enhance the parking area;
- Enhance the articulation of the rear (East) elevation;
- Consider storefront treatment at ground level, similar to front entry;
- Enhance the front (West) elevation;
- Provide additional articulation to the stucco wall;
- Draw attention to, and provide protection for, the stairwell entry at the southwest building corner (e.g. by extending awning over the entry area);
- Enhance visual interest of the roofline;
- Consider additional articulation; and
- Develop the mechanical equipment screening.

COMMENT AND DISCUSSION

Senior Planner Shawna Scott provided a brief agenda forecast.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:52 p.m. The next Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Commission is scheduled for Monday, August 17, 2020 at 5:00 p.m. via teleconference.

APPROVED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION: 08/17/2020
TREE COMMITTEE AGENDA REPORT

SUBJECT: Review of 6 tree removals and replanting plan of 66 trees as part of a Residential Care Facility development located at 1691 Fredericks Street.

PROJECT ADDRESS: 1691 Fredericks Street

FILE NUMBER: ARCH-0073-2020, SBDV-0076-2020, & USE-0203-2020

BY: Kyle Bell, Associate Planner
Phone: (805) 781-7524
E-mail: kbell@slcity.org

FROM: Ron Combs, City Arborist

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend the Planning Commission find the proposed tree removal and replanting plan as part of the residential care facility development at 1691 Fredericks Street consistent with the Tree Regulations.

SITE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Tim Ronda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>R-1 (Low Density Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>~47,916 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Status</td>
<td>Categorically exempt from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (in-Fill Development Projects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

The project consists of a proposed development of an existing residential property to include a two-story residential care facility consisting of 35 private rooms, accommodating up to 40 residents. The project is proposed on a vacant parcel and is combined with a lot line adjustment to establish a flag lot with access from Fredericks Street. The project includes the removal six (6) trees on site; 5 California Pepper trees (22"), 1 Blue Gum Eucalyptus tree (40"), The project also includes the removal of 1 Aleppo Pine (12"), and 2 Brisbane Box trees (12"), however, these three trees are exempt from a tree removal permit in accordance with Municipal Code § 12.24.090.C because these trees are non-native species that are less than 20-inches diameter at breast height (DHB), located within the R-1 zone. The project proposes to replace the 6 trees with 66 onsite trees (Attachment 1, Landscape Plans).

1 Municipal Code § 12.24.090 Tree Removal (C) Permit Not Required. Removing a tree in R-1 and R-2 zones does not require a permit if all of the following conditions exist: (1) The tree is a designated native species and the trunk is less than ten inches in diameter as measured by diameter standard height… or when the tree is nonnative and the trunk is less than twenty inches DSH; and (2) The tree is not located within a creek setback area…; and (3) The tree is not a
1.0 COMMITTEE PURVIEW

The Tree Committee’s role is to review the project and provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding consistency with the policies and standards set forth in San Luis Obispo Municipal Code (SLOMC) §12.24 (Tree Regulations).

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project includes the proposed removal six trees: 5 California Pepper trees (22”), 1 Blue Gum Eucalyptus tree (40”). The project includes preservation of 14 trees on-site, and 66 new trees, resulting in a total of 80 trees on-site. The replanting plan includes: 31 Pedestrian Scale Trees (Western Redbud, Moraine Locust, Crape Myrtle, and Ornamental Pear), 18 Perimeter/Screening Trees (Mariana Strawberry Tree, Cajeput Tree, Fruitless Olive, Brisbane Box), 17 Parking Lot/Drive Aisle Tree (London Plane, Chinese Pistachio) see Figure 1.

![Diagram of tree planting plan]

Figure 1: Replanting plan

4.0 TREE REGULATIONS

The City’s Tree Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.24) was adopted in 2010 and recently updated in 2019 with the purpose of establishing a comprehensive program for installing, maintaining, and preserving
designated street tree, and is not located within ten feet of the back of the sidewalk; and (4) Planting or retention of the tree was not a condition of development; or (5) The tree is a palm and the trunk is less than twelve inches DSH.
trees within the City. This ordinance establishes policies, regulations, and specifications necessary to govern installation, maintenance, removal, and preservation of trees to beautify the city; to purify the air; to provide shade and wind protection; to add environmental and economic value; and to preserve trees with historic or unusual value.

Process for Tree Removals Related to Ministerial or Discretionary Property Development Permits. SLOMC §12.24.090 subsection F.4 requires review by the Tree Committee for tree removal requests related to discretionary permit applications for Major Development Review, to make a recommendation based on criteria set forth in subsections G and J. The criteria are provided below with a description of how the proposed project responds.

- **Size of Tree.** The size of the trees proposed for removal range from 22 inches DHB to 40 inches DBH.

- **Location of Tree on Private Property.** All trees proposed for removal are located on private property. The trees are located throughout the property; some trees are visible from the public right-of-way, including most prominently the California Pepper trees located along the Fredericks Street frontage.

- **Species of Tree.** The species of trees proposed for removal include 5 California Pepper (native), 1 Blue Gum Eucalyptus (nonnative).

- **Forestry Best Practice.** The project includes preservation of 14 trees on site that vary in size and maturity, the replanting plan includes an additional 66 trees that significantly increases the biodiversity of the existing tree species and age distribution throughout the site.

- **Public Right-of-Way Obstruction or Displacement.** No street trees are proposed for removal.

- **Compliance Regarding Compensatory Plantings.** The applicant is proposing to provide compensatory plantings as discussed in greater detail below.

- **Heritage Trees.** None of the trees proposed for removal have been designated Heritage trees.

Compensatory Tree Planting. Per the Tree Regulations, tree removal shall be compensated by planting a minimum of one new tree for each tree removed onsite (1:1 replanting ratio). There are 6 trees proposed for removal throughout the site. The applicant is proposing to replant 62 trees on-site; this is a replanting ratio of 11:1. The compensatory planting plan complies and exceeds the requirements of the Tree Regulations.

5.0 **ACTION ALTERNATIVES**

5.1 Recommend approval based on consistency with Tree Regulations. An action recommending consistency of the application will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for final action. This action may include recommendations for conditions to

---

2 Zoning Regulations § 17.106.030, Levels of Development Review. (D) Major. Major Development Review is a discretionary Planning Commission review process that includes public notice with a public hearing conducted as is required for all Planning Commission actions. (1) Multi-unit residential developments with more than 10 units... (3) Nonresidential development with more than 10,000 gross square feet of new construction...
address further consistency with the Tree Regulations.

5.2 Continue the project. An action continuing the application should include direction to the applicant and staff on pertinent issues, with references to specific Tree Regulations.

5.3 Recommend denial based on findings of inconsistency with Tree Regulations. An action recommending inconsistency of the application should include recommended findings that cite the basis for denial and should reference inconsistency with the General Plan, Tree Regulations or other policy documents.

6.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Landscaping Plan
CALL TO ORDER

A Special Meeting of the San Luis Obispo Tree Committee was called to order on Monday, September 28, 2020 at 5:30 p.m. via teleconference by Chair Allen Bate.

ROLL CALL

Present: Committee Members Scott Loosley, Elizabeth Lucas, Allen Root, Rodney Thurman, Vice Chair Jane Worthy, and Chair Alan Bate

Absent: Committee Members Scott Loosley, Sean O’Brien, Allen Root

Staff: Ron Combs, City Arborist and Megan Wilbanks, Deputy City Clerk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES


   ACTION: UPON MOTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBER THURMAN, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER LUCAS, CARRIED 4-0-3 (Members Loosley, O’Brien, and Root absent), the Tree Committee approved the Minutes of August 25, 2020.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Will Powers

--End of Public Comment--

TREE REMOVAL APPLICATIONS

2. 675 Stoneridge Dr.

   City Arborist Combs provided a presentation and responded to Committee inquiries.

   The applicant, Thor Krichevsky, provided a brief overview of the tree removal project.

   Public Comment:
   None

   --End of Public Comment—
**ACTION:** UPON MOTION OF VICE CHAIR WORTHY, SECONDED BY CHAIR BATE, CARRIED 4-0-3 (Members Loosley, O’Brien, and Root absent), to deny the Tree Removal Application based on insufficient findings to support removal.

3. **4421 Brookpine (HOA Pathway Trees)**

   City Arborist Combs provided a presentation and responded to Committee inquiries.

   The applicant, Casey Guenther and Christine Noffz with Islay Hill HOA, provided a brief overview of the tree removal project.

   **Public Comment:**
   None

   --End of Public Comment—

   **ACTION:** UPON MOTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBER THURMAN, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER LUCAS, CARRIED 4-0-3 (Members Loosley, O’Brien, and Root absent), allow removal of four Cottonwoods trees and replace 1:1 with 15gal or greater.

4. **529 Hathway Ave.**

   City Arborist Combs provided a presentation and responded to Committee inquiries.

   The applicant, Alvin White, and Ron Rinell with Bunyon Bros provided a brief overview of the tree removal project.

   **Public Comment:**
   None

   --End of Public Comment—

   **ACTION:** UPON MOTION OF CHAIR BATE, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER THURMAN, CARRIED 4-0-3 (Members Loosley, O’Brien, and Root absent), continue review of this item to the October 26, 2020 Tree Committee meeting.

5. **1348 Alder St.**

   City Arborist Combs provided a presentation and responded to Committee inquiries.

   The applicant, Lisa Ajanel, provided a brief overview of the tree removal project.

   **Public Comment:**
   Bill Nevins
   Marcia Nevins
---End of Public Comment---

**ACTION:** UPON MOTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBER LUCAS, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER THURMAN, CARRIED 3-1-3 (Vice Chair Worthy dissenting, Members Loosley, O’Brien, and Root absent), to allow removal of the tree and replace it with a 24-inch box.

6. **880 Leff St.**

City Arborist Combs provided a presentation and responded to Committee inquiries.

The applicant’s representative, Ron Rinell with Bunion Bros, provided a brief overview of the tree removal project.

**Public Comment:**
None

---End of Public Comment---

**ACTION:** UPON MOTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBER LUCAS, SECONDED BY CHAIR BATE, CARRIED 3-1-3 (Member Thurman dissenting, Members Loosley, O’Brien, and Root absent), to deny removal of the tree based on insufficient findings.

7. **1159 Islay St.**

City Arborist Combs provided a presentation and responded to Committee inquiries.

The applicant, Chris Knauer, provided a brief overview of the tree removal project.

**Public Comment:**
None

---End of Public Comment---

**ACTION:** UPON MOTION OF VICE CHAIR WORTHY, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER LUCAS, CARRIED 4-0-3 (Members Loosley, O’Brien, and Root absent), to deny removal of the tree based on insufficient findings to support removal.

**BUSINESS ITEMS**

8. **New Business:** Tree removals at a Mixed-Use project located at 830 Orcutt Road, ARCH-0764-2019.

City Arborist Combs provided a presentation and responded to Committee inquiries. Associate Planner Kyle Bell presented the staff report and PowerPoint presentation and responded to Committee inquiries.
The applicant, Bryan Ridley, provided a brief overview of the tree removal project.

Public Comment:
None

--End of Public Comment—

ACTION: UPON MOTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBER THURMAN, SECONDED BY CHAIR BATE, CARRIED 4-0-3 (Vice Chair Worthy abstaining, Members Loosley, O’Brien, and Root absent), the Tree Committee is in support of the project with the following recommendations to the Planning Commission:

• Replace the street trees designated as Strawberry Midrones with Chinese Pistache
• Along the creek, incorporate two additional Coast Live Oaks (all oaks 36-inch box), to bring the number of total replacement trees onsite to 21.

9. New Business: Tree removals for a Residential Care Facility at 1691 Fredericks Street (ARCH-0073-2020)

City Arborist Combs provided a presentation and responded to Committee inquiries. Associate Planner Kyle Bell presented the staff report and PowerPoint presentation and responded to Committee inquiries.

The applicants, Tim Ronda and Scott Wright, provided a brief overview of the tree removal project.

Public Comment:
None

--End of Public Comment—

ACTION: UPON MOTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBER THURMAN, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER LUCAS, CARRIED 4-0-3 (Members Loosley, O’Brien, and Root absent) the Tree Committee is in support of the project with the following recommendations to the Planning Commission:

• Switch the proposed planting list for the parking lot trees from London Plane to Chinese Pistash
• Consider changing the proposed planting list for the driveway trees from Chinese Pistach to Tristania or Crape Myrtle
• Move the London Planes to a different part of the site plan to allow a larger planting area


ACTION: By consensus, the Committee moved to continue this item to the next Special Tree Committee meeting on October 26, 2020.
COMMENT AND DISCUSSION

11. Arborist Report: Tree Committee Goal Setting discussion

- Budget for maintenance of trees
- Budget for a Development Review Arborist staff member
- Update the tree inventory or Urban Forest Master Plan
- Disseminating service request tasks to contracted Arborists and other support staff

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m. The next Special Meeting of the Tree Committee is scheduled for Monday, October 26, 2020 at 5:30 p.m. via teleconference.

APPROVED BY THE TREE COMMITTEE: XX/XX/2020
April 21, 2020

Mr. Tim Ronda
Studio Design Group Architects
762 Higuera Street, Suite 212
San Luis Obispo, CA  93401

Subject:  1691 Fredericks Street Assisted Living Shared Parking Analysis

Dear Mr. Ronda:

Orosz Engineering Group, Inc. (OEG) is pleased to provide you with this letter report to assist in the evaluation of the potential parking impacts that could be associated with the proposed residential care assisted living project planned at 1691 Fredericks Street in San Luis Obispo. We are familiar with shared parking concepts and the City of San Luis Obispo parking requirements.

PROPOSED PROJECT
The proposed project will share parking with the existing Mt. Carmel Luthern Church immediately to the east. A daycare/preschool also shares parking with the Church. The project is requesting a reduction in the required parking on-site which is allowed with the Director’s approval, as the parking supply serves more than one use.

The project proposes a total of 35 living units with shared dining facility. Five (5) full-time daytime staff is planned with two staff members working overnight. On-site parking for 73 vehicles is planned for the assisted living facility, church and pre-school.

PARKING REQUIREMENTS
The City of San Luis Obispo requires that a shared parking analysis be conducted to ensure that the on-street parking near the site is not impacted by the parking required for the proposed project. Further the City requires that the land uses that will be sharing the parking, do not impact the on-street parking supply.

City of San Luis Obispo
Based on the City’s parking requirement for the three uses that share the parking, 86 parking spaces are required summarized in the table below. As seen in this table, the assisted living component of the project would require 12 parking spaces, before any shared parking reduction was considered. For the Church element, the parking requirement would be 65 spaces and the Day Care/Pre-school would require eight parking spaces. The total parking requirements based on the City’s Zoning Ordinance requirements would be 85 spaces.