San Luis Ranch Specific Plan
1035 Madonna Road
SPEC-ANNX-ER-1502-2015

Public Hearing for the
San Luis Ranch Specific Plan Project

May 24 and 25, 2017

Applicant: Coastal Community Builders
Representatives: Marshall Ochylski, Rachel Kovesdi
Presentation Overview (May 24 and 25)

- Proposed Hearing Structure (May 24, May 25 and June 7)
- Project Background and History
- Previous Advisory Body Review
- Discussion of Final EIR
- General Plan Guidance and Policy Consistency
- Overview of Project Entitlements
- Overview of the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan
  - How the FEIR is reflected in the Specific Plan
  - How the Specific Plan includes Advisory Body input
- Key Issues/Questions to Consider
Planning Commission Role

- Review Specific Plan and Related Entitlements
- Review Final EIR and Mitigation Measures
- Take Public Input
- Make Recommendations to City Council
Outline of PC Hearings

- **May 24 and 25** – Final EIR, Specific Plan, GPA, and Pre-Zoning

- **June 7** – Vesting Tentative Tract Map (including project conditions), Term Sheet, and Annexation
Part 1

Project Background and Site History
Project Site and Location

[Map and aerial view of project site and location]
History of Development Efforts at the Site

- **1994**: General Plan anticipates development in City
- **2001**: City Council denies Dalidio Marketplace Project
- **2004**: City Council approves San Luis Marketplace Project
- **2005**: City Voters reject San Luis Marketplace Project
- **2006**: “Dalidio Ranch” project approved in County (Measure J)
- **2007**: Lawsuits filed to overturn Measure J
- **2009**: Court of Appeals upholds Measure J
- **2012-14**: LUCE update underway (completed in December 2014)
- **2014**: Applicant seeks updated project in City (San Luis Ranch), consistent with updated LUCE
April 1, 2014

- City Council accepts San Luis Ranch project application for processing based on Planning Commission recommendation
- Initiates preparation of Specific Plan consistent with LUCE direction (which was still in progress at that time)
- Authorizes preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to analyze the project
December 2014

- City Council adopts the Land Use and Circulation Elements (LUCE) update, and certifies Program EIR

- Specific Plan must be consistent with General Plan Land Use Policy 8.1.4, which provides a development framework for the San Luis Ranch area
## Land Use Element Policy 8.1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Designations Allowed</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Minimum(^1)</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>350 units</td>
<td>500 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>50,000 SF</td>
<td>200,000 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/High tech)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>50,000 SF</td>
<td>150,000 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Visitor-serving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200 rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>5.8 ac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space / Agriculture</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Minimum 50%(^2)</td>
<td>No maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. There can be a reduction in the minimum requirement based on specific physical and/or environmental constraints.

2. The City Council may consider allowing a portion of required open space to be met through off-site dedication provided:
   a. A substantial multiplier for the amount of open space is provided for the off-site property exchanged to meet the on-site requirement; and
   b. Off-site land is of similar agricultural and visual value to the community; and
   c. Off-site land is protected through an easement, dedication or fee title in perpetuity for agriculture/open space.
Land Use Element Policy 8.1.4

a. Land for Prado Road connection must be provided
b. Multi-modal Circulation needs to be included
c. Circulation not to bifurcate onsite Agriculture
d. Transit hub required
e. Maintain agricultural views from 101
f. Maintain agricultural and open space resources onsite
g. Ag buffers (when needed) need to be placed on non-ag lands
h. Integrate onsite ag uses with development
i. Include walkable retail and bike/ped connections
j. Commercial parking shall be visually screened to the extent possible
k. Neighborhood commercial for residential uses shall be provided
l. Flood issues need to be addressed onsite
m. Land uses need to be in keeping with applicable ALUC regulations
n. Historic evaluation of onsite farm structures is required.
Project Description

- Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment/Pre-Zoning, and Development Plan/Tentative Tract Map for the 131-acre project site

- Specific Plan will guide land use, circulation, parks and open space, infrastructure, and architecture/design
Part 2

Previous Advisory Body Input
Previous Planning Commission Input

- **February 12, 2014.** *Pre-Application Review*

- **February 10, 2016.** *Preliminary Draft Specific Plan Review*

- **March 23, 2016.** *Preliminary Draft Specific Plan Review*

- **January 11, 2017.** *Draft EIR Workshop*

- **January 25, 2017.** *Draft EIR Workshop*
Previous City Advisory Body Review

- **Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)**
  - *November 19, 2015.* Preliminary Draft SP review
  - *January 19, 2017.* Conceptual concurrence with Draft SP as revised

- **Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC)**
  - *February 3, 2016.* Preliminary Draft SP Review; input reflected in EIR and revised SP
Previous City Advisory Body Review

- **Architectural Review Commission (ARC)**
  - *May 1, 2017.* Initial review of revised Design Guidelines and further input
  - *May 22, 2017.* Workshop for revised Design Guidelines

- **Cultural Heritage Committee (CHC)**
  - *January 23, 2017.* Draft EIR mitigation review
  - *May 15, 2017.* Review of and concurrence with proposed SP historic preservation approach and policy consistency
February 15, 2017
- Continued consideration of item to allow applicant to update plan to ensure ALUP consistency

March 29, 2017
- Considered updated project and provided additional direction to ensure ALUP consistency

April 19, 2017
- Found project as consistent with ALUP, subject to conditions (land use restrictions)
- These conditions are now included in updated Specific Plan
Part 3

Final Environmental Impact Report
EIR Process Overview

- Initial Study-NOP Comment Period/Scoping Process
- Public Draft EIR Released (45-day comment period)
- Response to Comments & Final EIR Released
- Final EIR Certification & City Decision-maker Hearings
Project EIR Timeline

**Winter 2016 – 2017**
- Public Review of Draft EIR

**Winter/Spring 2017**
- Respond to Comments

**Summer 2017**
- Final EIR & Certification
CEQA Process

- **April 1, 2014.** City Council authorizes EIR preparation
- **October 26, 2015.** Notice of Preparation/Initial Study
- **December 9, 2016.** Draft EIR released (45-day review period; subsequently extended to 52 days)
- **January 30, 2017.** 52-day public review period ends
CEQA Process

- **March 3, 2017.** Portion of DEIR (Energy Demand Impacts section) recirculated for 45 days

- **April 17, 2017.** Recirculation public review period ends

- **March through May 2017.** Responses to comments lead to modification of some analysis and mitigation measures. No new impacts introduced, or changes in the level of severity of previously-identified impacts.

- **May 16, 2017.** Final EIR released, including responses to comments and changes from Draft EIR
CEQA Environmental Resources Analyzed in Draft EIR

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology & Water Quality
- Land Use/Policy Consistency
- Noise
- Recreation
- Transportation & Traffic
- Water Resources
Agricultural Resources

- Conversion of prime soils to urban development
- Potential land use conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations

**Mitigation:**
- Off-site agricultural conservation easement or pay in-lieu fees to preserve existing agricultural land
- Agricultural fencing, signage, and buffer landscaping
Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Unavoidable increase in vehicle miles traveled inconsistent with SLOAPCD Clean Air Plan
- Construction emissions would exceed SLOAPCD thresholds (ozone precursors, diesel particulate matter)
- Operational emissions would exceed SLOAPCD daily thresholds (ozone precursors, diesel particulate matter, dust)

Mitigation:

- Construction measures to control dust and diesel emissions, low-VOC architectural coatings;
- Operational emission control measures and off-site mitigation funding consistent with SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook
Biological Resources

- Impacts to wildlife and special status species
- Impacts to sensitive habitats, including riparian areas and wetlands

**Mitigation:**

- Biological best management practices for construction, including:
  - Sedimentation and runoff minimization
  - Delineation and avoidance of Environmentally Sensitive Areas
- Environmental monitoring and pre-construction surveys
- Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan
- Tree replacement
- Construction and infrastructure setbacks from Prefumo Creek
Cultural Resources

- Unavoidable removal/relocation of historic structures
- Potential impacts to unidentified subsurface archaeological resources

**Mitigation:**
- *Historical Structure Relocation and Reconstruction Plan*
- Archival documentation of historic buildings
- *Informational display of historic resources in the proposed new Agricultural Heritage Facility*
- Construction monitoring for archaeological and Native American resources
Hydrology and Water Quality

- Site grading and development would alter drainage and affect flooding, erosion, and siltation
- Operational runoff and sedimentation from residential, commercial, and agricultural uses
- Avoidance of structures/housing within 100-year flood zone

  **Mitigation:**
  - Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)
  - Master Drainage Plan and Maintenance Manual
  - Stormwater quality treatment controls
  - Conditional Letter of Map Revision/ Letter of Map Revision
Land Use/Policy Consistency

- Unavoidable potential inconsistency with City General Plan policies for historical resources
  
  - **Mitigation:**
    - Mitigation required for agricultural resources also addresses potential LU policy inconsistency
Land Use/Airport Hazards

- Project located within City Airport Overlay Zones and ALUP Safety Areas S-1b and S-2
- Consistent with City’s Airport Safety Zones
Noise

- Unavoidable temporary construction noise during grading activity
- Operational noise conflicts between proposed new commercial uses and proposed new residential uses
- Roadway noise at proposed new residential uses

**Mitigation:**
- *Construction noise reduction measures*
  - Construction vehicle travel route
  - Construction activity timing
  - Equipment best management practices
  - Neighboring property owner notification
- *Commercial noise attenuation (HVAC shielding, parking lot orientation, noise barriers)*
- *Interior noise reduction requirements for new construction*
- Froom Ranch Way noise barrier
Transportation & Traffic

- *Multimodal Transportation Impact Study* (TIS) prepared by Omni-Means

- TIS evaluated traffic with project under multiple scenarios
  - Existing & Near-Term conditions
  - Cumulative conditions

- Different scenarios provide basis for phasing triggers for EIR mitigation measures
PHASE I - CIRCULATION

LOVR & 10 Freeway - Multimodal LOS and Capacity Impact.
Mitigation: Add turn lanes.

Froom Bridge as Part of Phase 3 Creates Multimodal LOS and Capacity Impacts.
Mitigation: Build as part of phase 1.

Froom & LOVR Multimodal LOS and Capacity Impacts.
Mitigation: Widen to add turn lanes.

LOVR & AutoPark Multimodal LOS Impact.
Mitigation: Signalize.

LOVR & 101 Capacity Impact.
Mitigation: Lengthen off ramp turn pocket.

LOVR & Higuera Capacity Impact.
Mitigation: Lengthen turn pocket.

Higuera & TankFarm Capacity Impact.
Mitigation: Lengthen turn pocket & channelize right turn.

Higuera & Prado Multimodal LOS and Capacity Impact.
Mitigation: Add second NB left lane.

Madonna Corridor Multimodal LOS Impact.
Mitigation: Separated Path.

Higuera Corridor Multimodal LOS Impact.
Mitigation: Separated Path.
PHASE II - CIRCULATION

Mitigation: Prado Rd. Overpass & NB Ramps

Mitigation: Roundabout Control
PHASE III - CIRCULATION

1. San Luis Ranch Rd. – Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation: Preclude Thru Traffic

2. Los Osos Valley Road – Multimodal Level of Service Mitigation: Separated Path
CUMULATIVE CIRCULATION

- Madonna & Oceanaire Capacity Impact Mitigation: Lengthen Turn Pockets
- LOVR & Madonna Capacity Impact Mitigation: Lengthen Turn Pockets
- Higuera & South Capacity Impact Mitigation: Lengthen Turn Pocket

Multimodal LOS and Capacity Impacts. Mitigation: Prado Rd. SB Ramps
Transportation & Traffic

Potentially Unavoidable Impacts

#1 Los Osos Valley Road & Froom – Intersection LOS & Queuing
Transportation & Traffic

Potentially Unavoidable Impacts

#2 Madonna & Dalidio – Intersection LOS & Queuing
Transportation & Traffic
Potentially Unavoidable Impacts
#3 Higuera Street – Bicycle LOS
Additional EIR Issues

- **Aesthetics**
  - Existing viewsheds and visual character
  - Nighttime lighting and glare

- **Geology and Soils**
  - Earthquake hazards
  - Liquefaction potential

- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**
  - Consistency with City Climate Action Plan

- **Hazards/Hazardous Materials**
  - Agricultural pesticides in on-site soils
  - Exposure to PCE
  - Exposure to Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) during construction activity

- **Recreation**
  - Failure to meet City parkland standards on-site

- **Water Resources**
  - Increased demand for water supply
Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts

- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Land Use
- Noise
- Transportation
Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts

- Air Quality
  - Clean Air Plan consistency (AQ-1)
  - Cumulative impacts related to air quality
Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts

- Cultural Resources
  - Elimination of San Luis Ranch farm complex (CR-1)
  - Cumulative impacts related to historic resources
Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts

- **Land Use**

  - Potential inconsistency with General Plan policies related to parkland, historic resources, and meeting multi-modal transportation objectives (LU-1)
Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts

- Noise
  - Short-term construction noise (N-1)
Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts

- **Transportation**
  
  - Project and cumulative impacts to intersection capacity at Los Osos Valley Road/Froom Ranch Way (T-2; T-9)
  
  - Impacts to the Higuera Street segment between Prado and Madonna Road (T-3)
  
  - Project and cumulative impacts to intersection capacity at Madonna Road/Dalidio Drive (T-8; T-9)
  
  - Cumulative impacts to the U.S. 101 segment between Los Osos Valley Road and Madonna Road (T-10)
Alternatives Analysis

- **No Project Alternatives**
  - Continuation of agricultural uses, or
  - Development of project site under existing Measure J entitlements

- **Historical Resources Preservation Alternative**
  - Retains the historical San Luis Ranch Farm Complex
  - Similar residential and commercial development
  - Higher density to retain overall buildout on a smaller footprint

- **50% On-Site Agriculture/Open Space Alternative**
  - Preserves 50% of the project site acreage as agriculture/open space
  - Reduces residential buildout from 580 units to approx 536 units
### Comparison of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>No Project Development</th>
<th>Measure J Entitlements</th>
<th>Historical Resource Protection</th>
<th>50% On-Site Agriculture/Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Issues (EIR identifies significant and unavoidable impacts)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Policy Consistency</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Traffic</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Issues (EIR identifies impacts that are less than significant with or without mitigation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Resources</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less (Surface Water)/</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater (Groundwater)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>14 Less, 0 Greater</td>
<td>3 Less, 11 Greater</td>
<td>7 Less, 1 Greater</td>
<td>8 Less, 0 Greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of San Luis Obispo
Planning Commission – 2 workshops (January 2017)
  - 23 speakers plus Commission comments

Cultural Heritage Committee workshop (January 2017)
  - 1 speaker plus CHC comments

Written Comments during public review period
  - 41 letters and e-mails (12-9-16 to 1-30-17)
  - 2 letters (recirculation 3-3-17 to 4-17-17)
Final EIR Conclusions

- No new impacts or change in level of severity of previously identified impacts

- Primary change to Draft EIR – Refinement of Mitigation Measures

- Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts remain the same as in Draft EIR

- Specific Plan incorporates mitigation measures
Primary Changes to Draft EIR in the Final EIR

- **Modified Mitigation Measures**
  - Agriculture [AG-1]
  - Air Quality [AQ-2(a); AQ-2(b); AQ-2(e); AQ-3(a)]
  - Biological Resources [BIO-1(e); BIO-1(f)]
  - Cultural Resources [CR-1(a)]
  - Hazards and Hazardous Materials [HAZ-5(a); HAZ-5(b)]
  - Hydrology and Water Quality [HWQ-3(a)]
  - Noise [N-4(b); N-5(a); N-5(c); N-5(d)]
Part 4

General Plan Guidance and Policy Consistency
Key General Plan Policies

- Discussed and Analyzed in Section 4.9 of the Final EIR
- Also included as an attachment to the staff report
Policy Consistency

- **FEIR Consistency Analysis**
  - Project is **Consistent** with most City policies
  - Potentially inconsistent with a few policies, noted below, pending decision-maker consideration

- LUE Policy 1.10.4 (design standards)
- LUE Policy 8.1.4 (parkland requirement)
- COSE Policy 3.3.2 (demolitions)
- CE Policy 6.1.2 (multi-modal design objectives)
Policy Consistency

Consistency Analysis

- LUE Policy 1.10.4 (design standards)
- COSE Policy 3.3.2 (demolitions)
  - Project is clustered to the extent possible (minimizes impacts to archaeological resources)
  - CHC found the project’s approach to relocate and adaptively reuse site consistent with City policies that relate to historic resources
- Staff conclusion: Consistent with policies
Consistency Analysis

- LUE Policy 8.1.4 (parkland requirement)
  - Policy requires 5.8 acres onsite
  - Project includes 2.8 acres and payment of in-lieu fees
  - PRC found this this approach was a more effective way of providing needed park facilities than requiring all 5.8 acres onsite
  - Staff conclusion: Consistent with policy
Policy Consistency

- **Consistency Analysis**
  - CE Policy 6.1.2 (multi-modal objectives)
    - *EIR found Class I impacts related to achieving multimodal objectives at:*
      - Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive intersection
      - Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way intersection;
      - Higuera Street (certain roadway segments); and
      - U.S. 101 mainline segments at Los Osos Valley Road and Madonna Road.
    - However, project includes robust multimodal circulation system; SP addresses this to the extent feasible
      - Walkable within project area to key locations
      - Network of interconnected paths and trails
      - Central transit stop included
    - **Staff conclusion:** Consistent with intent of policy
Part 5

Project Components and Discussion
Project Components and Entitlements

- San Luis Ranch Specific Plan
- General Plan Amendment/Pre-Zoning
- Development Plan/Vesting Tentative Tract Map
- Term Sheet/Development Agreement
- Annexation
Proposed Specific Plan Principles ("Core 4")

- Maintain and Promote San Luis Obispo’s Agricultural Heritage
- Provide Open Space and Recreation Areas
- Deliver Diverse Housing Opportunities, Including Workforce Housing
- Create a Multimodal Community Seamlessly Integrated into the Existing Circulation System
Proposed Land Use Designations/Zoning
## Summary of Proposed Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Units/SF</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>NG-10</td>
<td>16.42%</td>
<td>200 units</td>
<td>21.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>NG-23</td>
<td>5.54%</td>
<td>100 units</td>
<td>7.3 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>NG-30</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
<td>246 units</td>
<td>11.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>9.03%</td>
<td>150,000 SF</td>
<td>11.9 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>100,000 SF</td>
<td>4.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and Conference Center</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>200 rooms</td>
<td>3.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture and Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>39.82%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.3 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Open Space</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Planned Development area is based on Net Site area of approximately 122.5 acres. The gross site area is approximately 131.4 acres, less approximately 8.9 acres of right-of-way for regional roads.*
Project Description

- Neighborhood General 10
  - Single-Family Residential
  - Small Lot Residential

- Neighborhood General 23 and 30
  - Multi-Family Residential
  - Townhomes

- Neighborhood Commercial
  - Commercial, Office, Hotel

- Open Space

- Agriculture
  - Ag Processing Center
  - Market/Farm Stand
  - Learning Center
  - Food Services

Neighborhood General 10 (NG-10)
This zone allows for detached single family residential units with the majority of lots averaging 3,200 sf. Residential products envisioned for this zone are Traditional Single Family.

Neighborhood General 23 (NG-23)
This zone allows for detached single family residential units on lots averaging 2,400 to 3,000 sf. Residential products envisioned for this zone include Small-Lot Front Loaded and Small-Lot Alley Loaded. These products will appeal to a wide variety of home buyers and will support workforce housing needs on the Central Coast.

Neighborhood General 30 (NG-30)
This zone allows for attached and detached units on lots as small as 1,000 sf to lot sizes that can accommodate multi-family residential structures. Residential products envisioned for this zone include Detached Townhomes, Attached Townhomes, and Multi-Family structures such as apartments or condos.

Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
This zone allows commercial development intended to serve neighborhood residents as well as visitors. Table 3-10 includes a wide variety of allowable uses. The vision for this zone is to include a blend of retail, office, hotel, and horizontal mixed-use buildings.

Open Space (OS)
The primary intent of this zone is to provide areas for active and passive recreation that includes community parks, neighborhood parks, pedestrian paths, and habitat restoration areas. This zone accommodates trails, paths, playground equipment, and limited structures necessary to support the specific uses.

Agriculture (AG)
The primary intent of this zone is to preserve and maintain agriculture uses consistent with the San Luis Obispo General Plan, as well as integrate agricultural history into the community. Physical development should promote the Specific Plan area's agricultural uses and heritage.
# Project Description

## Table 2: Summary of the proposed lot sizes, lot coverage, and building heights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>Lot Sizes/Lot Coverage</th>
<th>Max Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood General 10 (NG-10)</td>
<td>Traditional Single Family</td>
<td>3,200 SF min</td>
<td>35’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood General 23 (NG-23)</td>
<td>Small Lot Front Loaded</td>
<td>2,400 SF min</td>
<td>35’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood General 23 (NG-23)</td>
<td>Small Lot Alley Loaded</td>
<td>2,400 SF min</td>
<td>35’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood General 30 (NG-30)</td>
<td>Detached Townhome</td>
<td>1,000 SF min</td>
<td>40’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood General 30 (NG-30)</td>
<td>Attached Townhome</td>
<td>1,000 SF min</td>
<td>40’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood General 30 (NG-30)</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>1,000 SF min</td>
<td>40’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (NC)</td>
<td>Commercial, Office and Hotel</td>
<td>80% max</td>
<td>20’ min; 50’ max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (A)</td>
<td>Ag Learning Center</td>
<td>3,000 SF max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market/Farm Stand</td>
<td>3,000 SF max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ag Processing Center</td>
<td>10,000 SF max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>5,000 SF max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ag Accessory Structures *</td>
<td>1,500 SF max per structure</td>
<td>35’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* up to a total of 10,000 SF in structures; historical structures may go to 45’
How the Specific Plan Addresses Advisory Input

- Planning Commission
  - *Broader Mix of Densities.* Greater range of densities and flexibility within zones provided
  - *Avoid Cul-de-Sacs.* Plan revised to include only 2 cul-de-sacs
  - *Clarify Roadway and Infrastructure Phasing.* Plan is updated and clarified, notably with respect to Prado Road improvements timing
Bicycle Advisory Committee

- Supported Prado crossing of US 101, even if only for bikes. Prado Road crossing will contain bike paths on both sides

Parks and Recreation Commission

- Include more passive recreation (trails). Additional trails included along creeks and drainages
- Separate parks and open space. Plan now includes separate Open Space zone with standards
How the Specific Plan Addresses Advisory Input

- **Cultural Heritage Committee**
  - *Need more detail on relocation plan.* Specific Plan includes additional detail.
  - *Ag Center should maximize number of historic buildings.* Plan now includes three major buildings from complex; was two.
  - CHC determined *project consistent with policy* and ordinances.

- **Architectural Review Commission**
  - *Design Guidelines need to be internally consistent and provide clear direction.* Chapter 3 of Specific Plan being updated.
  - ARC considered project on May 1 and 22, with recommendations to City Council forthcoming on June 5
How the Specific Plan Addresses Advisory Input

Airport Land Use Commission

- Found project consistent with safety and density policies on April 19, 2017, with conditions
- Specific Plan addresses these conditions:
  - Includes 200’-wide no build zone affecting commercial areas
  - Changes 3 acres of Residential (NG-23) to Commercial
  - 27 units removed from S-1b Zone, relocating 8 to S-2 Zone

- ALUC Consistency findings included in Appendix C of Specific Plan
How the Specific Plan Responds to the FEIR

- **Key Mitigation Measures are inserted into** the body of the **Specific Plan** document
  - Agriculture
  - Air Quality
  - Biological Resources
  - Cultural Resources
  - Hydrology and Water Quality
  - Noise
  - Recreation
  - Transportation

- **All Mitigation Measures are incorporated into Appendix B of the Specific Plan**
Specific Plan Components

- **Land Use**
  - Land use pattern to be addressed by PC
  - Architecture and design issues addressed by ARC
Neighborhood General 10 and 23 (NG-10 and -23)
Neighborhood General 10 (NG-10)

Figure 2.13 Single Family Traditional Lot Site Plan

Figure 2.14 Single Family Traditional Lot Elevations
Neighborhood General 23 (NG-23)

Figure 2.15 Single Family Small Lot Front Loaded Site Plan

Figure 2.16 Single Family Small Lot Front Loaded Elevations
Neighborhood General 23 (NG-23)

Single Family | SMALL LOT ALLEY LOADED

Figure 2.17 Single Family Small Lot Alley Loaded Site Plan

Figure 2.18 Single Family Small Lot Alley Loaded Elevations
Neighborhood General 30 (NG-30)

Figure 2.19 A Multi-Family Detached Compact Lot Site Plan

Figure 2.19 B Multi-Family Detached Compact Lot Elevations

Figure 2.20 A Multi-Family Attached Compact Lot Site Plan

Figure 2.20 B Multi-Family Attached Compact Lot Elevations
Neighborhood General 30 (NG-30)

Multi-Family | FLATS

Figure 2.21 Multi-Family Flats - Option A

Figure 2.22 Multi-Family Flats - Option B
Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
Neighborhood Commercial (NC)

Figure 2.25 Conceptual Elevation for Commercial Area
Neighborhood Commercial (NC)

Figure 2.26 Illustrative Plan for Hotel and Conference Area
Open Space (OS)
Agriculture (AG)
Agriculture (AG)

Figure 2.29 Illustrative Plan for Agricultural Heritage and Learning Center Area
Illustrative Agricultural Heritage Center
Specific Plan Components

- Circulation
Circulation Element Map
Provide land and appropriate financial support for development of a Prado Road connection. Appropriate land to support road infrastructure identified in the Final Project EIR (overpass or interchange) at this location shall be dedicated as part of any proposal and any area in excess of the project’s fair share of this facility shall not be included as part of the project site area used to calculate the required 50% open space.
b. Circulation connections to integrate property with surrounding circulation network for all modes of travel.

c. Connection to Froom Ranch and Calle Joaquin, if proposed, shall not bifurcate on-site or neighboring agricultural lands. Any connection to Calle Joaquin shall be principally a secondary / emergency access by design.

d. Development shall include a transit hub. Developer shall work with transit officials to provide express connections to Downtown area.
Specific Plan will be modified to update circulation map to a roadway classification map consistent with the General Plan, and a bicycle classification map consistent with the bicycle transportation plan.
Key Circulation Improvements

- Prado Road Overpass & NB 101 Ramps
- Froom Ranch Way extension (Prado to LOVR)
- Dalidio Drive improvements
- Madonna Road improvements
- Class I Multiuse Paths
- Roundabouts
- Transit Facilities
- Neighborhood Traffic Calming
- Emergency Access easement

The proposed Specific Plan language regarding these improvements is not fully consistent with the findings of the EIR. The Specific Plan will be modified to reconcile those inconsistencies.
### Key Roadway Design Considerations

The proposed specific plan classifications and cross sections are not fully consistent with the General Plan and EIR findings. The Specific Plan will be modified to reconcile those inconsistencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>ROW width</th>
<th>Travel Lanes</th>
<th>Other Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Collector – Froom Ranch Way</td>
<td>77’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11’ travel lanes; 6’6” Class I bike path; 14’ central median; parkways; 89-foot ag buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Street – Dalidio Drive/Prado Rd</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11’ travel lanes; two 5’ Class I bike lanes; 12’ median/turn lane; separate 7’ sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Residential Street</td>
<td>46’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ travel lanes; 6’ sidewalk in parkway median; 7’ parking on either side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20’ width with no center line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific Plan Components

- Utility Infrastructure
Infrastructure: Domestic Water
Infrastructure: Recycled Water
Infrastructure: Wastewater
Conceptual Floodplain Management
Conceptual Grading
Conceptual Drainage
Proposed Water Conservation Measures

- Drought-Tolerant Landscaping
- Recycled Water Use for landscaping
- Low-Flow Water Fixtures
- Interior Use of Gray Water (as allowed by law)
- Onsite Rainwater Harvesting
Specific Plan Components

- Phasing and Financing
The proposed phasing of the Prado Road Overpass & 101 Ramp is inconsistent with the EIR. The Specific Plan will be modified to reconcile this inconsistency.
Propose Project Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase/Trigger</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 – Residential (large lot)</td>
<td>Dalidio Drive widening, Froom Ranch Way Extension and Bridge, Froom Ranch Way / Dalidio Drive Signal or Roundabout, Madonna Road / Dalidio Drive intersection improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Residential (small lot)</td>
<td>Funding mechanism established for Prado Road Overpass and reconfigured North Bound Ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 – High Density Residential and Agricultural Heritage Center</td>
<td>Madonna Road Widening and Frontage Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 – Commercial (Hotel)</td>
<td>Froom Ranch Road / Dalidio Drive Traffic Signal or Roundabout Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases 5 and 6 – Commercial (Office and Retail)</td>
<td>Transit Hub at Retail Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Specific Plan Build-Out</td>
<td>Prado Road - Install Southbound Ramps to US 101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These proposed improvements, descriptions, and timing are not fully consistent with the EIR. The Specific Plan will be modified to reconcile those inconsistencies.
Proposed Residential Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Actual timing will be based on market forces and other related factors out of the applicant’s control.

The EIR evaluated a very specific sequential phasing. The Specific Plan will be modified to be consistent with what the EIR evaluated.
### Proposed Non-Residential Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Hotel + Conference Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Actual timing will be based on market forces and other related factors out of the applicant’s control.**

The timing of development shown here is inconsistent with the EIR evaluation. The Specific Plan will be modified to reconcile the inconsistency.
These proposed improvements, descriptions, and timing are not fully consistent with the EIR. The Specific Plan will be modified to reconcile those inconsistencies.
Infrastructure Financing Strategy

- **Primary Funding Mechanisms**
  - Development Impact Fees
  - Community Facilities District (CFD)

- **Possible Ancillary Funding Mechanisms**
  - City/County Tax Exchange
  - Developer Financing
  - Landscape and Lighting District
  - Homeowner Association Fees
  - Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD)
Project Components and Entitlements

- San Luis Ranch Specific Plan
- General Plan Amendment/Pre-Zoning
- Development Plan/Vesting Tentative Tract Map
- Term Sheet/Development Agreement
- Annexation
General Plan Amendment/Pre-Zoning

- **Update** the General Plan **Land Use Map**

- **Update** the General Plan **Circulation Map**

- **Update** portions of the General Plan related to statistical land use data

- **Specific Plan provides pre-zoning** for the site
  - *Needed for annexation application to LAFCo*
  - *Once annexed, the City’s zoning map will be updated*

- **Update** the Bicycle Transportation Plan
Project Components and Entitlements

- San Luis Ranch Specific Plan
- General Plan Amendment/Pre-Zoning
- Development Plan/Vesting Tentative Tract Map *
- Term Sheet/Development Agreement *
- Annexation *

* To be addressed by PC on June 7
Key Issues to Consider

- Agricultural Preservation
- Housing Affordability and Density Bonus Provisions
- Timing of Prado Road Improvements
- Airport Land Use Plan Consistency
Policy 8.1.4 requires 50% of site net area be in agriculture or open space.

City Council may consider a portion may be met offsite under these conditions:

- “Substantial multiplier” for amount of off-site dedication (GP does not establish criteria for a “multiplier”)
- Off-site land has similar visual and agricultural value
- Off-site land is protected through an easement
Agricultural Preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Offsite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Site Area</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Right-of-Ways</td>
<td>1.8 (LUCE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Site Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>129.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture/Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Prime Soils</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>50% = 54.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>50% - 10.3</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total AG/OS</td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The General Plan allows a portion of the Agriculture and Open Space requirement to be met through off-site dedication.*
LUE Policy 8.1.4 allows up to 500 dwellings on site

Under State Density Bonus Law, 80 more units are allowed

Project meets criteria to qualify for density bonus
Housing Affordability and Density Bonus Issues

- Inclusionary affordable housing requirements must be met within the first 500 units.

- Specific Plan will include 34 units onsite for very low, low, and moderate income households.
  - 26 of these are for very low income households, which qualifies the project for a 20% density bonus.
  - 12 deed-restricted NG-10 and NG-23 units will be located throughout area, integrated with other homes.

- Staff determined that this meets the City’s affordable housing requirements.
Provide land and appropriate financial support for development of a Prado Road connection. Appropriate land to support road infrastructure identified in the Final Project EIR (overpass or interchange) at this location shall be dedicated as part of any proposal and any area in excess of the project’s fair share of this facility shall not be included as part of the project site area used to calculate the required 50% open space.
Prado Road Improvements

- Prado Road/US 101 Interchange has been in the RTP and Circulation Element for decades

- As proposed, Specific Plan would dedicate right-of-way, but not make include improvements

- FEIR identified that the Specific Plan will trigger the need for an overpass by Phase 2

- Project would also contribute to cumulative impacts that would require a full interchange
Prado Road Improvements

- Per FEIR, construction of an overcrossing of U.S. Highway 101 prior to Phase 2 building permits

- Phased construction of full interchange required per mitigation measures T-1(c) and T-8(d-f)

  - Interchange will be addressed more fully as a map condition
  - Condition will require that prior to building permits for Phase 2, the following must be in place:

    - A city-approved funding mechanism for constructing the Prado Road interchange capable of delivering construction by phase 2.
    - Applicant’s fair share contribution toward Overpass & Northbound ramps must be paid.
    - Offer to dedicate right of way for Southbound ramps
Airport Land Use Plan Consistency

- **Airport Land Use Commission** found project consistent with safety and density policies on April 19, 2017, with conditions:

- Specific Plan addresses these conditions:
  - Includes 200’-wide no build zone affecting commercial areas
  - Change 3 acres of Residential (NG-23) to Commercial
  - 27 units removed from S-1b Zone, relocating 8 to S-2 Zone

- ALUC Consistency findings included in Appendix C of Specific Plan
Key Issues and Questions

General Issues

1. Does the proposed Specific Plan (including land use and circulation pattern) meet the multiple goals set forth for the site in the LUCE? Is it consistent with key General Plan policies?
2. Is there sufficient pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to satisfy the intent of multi-modal transportation goals?
3. Are you satisfied with the proposed phasing concept?
4. As a regulatory document, do you believe the Specific Plan will be easy to read and use? Are there ambiguities that need clarification?
Key Issues and Questions

**Agricultural Preservation**
1. Is there sufficient on-site ag and open space land included?
2. Is the amount of off-site dedication sufficient in the context of the required findings related to the quality of land and the need for a concept of a “substantial multiplier”?

**Affordable Housing and Density Bonus**
1. Are you satisfied that the project meets the City’s affordable housing requirements?
2. Do you support the applicant's approach to distribute deed-restricted very low income housing throughout the project site?
3. Do you have additional recommendations related to providing affordable housing on the site that do not impair the economic viability of the project?
Key Issues and Questions

**Prado Road Improvements**

1. Do you agree with the proposed timing of the applicant's responsibility to construct the Prado Road overpass (prior to building permits for Phase 2)?
2. Do you agree with the proposed condition regarding to the applicant’s responsibilities related to timing of a fair share payment and providing land dedication toward the construction of the Prado Road interchange?

**Airport Land Use Plan Consistency**

1. With the ALUC’s consistency finding leading to revisions to the Specific Plan, are you satisfied that aircraft-related safety and noise issues have been adequately addressed?
Next Steps

- **Architectural Review Commission** – *June 5, 2017*
  - ARC to provide recommendation to City Council on Design Guidelines (Specific Plan, Chapter 3)

- **Planning Commission** – *June 7, 2017*
  - Consideration of remaining entitlements
  - Recommendation to City Council

- **City Council to consider project approval** – *July 2017*

- **Annexation (if project approved)**
  - City Council to forward annexation request to LAFCo
  - LAFCo to consider City’s annexation application

- **Project Development**