ACTION MINUTES
Regular Meeting – Tuesday, November 15, 2011 – 7:00 P.M.
City Hall Council Chambers
6907 El Camino Real, Atascadero, California

CALL TO ORDER - 7:00 p.m.
Chairperson Bentz called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and Commissioner Wingett led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL
Present: Commissioners Cooper, Dariz, Schmidt, Wingett, Vice Chairperson Ward, and Chairperson Bentz
Absent: Commissioner Colamarino (excused)
Others Present: Recording Secretary Annette Manier
Victor Montgomery, RRM Design Group
Steve Weinberger, W-Trans
Randy Chafin, Michael Brandman Associates
Jason Brandman, Michael Brandman Associates
Staff Present: Community Development Director Warren Frace
Public Works Director Russ Thompson
Associate Planner Callie Taylor
Assistant Planner Alfredo Castillo
Deputy Director of Public Works-Engineering David Athey
Fire Marshal Tom Peterson
Community Services Director Brady Cherry
APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: By Commissioner Cooper and seconded by Commissioner Schmidt to approve the agenda.

Motion passed 6:0 by a roll-call vote. (Colamarino absent)

PUBLIC COMMENT
None

PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS
None

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ON OCTOBER 4, 2011.

MOTION: By Commissioner Schmidt and seconded by Vice Chairperson Ward to approve the Consent Calendar.

Motion passed 6:0 by a roll-call vote. (Colamarino absent)

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STAFF REPORTS
None

PUBLIC HEARINGS
None
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

2. **PLN 2008-1280, EAGLE RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN WORKSHOP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner:</th>
<th>Eagle Ranch, LLC c/o Greg Smith and Jeff Smith, PO Box 25010, Ventura, CA 93002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>RRM Design Group, 3765 S. Higuera St., Ste. 102, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>PLN 2008-1280 / Eagle Ranch Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location:</td>
<td>Eagle Ranch (San Luis Obispo County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description:</td>
<td>The Eagle Ranch Specific Plan is a 3,450+ acre, undeveloped area containing 450+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undeveloped Atascadero Colony lots and a network of un-built Colony roads that were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>originally established by E. G. Lewis' 1914 Atascadero Colony Map. The Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>would reconfigure these colony lots into a master planned community that includes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>housing, commercial uses, parks, trails, open space, and tourist serving facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Director Frace introduced City staff, Steve Weinberger from W-Trans, Randy Chafin from Michael Brandman Associates and Jason Brandman from Michael Brandman Associates. Director Frace explained the process of tonight’s informal meeting, and explained that the public will be given an opportunity to ask questions. Director Frace gave the history and background on the Eagle Ranch project. Director Frace also explained that there will be future meetings, including a LAFCO public review process. The City’s website will accept comments on the project, and the public can put comment cards in the comment card box at the back of the room. Comments will be considered during the development of the EIR.

Randy Chafin, Director of Environmental Planning with Michael Brandman Associates, gave a presentation on the project. (Exhibit A)

Victor Montgomery, RRM Design Group, gave a presentation on the project. (Exhibit B)

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following people spoke during public comment: Alana Reynolds, Sherry Condon, Paul Hyman, Barry Baker, Jody Smith, Diana Larsen, Mark Frazier, Twyla Martin, Dennis Derickson, Red Heesch, Terry Grebel, Matt Gillette, Brenda Noel, Kris Hollensen, Fred Collins, Craig Smith, Ellen Béraud.

Staff and consultants answered questions from the public.

The meeting was video-recorded and is available on the City’s website for public review.

*Chairperson Bentz closed the public comment period.*
Commissioners made comments about the larger issues surrounding Eagle Ranch, asked questions, and made comments about the project. Director Frace answered questions from the Commission.

Chairperson Bentz stated that the EIR will be the next step in the process and that document will address the public’s concerns. The Planning Commission did not take any action on the project.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND REPORTS
None

DIRECTORS REPORT

- Director Frace announced again that the next step for the Eagle Ranch project will be a joint session with the Planning Commission and City Council to review comments.
- Director Frace stated that the next meeting is scheduled for December 6, 2011.

ADJOURNMENT - 9:21 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for December 6, 2011, at City Hall, Council Chambers, 6907 El Camino Real, Atascadero.

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Annette Manier, Recording Secretary

Approved 12-6-11

The following exhibits are available in the Community Development Department:

Exhibit A – Presentation from Michael Brandman Associates
Exhibit B – Presentation by RRM Design Group
Eagle Ranch Meeting Notes:

Roll Call - Commissioner Colamarino is excused
Approval of Agenda
Motion to approve the agenda
Motion passes 6-0
Public Comment period open than closed
Item #1 - Presentation

Warren opened up the meeting with a welcome note and gave a presentation
- “We are hoping to have informal dialogue with the public, we want to give the public an opportunity to find about the project, and an opportunity to ask question”
- The 2002 General Plan calls for the annexation of the property has policies set up for the annexation of the property
- The family expressed an interest in restarting the project
- Warren described the project process and where we are in this process

Randy Chafin makes his presentation in regards to the EIR
- Randy describes some of the initial items that were reviewed
- Randy goes over the Ag constraints of the site
- Ag is not a viable use of the site and not a constraint
- Biological resources is now discussed
- Discusses some of the areas where the species were found as well as some of the sensitive plants
- No real biological resources that will preclude development on the site
- Historical resources included field surveys and tribal consultations
- Key to avoid the impact whenever possible or record information
- Flood zones discussed, but no real impact
- Slopes than discussed, and Randy describes how the development avoids the steep slopes area
- Randy discusses the traffic aspect of the review.
- Existing conditions are operating at existing LOS B, with the exception of Santa Rosa Rd
- Randy goes over the ADT stats and PM/AM Peak
- Randy than describes some the potential project impacts
- Randy goes over the approach to mitigation
- Local streets will be carefully analyzed
- Randy discusses wildfire/emergency connectivity

Vic Begins his presentation
- Vic goes over the constraints
- Vic describes the lotting concept
- Vic goes over the proposed elementary school site
- Vic describes the “Paloma Creek” areas
- The village center is described with the smaller lots, multi-family house, public park and small commercial area
- San Rafael Road is now described. Some concerns were raised by an attendee
- Ranch HQ/Resort is now being described
- The conceptual trails map is discussed
- Vic goes over the road sections
- The conceptual drawings are now presented
• Applicant goes over the village center concept as well as the Ranch HQ
• The applicant discusses the project summary and ranges

Public Comment Period

Alana Reynolds-The diagram looked like people where coming off the freeway right pass the elementary school, has traffic been considered passing by the school? Are Horse trails, going through people’s neighborhood’s property? Has trail maintenance and sanitary conditions been considered? Will the Multi-use trails be paved or dirt? Is the loop road the only way to get to the resort? Like the Multi-use trail, focus on the equestrian portions and move them away from the roadways.

Response: Trails were considered, but need to go pass residential lots in some instances. Main village loop trail will be paved. The trails that are referred to as multi-use will be open to the public. Applicant did review access to the property and in consultation with the school district, because of the slopes there are relatively few areas available for school sites. Traffic with commercial will not be an issue due to site topography. Wtrans has yet to evaluate the issue thoroughly. Access to the resort will travel to the heart of the loop. No direct residential access from loop

Sherry Condon- The lot sizes will be much smaller than the existing lots. We have a minimum lot size of 2.5 in that area. I have concerns of the lot sizes plus the impact of traffic on San Rafael especially on San Gabriel when you combine this with school traffic. Please review San Rafael/San Gabriel intersection. The roadway on Los Osos road is crumbling, will the applicant repave the roadway to make current standards. Previous project approval from the Kelly Gearheart development was never brought to standards, so will this project fix the roadway?

Response: The lot size is smaller. Though the process there is a way to propose different lot sizes, and this is permitted. This is subject to review and approval by pc/cc. Improvement requirements would include project frontage and improvements on San Rafael and Los Osos, part of the EIR process. Los Osos would have to be widen to meet City Standards. The initial traffic analysis has just scratched the surface, comment noted.

Paul Hyman- Concerned about Nightscape on Colorado Road. Concerned about dark skies. Requests that the applicant do everything possible to reduce ambient light effect. Shocked at the amount of lots that were added between the previous project versus what is presented tonight. Looks forward to more information

Response: There are policies in the general plan that encourages minimal lighting at night to protect the night sky. To be looked at in the EIR. In terms of how much lighting will be made, we will make sure that the issue is addressed to the degree necessary to push staff in that direction. Vic addressed the increase in lot number. The number of units is being driven by the cost of improvements. Between the mandates to cluster, various lot sizes, and improvements on-site and off-site, the unit size is trying to capture a balance.

Barry Baker: Amount of vehicle traffic is low at 700 in the morning. Estimates are very low at traffic impact. Concerned about sewage treatment, are they on septic, can the current plant take that? A lot of the current residents are on septic, will existing residents be forced on sewer if they fail?
Response: Estimates that are shown tonight are based on standard rates on residential, retail, etc. Less than 1 trip per unit, not all take a trip during the peak hour. The smaller lots will be on sewer. We do not have the exact locations of the infrastructure. The existing treatment plant does have the capacity and will be evaluated. Existing residence will not be forced and it will be an internal sewer more than likely.

Jody Smith: Really shocked to see a housing development, are you planning on putting in a buffer zone or have homes right against the fence line. How big is the buffer?

Response: Applicant is proposing to leave a buffer, and those will not be accessed from a through street. Do not know the size of the buffer at this time.

Diana Larsen: Glad to show that the only meetings that have been held so far have been 2 and feels like this is a bait and switch. I signed a document that acknowledged up to 300 homes on the adjacent property when I bought my home. I am quite surprised. If San Rafael punches through to Santa Barbara it will become a thoroughfare to the freeway. It will take a growth in the district to build a new school. This will make San Rafael a thoroughfare to the freeway. It is a private road right now. If that is going to be a new road to the project, who will maintain that road in the future? You mentioned some of the sensitive biological resources such as foxes, vultures, etc. You will be destroying habitat. What will you to mitigate the destruction of habitat? What kind of mitigation can you do?

Response: Noted as an issue to address in the EIR for San Rafael Road. This preliminary analysis focused on impacts to the main roads, still need further analysis. As far as road maintenance, we will review as a part of this process so that the new residents maintain roads. Somehow Eagle ranch or the City will have to accept it into the maintained system. As for the biological, we do not expect a lot of impact on most species, however raptors and other birds that may be affected, and mitigation will be required with avoiding nesting areas. The other comment alluded too is loss of habitat and forging area. Quite a lot of site is still protected, and there are no areas blocked in terms of corridors. At this point we do not see a significant impact from a CEQA standpoint, but we reserve a right to dive deeper as the project is refined.

Mark Frazier: We are pretty emotionally invested in the home that we own. When you say that there are not many flood zones in the area, there is a lot of flooding during heavy rains. The water sheets across it during rains, and this is an issue as the City called this a big concerned. It is not a matter of making the road wider, but bring the road up to standards. I am concerned about the speeding on the road. I am concerned with cut through traffic utilizing San Rafael. Who do you think is going to clean up the horse trails with bicycle? Nobody. It is one thing to talk about wildlife that is there, but what about the wildlife that should be there. There is real pig problem in the Ranch. It needs to be addressed as a current and future issue. As for the size of the lot, now you are going to reduce the lot sizes? You need to be more considerate to the existing lot sizes and residents.

Response: Localized drainage will be addressed at the later time. Traffic consultant has noted the traffic concern. In terms of the wild pig, there is no applicant response at this time. Applicant did not know about the issue, and will review the issue and figure out an approach. The issue of the size of the lots will also be reviewed.

Twyla Martin - Traffic. If I did my math correctly, that is 500 cars going pass my property that is a huge impact when you already used to a low level of traffic. I think it is really important to look at traffic
patterns and the school. The third one is the flooding that comes down San Diego road. It is supposed to stay on the south side, and I am wondering if there is going to be any impact on the amount of water with development. It is definitely a problem currently. With the increased traffic changes the whole way you are living and it does have an impact.

Response: You are correct with the traffic numbers. With the increase in traffic, there are two issues, capacity and volume. We are treating the residential streets much different than say El Camino Real. Most residential streets around have 500 to 1,500 trips a day. Right now San Diego is about 100 trips. It is way below any standard and any increase will be a tenfold. The residential streets will be treated differently in the EIR. The flooding along San Diego is an existing problem and the City will review the watershed from the Ranch to help minimize that flooding:

Denis Derickson: Look at west Atascadero there is miles and miles of low density and now there is an proposed increase in density. I am in a state of shock and it should be a courtesy to somehow taper the density while going into the eagle ranch development. Somehow that lower density part should transition on the existing lots. The happiness factor will rise with a transition from old style to new style.

Red Heesch: A little bit confused with this addition or proposed right of way. At the first two meetings that we had, we were told not had to worry about San Diego Road be extended. Now the fire department is requiring to extend San Diego Road for safety. Also, you have two, 4 acres parcels that are not a part of the Ranch. Will they be annexed or will they be left in the County? If this proposed San Diego extension goes through, someone will have to pay some sort of impact for the extension of the road. In 1996 we discussed this with the fire department and AWMWC if they would assist in putting in the driveway and to use the old ranch road and were not interested. So we located the house appropriately which put us closer to San Diego Road. This could have been solved. No one wanted to listen than, now we are being impacted. These roads open up the possibility of more traffic.

Response: Those 2 remainder parcels will be annexed as a part of the Eagle approvals. We will not leave an island. In terms of the San Diego Road extension, we believe that the project provides an opportunity to provide fire breaks and fire evacuation. The idea of connect a roadway to the project is a recommendation by the fire department. The consultant team was charged in reviewing a variety of ways to provide fire protection, etc. We do need to look at a potential solution for a limited access problem. We are at the early stages of analysis. We are certainly sensitive of the environmental impacts that this may present. The City has contemplated breakaway gates and other barriers to inhibit connections. There are ways that prevent public access but be available for emergency access. The City’s FD is looking at an emergency access road, not a public roadway at this time.

Terry Grebel: Wanted to compliment the applicant and City staff on the work so far. I want to bring up the Atascadero Road “S” curve. Hoping there would be a way to reduce speed through a stop sign or the method at Ortega Road.

Matt Gillette: It would be nice to take that density and push it further away from the project. I will now see 50 plus a home in the backyard and it is a little much to swallow. I would like to suggest the AT&T fiber optic line running though the corridor be taken into consideration, and make sure to talk to them. Grant deed very specific on not building anything nor plantings. It is a pretty major line that serves the
west coast. There are two lots currently designed over a neighbor’s house on San Rafael that is shown over someone’s house. The buffer is a good idea too. If not, a lot split is only fair to be looked at.

**Brenda Noel:** Concern is about traffic flow especially going across the freeway, especially at Santa Rosa. There will be 3 elementary schools on the west side, if you ever try to go across that overpass, it is a zoo. Extremely concerned about the number of homes, yet understands why the need for more. If there is any way to look at not opening up San Rafael Road to through traffic? If you leave the way San Rafael is, you will open up 3F meadows to a shortcut to 101 and this is not acceptable.

**Barry Baker:** Is this one developer for the project and what is the timeline?

*Response:* It is a single property owner and this project will be phased. It is going to take somewhere between 10 and 20 years. In terms of how the phasing will be done is not figured out yet. Traffic may drive some of the phasing decision. Also driving the decision will be sewer. Someone also asked about the timing of the elementary school, the district’s projections show enrollment will begin to increase and the district cannot tell us when they need the school site, however indication is it will increase by 2014. The smallest option to date is an elementary school at 13 acres, but have also mentioned either a junior high school or middle school. Applicant is waiting for decisions from them.

**Kris Hollensen:** Curious about all the talk about traffic, but is there any discussion of public transit or park and ride.

*Response:* As part of the transportation section of the EIR, it will be addressed in the EIR.

**Fred Collins:** Having a native American consultation has been a great assist to the project. We have been meeting with the Smith Family and others over the last year and this is a blue print project on how to do exceptional work. We are at the beginning stages of the cultural resources and very pleased with the way the project is going.

**Craig Smith:** One of the things I really like is the character of the drive on Atascadero drive. It is a nice scene. I am afraid of with this development, it will appear like track housing. I hope they are considerate of that.

**Ellen Béraud:** ALPS board and very pleased to see a connection trail between ALPS and the national forest. Make sure the property is respecting species protection and the environment.

**Sherry Condon:** I live on San Rafael on min. 2.5 acres. If there is the development that is proposed at the end of our lot, the applicants should consider the impact of the existing residents with the smaller lot sizes that are proposed.

**Diana Larsen:** When will this process end and when will the bulldozers start moving and where will they begin construction? Will the housing be spec or custom built?

*Response:* We are very early in this process. We have a year and half left in entitlements. We still have to prepare final maps and building plans. 3 years at the earliest. We are anticipating that the project will be 10 to 20 years. To be honest, we have considered 2 options so far. Option 1 is the area of the elementary school as a phase 1. The other option is to start at the northeast corner of the property and work towards the west across the site. We do not know which one because of utilities and economic analysis. The
owners are deciding which one is more feasible. It is unlikely that one developer will do the whole thing, so more than likely it will be sold to builders. It will probably be custom homes on the larger lots. The smaller lots will be done through spec homes more than likely through developers.

Alana Reynolds: One concerned that has not come up is the surrounding properties and farm animal. If these people surrounding the area, these people will not be happy about those rural/density issues. One thing that has not been raised, is that issue.

Public hearing is closed.

Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Schmidt: Obviously there were a lot of questions in regards to the density issue on San Rafael Road and the interface issue. We are all cognizant of the issue. It is more the spacing of the houses that need to be reviewed. The density in that area is very important. The fire department and the emergency roads are for emergency use and will not be open for everyday public use. I wanted to remind the public about that. The applicant at the very beginning made it clear that the constraints will drive the project. They will shift to address the needs and issues brought up today. LAFCO technical question of when the area is annexed into the City. The property is already in the sphere. A lot of comments made about traffic.

Commissioner Dariz: Would like RRM to discuss the buffer and interface of the existing and new lots. Another concern is a little bit more information on the commercial component. Would like to hear a discussion on any lots zoned for ag.

Commissioner Wingett: Concerned addressed:

Commissioner Ward: This is one of the most unique areas in the entire County, and when it develops, it will be one of the most desirable ones to live in. Staff and the applicant have anticipated a lot of the problems that have come up. One question that I have is that there is a very large parcel of land designated for a school. I question whether there will be enough kids to populate that school, however there are roadways that would lead to existing schools and hope that issue will be worked out. This will be a real assist for the City.

Commissioner Cooper: I commend the public for speaking, but thankful for the speakers. My feeling on this whole project has been thankful for the thoughtfulness put into the plan. A lot of the issues that have been put in, we have been asking for them from the developer. These aren’t the builders or the developers asking for them, we as a city are asking for them. The school district sees this project as an opportunity to get a new school. Many of these items that are discussed are things we need to address and wanted. Many of the planning commissioners were privileged to take a tour of the ranch. I think that the applicant has been very thoughtful at the same time we have to be cautious as well and that was evident by the local Chumash tribal consultation. Your concerns are important to us. I live here. We want to do what’s right for residents, landowners, environment, etc.

Commissioner Bentz: Traffic, transportation, equestrian trails, environmental, historical resources, these are all big issues. That’s what an EIR is required and put in place for. All of these issues will be discussed and we will have an opportunity to discuss these items. We can all make a better decision when these
documents will be made available. I have made quite a few notes on your comments and will take these into consideration. We have a team that has been praised by professionals as well as our Native Americans. This development will be a benefit to the community as long as the process is followed. We are here to make sure to represent what the people would like to have in this particular project. This EIR will change your mind on how you feel about these things.