

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER
FROM: ROBERT A. LATA, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: CODE AMENDMENT 03-008 (HASTINGS ENTERPRISES)
DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2004

Needs: For the City Council to review a request for a city wide sign code amendment. The request is to allow buildings that back up to or side on a street, highway or parking lots to obtain additional square footage for wall mounted signs.

- Facts:
1. Newlin Hastings of Hastings Enterprises has submitted the application for the Code Amendment 03-008. While his focus is mainly on buildings within the Food 4 Less Shopping Center, a code amendment would apply to buildings within other shopping centers and individual buildings throughout the City.
 2. For buildings that back up to or side on to a street, highway, or parking lot, the current Sign Ordinance allows one square foot of wall mounted sign for every linear foot the building has towards the street. This ratio, according to Mr. Hastings as well as many other commercial developers, is not enough.
 3. For buildings with multiple frontages, the business owners seek to place signs on the front elevation over the entry of the store, as well as on the rear or side elevations of the building facing a street, highway or parking lot. More often than not, especially if the building has multi-tenants, there is not enough linear footage of the building facing the street to qualify for the desired signage.
 4. The proposed code amendment would add the following language to Section 21.19.070:

For buildings located within the Highway Oriented Sign Districts (see Figure 21.19-1 & 21.19-2 for specific geographic locations) or within a "Regional Commercial" designated shopping center, when the buildings have a front, side or rear frontage on a street, alley, highway, driveway or a parking lot, approval for wall mounted signage may be requested on any frontage. The maximum sign area for any building elevation with frontage shall not exceed one square foot for every linear foot of building frontage. Exception: when determined to be appropriate in terms of scale and overall appearance, the DRC can limit the size/area of a sign and/or allow a building side to receive additional square footage beyond the one square foot per linear foot when transferred from another elevation from the same building.

5. All wall mounted signs are required to go through a sign permit process, where the ultimate approval of the size and character of the sign is approved by the Development Review Committee. Furthermore, signage for shopping centers would be addressed in the sign program for the center with the final review of each sign being approved by the DRC via a sign permit. Once a sign is approved by the DRC it is reviewed by the Building Division for the necessary permits.
6. The proposed text of the code amendment reflects the DRC's recommendation.
7. The Code Amendment is on the Planning Commission's agenda for January 27, 2004. Since this report was prepared prior to the Planning Commission meeting, staff will give a verbal update of the Commission's recommendation at the Council meeting on February 3, 2004.

**Analysis and
Conclusion:**

The code amendment would allow the use of other frontages besides street frontage such as highways, driveways and parking lots for additional square footage for wall mounted signs.

All signs would be required to be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Committee for content and scale. For shopping centers, the additional signage would be outlined in the sign program with the master development plan for the center.

By adopting Code Amendment 03-008, it would allow buildings with multiple frontages to have additional signage when determined to be appropriate by the DRC, with the intent of reducing the demand for illegal banners.

Policy

Reference: General Plan, Zoning Ordinance

Fiscal

Impact: None anticipated at this time.

Options: After consideration of all public testimony, that the City Council adopt one of the following options:

- a. (1)** Adopt Resolution No. 04-xx adopting a Negative Declaration for Code Amendment 03-008 application;
 - (2)** Introduce Ordinance No. xxx N.S. approving Code Amendment 03-008, to amend Section 21.19.070, for buildings located in a Highway Oriented Sign District or within a “Regional Commercial” designated shopping center, when buildings have a front, side or rear frontage on a street, alley, highway, driveway or parking lot, approval for wall mounted signage on any frontage, and set February 17, 2004, as the date for adoption of said Ordinance.
- b.** That the City Council amend, modify, or reject the above options.

Attachments:

- 1. Draft Negative Declaration Resolution
- 2. Draft Ordinance approving Code Amendment 03-008
- 3. Newspaper Notice Affidavit

DRAFT ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
AMENDING THE ZONING TITLE OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE
TO ALLOW FOR ADDITIONAL WALL MOUNTED SIGNAGE FOR BUILDINGS
THAT BACK-UP TO OR SIDE ON A STREET, HIGHWAY, DRIVEWAY OR PARKING LOT
(CODE AMENDMENT 03-008)**

WHEREAS, Newlin Hastings has applied for Code Amendment, CA 03-008, requesting that the Planning Commission adopt an amendment to the Section 21.19.070 of the Zoning Code to allow for additional wall mounted signage for buildings that have more than one frontage; and

WHEREAS, while Mr. Hastings is primarily proposing the Code Amendment to address buildings within the new Food 4 Less Shopping Center, there are other buildings in the City that could benefit from the Code Amendment, and therefore Code Amendment would address buildings City-wide; and

WHEREAS, Table 21.19.070 currently would allow buildings with multiple frontages only the linear footage of the building facing the street to calculate for wall mounted signs; and

WHEREAS, Code Amendment 03-008 is proposing to amend the Code to allow the use of driveways, parking lots and highways to be included in the linear footage calculations; and

WHEREAS, a resolution was adopted by the City Council approved a Negative Declaration status for this project, and a Negative Declaration was prepared for the proposed code amendment application in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of January 27, 2004, the Planning Commission took the following actions regarding this ordinance:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for this project;
- b. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on the proposed ordinance;
- c. Recommend that the City Council adopt a Negative Declaration for the Code Amendment;
- d. Recommended that the City Council adopt the proposed ordinance;

WHEREAS, at its meeting of February 3, 2004, the City Council took the following actions regarding this ordinance:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for this project;
- b. Considered the recommendation of the Planning Commission regarding this code amendment;
- c. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on the proposed ordinance;
- d. Considered the content of the Environmental Initial Study and adopted a Negative Declaration status for the Code Amendment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT KNOWN that the Paso Robles City Council, based upon the substantial evidence presented at the above referenced public hearing, including oral and written staff reports, finds as follows:

1. The above stated facts of this ordinance are true and correct.
2. This code amendment is consistent with the City's General Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. *Section 21.19.070 of the Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows (changes are in bold):*

1. Sign Area Limits. For any building or tenant space frontage, the total maximum sign area for all signs including wall-mounted, projecting, hanging, awning, and roof signs, but excluding freestanding and icon signs, shall not exceed one square foot of sign area for every linear foot of building with street frontage. Subject to DRC approval, the allowable sign area may be applied on any side of a building provided that the total square footage of all signage shall not exceed the sign area limits for the building.

Exceptions:

- a. Within the downtown area described as the geographical area bounded by 7th Street on the south, 17th Street on the north, Oak and Vine Streets on the west and State Highway 101 on the east, as shown on Figure 21.22-4, the maximum allowable sign area shall be based on both public street and alley frontages. The maximum sign area for any building side shall not exceed one square foot for every linear foot of street or alley frontage. A building side with no frontage on a street or alley may receive the sign area allotment for an opposite building side that has street or alley frontage, provided that the maximum sign area on the building side that has street or alley frontage is reduced proportionately. Multi-tenant buildings may allocate any portion of a frontages' maximum allowable sign area to any one specified tenant, even if the frontage of the specified tenant's space is less than the corresponding sign area. Other tenant uses' maximum sign areas must then be reduced accordingly.
- b. **For buildings located within the Highway Oriented Sign Districts (see Figure 21.19-1 & 21.19-2 for specific geographic locations) or within a "Regional Commercial" designated shopping center, when the buildings have a front, side or rear frontage on a street, alley, highway, driveway or a parking lot, approval for wall mounted signage may be requested on any frontage. The maximum sign area for any building elevation with frontage shall not exceed one square foot for every linear foot of building frontage. Exception: when determined to be appropriate in terms of scale and overall appearance, the DRC can limit the size/area of a sign and/or allow a building side to receive additional square footage beyond the one square foot per linear foot when transferred from another elevation from the same building.**

SECTION 2. Publication. The City Clerk shall cause this ordinance to be published once within fifteen (15) days after its passage in a newspaper of general circulation, printed, published and circulated in the City in accordance with Section 36933 of the Government Code.

SECTION 3. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of the Ordinance is, for any reason, found to be invalid or unconstitutional, such finding shall not affect the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance by section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, or phrases are declared unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. Inconsistency. To the extent that the terms of provisions of this Ordinance may be inconsistent or in conflict with the terms or conditions of any prior City ordinance(s), motion, resolution, rule, or regulation governing the same subject matter thereof and such inconsistent and conflicting provisions of prior ordinances, motions, resolutions, rules, and regulations are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall go into effect and be in full force and effect at 12:01 a.m. on the 31st day after its passage.

Introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council held on February 3, 2004, and passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles on the 17th day of February 2004 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sharilyn M. Ryan, Deputy City Clerk

**ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF PASO ROBLES
PLANNING DIVISION**

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** Code Amendment 03-008
- Concurrent Entitlements:** None
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Darren R. Nash, Associate Planner
Phone: (805) 237-3970
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** City-wide, within the City of Paso Robles, California
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Newlin Hastings
- Contact Person:** Newlin Hastings, Hastings Enterprises, Inc.
Phone: (805) 237-4040
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** A majority of the properties are commercial, regional commercial or manufacturing Zoning/General Plan designations.
- 6. ZONING:** A majority of the properties are commercial, regional commercial or manufacturing Zoning/General Plan designations.

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Code Amendment that would amend Section 21.19.070 to allow the ability to use highways, driveways and parking lots to be considered “frontage” for calculating sign square footage.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The proposed code amendment would apply to existing buildings as well as new buildings. Each sign would go through the sign permit process, reviewed by the City’s Development Review Committee.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	-----------

9. RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

None

10. PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THE PREPARATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY:

Darren Nash: Associate Planner

11. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR PROJECT:

This environmental initial study analyzes the potential impacts associated with calculation additional building frontage for wall mounted signage.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but one or more effects (1) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) have been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or is “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effect(s) that remain to be addressed.

Signature

Darren R. Nash

Printed Name

Date

Associate Planner

Title

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	
ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact		No Impact

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.
4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.
6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.
7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix I of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the needs and requirements of the City of Paso Robles.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, a list of applicable standard conditions identified in the discussions has been provided as an attachment to this document.)

SAMPLE QUESTION:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

Landslides or Mud flows? (Sources: 1, 6)

Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Paso Robles General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Source: 1,2)

Discussion: The ability for a building to have additional wall mounted signage would not have an impact to Land Use Planning.

b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Discussion: N/A

c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? (Source: 1,2)

Discussion: N/A

d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible uses)?

Discussion: There would not be a conflict with agricultural resources.

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

Discussion: The code amendment would not disrupt the physical arrangement of an established community. In the downtown area, there does not appear to be an established community.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (Source: Paso Robles General Plan.) Discussion: There is no residential development proposed with this project. This project would not exceed and regional or local population projections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? Discussion: There would not be a substantial growth in this area of the City with the proposed code amendment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? Discussion: There is no development proposed with this code amendment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

a) Fault rupture? Discussion: There is no development proposed with this code amendment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Seismic ground shaking? Discussion: There is no development proposed with this code amendment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? Discussion: There is no development proposed with this code amendment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? Discussion: There is no development proposed with this code amendment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Landslides or Mud flows? Discussion: There is no development proposed with this code amendment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? Discussion: There is no development proposed with this code amendment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Subsidence of the land? Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expansive soils? Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Unique geologic or physical features? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Source: 6,7,9) Discussion: There is no development proposed with this code amendment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? Discussion: See comment for IV.a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity)? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? Discussion: See Sec. IV a, discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (source: 7) Discussion: There is no development proposed with this application. Upon reviewing a future development plan specific	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

environmental impacts will be further reviewed.

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The ability for a building to have additional wall mounted signage would not have an impact to Air Quality.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There would not be an exposure to sensitive receptors to pollutants with the approval of the code amendment requests.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Create objectionable odors? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The ability for a building to have additional wall mounted signage would not have an impact to Transportation and Circulation.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Discussion: The ability for a building to have additional wall mounted signage would not have an impact to parking.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? Discussion: N/A.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? Discussion: N/A.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? Discussion: The ability for a building to have additional wall mounted signage would not have an impact to Biological Resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? Discussion: There is no development proposed with this application. The ability for a building to have additional wall mounted signage would not have an impact to Locally Designated Trees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient				

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

a) Increases in existing noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There is no development proposed with this application. Upon reviewing a future development plan specific environmental impacts will be further reviewed.				
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The ability for a building to have additional wall mounted signage would not have an impact to Public Services.				

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Police Protection? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other governmental services? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a) Power or natural gas? Discussion: Southern California Gas Company provides service to the Paso Robles area. The project is not anticipated to interfere with gas services or create an unmet demand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Communication systems? Discussion: The Pacific Bell Company provides service to the Paso Robles and County areas. The project is not anticipated to interfere with phone/communication services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Source: 7) Discussion: Future projects will be required to hook up to City sewer and water.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Storm water drainage? (Source: 6) Discussion: The ability for a building to have additional wall mounted signage would not have an impact to Store Water Drainage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Solid waste disposal? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Local or regional water supplies? (source: 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Discussion: The ability for a building to have additional wall mounted signage would not have an impact to local or regional water supplies.

XIII.AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Source: 1,9)

Discussion: It is possible with this code amendment that there could be a situation where wall-mounted signage would be placed on buildings facing scenic vistas or highways. The reason for allowing additional signage is to eliminate the need for temporary or illegal banners. Additionally each new sign will have to go through the City's Development Review Committee (DRC) for review and approval. The DRC would be reviewing the signs for content as well as scale and appearance.

With the review of the sign by the DRC, the signs would be critiqued and required to be of appropriate scale and appearance, therefore, there would be a less than significant impact as a result of Code Amendment 03-008.

- b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (Source: 1,9)

Discussion: See response to discussion on Section XIII.a above.

- c) Create light or glare? (Source: 1,9)

Discussion: It is anticipated that there would be the request to have illuminated signage. With the DRC review the amount of lighting and the colors of the signs would be reviewed. The DRC discourages white backgrounds for internally illuminated signs, to reduce glare.

XIV.CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a) Disturb paleontological resources?

Discussion: N/A

- b) Disturb archaeological resources?

Discussion: The Paso Robles area has been classified as territory occupied by the Migueleno Salinan and the Obispeno Chumash Native California populations. Past community populations have been evidenced at several sites within the Paso Robles area and unincorporated portions of the surrounding County.

- c) Affect historical resources?

Discussion: See XIV b.

- d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?

Discussion: N/A.

- e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

Discussion: N/A

XV.RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion: N/A				
b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? Discussion N/A.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVI.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	1977 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
10	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
11	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
12	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446

Summary of Mitigation Measures

Description of Impact

N/A

Mitigation Measure

N/A

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 04-

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR CODE AMENDMENT 03-008
ALLOWING ADDITIONAL FRONTAGE FOR SQUARE FOOTAGE OF
WALL-MOUNTED SIGNAGE (CITY WIDE)**

WHEREAS, Newlin Hastings has applied for Code Amendment, CA 03-008, requesting that the Planning Commission and City Council adopt an amendment to the Section 21.19.070 of the Zoning Code to allow for additional wall mounted signage for buildings that have more than one frontage; and

WHEREAS, while Mr. Hastings is primarily proposing the Code Amendment to address buildings within the new Food 4 Less Shopping Center, there are other buildings in the City that could benefit from the Code Amendment, and therefore Code Amendment would address buildings City-wide; and

WHEREAS, Table 21.19.070 currently would allow buildings with multiple frontages only the linear footage of the building facing the street to calculate for wall mounted signs; and

WHEREAS, Code Amendment 03-008 is proposing to amend the Code to allow the use of driveways, parking lots and highways to be included in the linear footage calculations; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on January 27, 2004 and the City Council on February 3, 2004, to consider facts as presented in the staff report prepared for this project, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed subdivision; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project and is labeled Exhibit A (on file in the Community Development Department); and

WHEREAS, public notice of the proposed Negative Declaration was given as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that based on the City's independent judgment, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby approve a Negative Declaration for Code Amendment 03-008 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 3rd day of February 2004 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

Sharilyn M. Ryan, Deputy City Clerk

Memorandum

To: City Council
CC: Bob Lata, Shari Ryan, Jim App
From: Darren Nash, Planning Division *DN*
Date: January 30, 2004
Re: Code Amendment 03-008 – Addendum to Staff Report

Mr. Mayor and members of the Council:

Attached is a revised Ordinance for Code Amendment 03-008 reflecting the Planning Commission's recommendations from their meeting on January 27, 2004. The Commission proposed the following changes to the Draft Ordinance that is part of your agenda packet:

- Build in a sunset clause ending the amendment in two years unless formally amended by the City Council;
- That internally illuminated signs be required to be individual channel letters, for non-illuminated signs they shall have consistent aesthetic quality as the channel letter signs or better (ie: no internally illuminated "can" signs).
- Must be reviewed by full Planning Commission if requesting more than two signs on one building.

Based on the above changes, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council approve Code Amendment 03-008.

Agenda Item #5

DRAFT ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
AMENDING THE ZONING TITLE OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE
TO ALLOW FOR ADDITIONAL WALL MOUNTED SIGNAGE FOR BUILDINGS
THAT BACK-UP TO OR SIDE ON A STREET, HIGHWAY, DRIVEWAY OR PARKING LOT
(CODE AMENDMENT 03-008)**

WHEREAS, Newlin Hastings has applied for Code Amendment, CA 03-008, requesting that the Planning Commission adopt an amendment to the Section 21.19.070 of the Zoning Code to allow for additional wall mounted signage for buildings that have more than one frontage; and

WHEREAS, while Mr. Hastings is primarily proposing the Code Amendment to address buildings within the new Food 4 Less Shopping Center, there are other buildings in the City that could benefit from the Code Amendment, and therefore Code Amendment would address buildings City-wide; and

WHEREAS, Table 21.19.070 currently would allow buildings with multiple frontages only the linear footage of the building facing the street to calculate for wall mounted signs; and

WHEREAS, Code Amendment 03-008 is proposing to amend the Code to allow the use of driveways, parking lots and highways to be included in the linear footage calculations; and

WHEREAS, a resolution was adopted by the City Council approved a Negative Declaration status for this project, and a Negative Declaration was prepared for the proposed code amendment application in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of January 27, 2004, the Planning Commission took the following actions regarding this ordinance:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for this project;
- b. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on the proposed ordinance;
- c. Recommend that the City Council adopt a Negative Declaration for the Code Amendment;
- d. Recommended that the City Council include the following parameters in the proposed ordinance:
 1. Build in a sunset clause ending the amendment the in two years unless formally amended by the City Council;
 2. That internally illuminated signs be required to be individual channel letters, for non-illuminated signs they shall have consistent aesthetic quality as the channel letter signs or better (i.e.: no internally illuminated "can" signs);
 3. Must be reviewed by full Planning Commission if requesting more than two signs on one building.

WHEREAS, at its meeting of February 3, 2004, the City Council took the following actions regarding this ordinance:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the staff report prepared for this project;

- b. Considered the recommendation of the Planning Commission regarding this code amendment;
- c. Conducted a public hearing to obtain public testimony on the proposed ordinance;
- d. Considered the content of the Environmental Initial Study and adopted a Negative Declaration status for the Code Amendment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT KNOWN that the Paso Robles City Council, based upon the substantial evidence presented at the above referenced public hearing, including oral and written staff reports, finds as follows:

1. The above stated facts of this ordinance are true and correct.
2. This code amendment is consistent with the City's General Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. *Section 21.19.070 of the Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows (changes are in bold):*

1. Sign Area Limits. For any building or tenant space frontage, the total maximum sign area for all signs including wall-mounted, projecting, hanging, awning, and roof signs, but excluding freestanding and icon signs, shall not exceed one square foot of sign area for every linear foot of building with street frontage. Subject to DRC approval, the allowable sign area may be applied on any side of a building provided that the total square footage of all signage shall not exceed the sign area limits for the building.

Exceptions:

- a. Within the downtown area described as the geographical area bounded by 7th Street on the south, 17th Street on the north, Oak and Vine Streets on the west and State Highway 101 on the east, as shown on Figure 21.22-4, the maximum allowable sign area shall be based on both public street and alley frontages. The maximum sign area for any building side shall not exceed one square foot for every linear foot of street or alley frontage. A building side with no frontage on a street or alley may receive the sign area allotment for an opposite building side that has street or alley frontage, provided that the maximum sign area on the building side that has street or alley frontage is reduced proportionately. Multi-tenant buildings may allocate any portion of a frontages' maximum allowable sign area to any one specified tenant, even if the frontage of the specified tenant's space is less than the corresponding sign area. Other tenant uses' maximum sign areas must then be reduced accordingly.
- b. For buildings located within the Highway Oriented Sign Districts (see Figure 21.19-1 & 21.19-2 for specific geographic locations) or within a "Regional Commercial" designated shopping center, when the buildings have a front, side or rear frontage on a street, alley, highway, driveway or a parking lot, approval for wall mounted signage may be requested on any frontage. The maximum sign area for any building elevation with frontage shall not exceed one square foot for every linear foot of building frontage. Exception: when determined to be appropriate in terms of scale and overall appearance, the DRC can limit the size/area of a sign and/or allow a building side to receive additional square footage beyond the one square foot per linear foot when transferred from another elevation from the same building. Proposals for more than two signs for one building shall be reviewed by the full Planning Commission. If the signs are internally illuminated, they shall be individual channel letter signs (no internally illuminated "can" or cabinet signs are permitted). Signs that are not

internally illuminated shall have the same aesthetic qualities as the channel signs or better.

Effective Dates. The wall mounted signs and the ability to use multiple frontages that are provided for in this section shall apply from the effective date of the ordinance codified in this chapter through February 17, 2006. Prior to February 17, 2006, the city council may, by ordinance, determine to extend the effective period of the requirements and/or exemptions. In the absence of an affirmative action by the city council to extend the requirements and/or exemptions provided for in this chapter, on February 18, 2006, the process in which to calculate wall mounted signage in the Highway Oriented Sign Districts and "Regional Commercial" designated shopping center, as defined by Figure 21.19-1 & 21.19-2 of this code, shall revert to the wall mounted signage ratio requirements as contained in Section 21.19.070.1 Sign Area Limits.

SECTION 2. Publication. The City Clerk shall cause this ordinance to be published once within fifteen (15) days after its passage in a newspaper of general circulation, printed, published and circulated in the City in accordance with Section 36933 of the Government Code.

SECTION 3. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of the Ordinance is, for any reason, found to be invalid or unconstitutional, such finding shall not affect the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance by section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, or phrases are declared unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. Inconsistency. To the extent that the terms of provisions of this Ordinance may be inconsistent or in conflict with the terms or conditions of any prior City ordinance(s), motion, resolution, rule, or regulation governing the same subject matter thereof and such inconsistent and conflicting provisions of prior ordinances, motions, resolutions, rules, and regulations are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall go into effect and be in full force and effect at 12:01 a.m. on the 31st day after its passage.

Introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council held on February 3, 2004, and passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles on the 17th day of February, 2004, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sharilyn M. Ryan, Deputy City Clerk