



**City of Paso Robles
Development Review Committee Agenda**

TELECONFERENCE MEETING ONLY

3:30 PM Monday – March 7, 2022

Development Review Committee meetings will be held by teleconference only until further notice as permitted by AB 361, which allows for a deviation of teleconference rules required by the Ralph M. Brown Act. The meeting will be virtual because state and local officials are recommending measures to promote social distancing.

Commissioners present: Ty Christensen, Joel Neel, and Mark Koegler

Staff present: Darren Nash, Lori Wilson, Katie Banister, Darcy Delgado, and Warren Frace

Applicants and others present: Lynette Sayles, Steve Fear, Ingrid Holguin, Nick Holguin, and Nick Gilman

Item 1

File #: [SGN22-02/ P22-0007](#)

Requested Action: DRC Final Action

Application: Review plan to update signage for Panda Express.

Location: 90 Niblick Road

Applicant: Lynette Sayles, Jones Sign

Discussion: Staff presented the plans to update signage for Panda Express to allow for re-branding. The new sign is internally illuminated and also includes a halo lit component which would provide illumination to the word Express that would now hang below Panda. The applicant explained that typically the Panda Express logo is also included in the signage however to maximize the space on this store front the applicant chose to exclude the logo. The store is also hoping to separate its brand from Express hence the reason those letters are smaller and not illuminated. The DRC did not have any suggestions for the proposed signage.

Action: The DRC approved the sign as designed.

Item 2

File #: [SGN22-05 / P22-0028](#)

Requested Action: DRC Final Action

Application: Sign plan for The Junction Restaurant

Location: 710 Pine Street

Applicant: Ingrid Holguin

Discussion: Staff presented the wall-mounted sign for a new restaurant at the railroad depot. The proposed sign meets sign type and dimension requirements. Staff recommended the applicant add a dark color border to the sign (e.g., wood frame or printed on the metal). DRC members agreed with staff's recommendation for a border and recommended lighting be added to the sign.

Action: The DRC approved the sign and asked the owner to work with staff to add a border and external lighting that is compatible with the building.

Item 3

File #: [P21-0098 / SPR21-15](#)

Requested Action: Recommendation to Planning Commission

Application: Two-unit multifamily residential project with an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The project also includes a request for a front yard setback modification which requires approval by the Planning Commission.

Location: 712 Walnut Drive

Applicant: Nick Gilman

Discussion: This item had been reviewed at the 1/31/22 DRC meeting, at which time the DRC members requested additional information. In follow up to that meeting, the owners changed the project from being a 3-unit multifamily residential project to now including an ADU in place of one of the units. Staff provided the DRC the submitted material, which showed a change to the roof design for one of the structures. Mr. Gilman, the applicant's architect, answered some of the outstanding questions regarding the project submittal. First, Mr. Gilman clarified that the maximum height of the 2-story apartment/garage building's stem wall would be no more than 6-feet tall, since the plans showed varying heights. Additionally, in response to the DRC wanting more robust landscaping along Walnut Drive, Mr. Gilman agreed the project would install landscaping in the front yard setback that would be 3-4 feet in height to provide screening of the front elevation of that building. In response to the change in the roofline for the front structure, Mr. Gilman indicated the roof of the apartment/garage building would be a gabled roof, whereas the single-family residence would most likely maintain a hip roof. Another concern that was brought up by the DRC was the use of the site. At the first DRC meeting, the main issue raised by the DRC members was the rationale for having extra covered parking. The plans call for 3-additional garages beyond the minimum parking requirement. However, there is no zoning code requirement that precludes development of extra garage space for a multi-family residential use, so long as the parking use is residential and not commercial. According to the plans provided, the additional garages are for residential use only.

Action: This project will be reviewed at a future Planning Commission meeting.
