



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

**TELECONFERENCE MEETING ONLY**

**3:30 PM Monday – May 23, 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:** Joel Neel, Ty Christensen, and Field Gibson

**Staff present:** Darren Nash, Darcy Delgado, and Katie Banister,

**Applicants and others present:** Kiera Pascua, Jennifer Steen, Barbara Cohen, Don Geisinger, Coleen Kubel, Luis Ramos, Steve Fear, Ash Shaw, Jeremy Dicker, and Bryan Ridley

---

**Item 1**

File #: [SPR 21-21 / P21-0117](#)

Requested Action: DRC Final Action

Application: Site plan review for Target parking lot re-striping and signage.

Location: 2305 Theatre Drive

Applicant: Kimley Horn

Discussion: Staff presented the plans for Target to restripe a portion of their parking lot for their “drive-up” program as well as concurrent review of building signage immediately adjacent to the “drive-up” parking. Although some stalls will be deducted from the overall parking count, Target will still provide more than the required parking. The applicant also clarified that no trees will be removed, that the parking lot restriping will retain all trees. Lastly, staff verified that as part of the building permit process, that all wall-mounted signs would be calculated to make sure the newest sign would not put them over their threshold of 1:1 per lineal feet of frontage.

Action: The plans were approved as proposed.

---

**Item 2**

File #: [SGN22-13 / P22-0055](#)

Requested Action: DRC Final Action

Application: New sign plan for Carbon Health

Location: 504 1<sup>st</sup> Street, Suite A

Applicant: Coast Monument Signs

Discussion: Staff presented the sign noting the overall signage would be small than what was previously installed. The method of illumination is also halo-lit, which provides a high-quality look to the sign. The DRC unanimously agreed the sign appeared attractive as proposed.

Action: The sign was approved as proposed.

---

**Item 3**

File #: [ADD22-0034 / E22-0005 / B20-0427 / PD18-05 / CUP18-08 / P18-0047](#)  
Requested Action: DRC Final Action / Recommendation to Planning Commission  
Application: Review of fencing materials for vehicle storage lot.  
Location: 2906 Ardmore Road  
Applicant: Coleen Kubel for Johnboy's Towing  
Discussion: The applicant has proposed alternate fencing materials from what was approved by the Planning Commission in an effort to control costs. The DRC discussed practical and aesthetic considerations of wood fencing and chain link fencing with slats.  
Action: DRC approved a change in fence material so that decorative fence would be used near Ardmore Road to a point approximately in line with the fence behind the paved parking area. Farther from Ardmore Road, the exterior fence can be 8-foot chain link with slats. Interior fences can be 6-foot chain link with slats. Razor wire and similar materials prohibited.

---

**Item 4**

File #: [SPR22-03 / P22-0011](#)  
Requested Action: DRC Final Action  
Application: Park Ferme – new live/work unit behind an existing mixed-use building. *Linked plans include two options for exterior colors and materials.*  
Location: 1319 Park Street  
Applicant: Bryan Ridley, Bracket Architecture  
Discussion: The applicant presented two exterior elevation options. The first included vertical black metal siding with natural wood accents for the new building and painting the existing cinder block building black. The second option was a lighter palette, with vertical gray metal siding and natural wood accents for the new building and a new veneer of board-formed concrete for the existing building. The application includes a request for a height exception and a determination about the requirement for a live-work unit to provide street frontage. The project would utilize the parking in lieu fee to satisfy 2 spaces of the onsite parking requirement.  
DRC members expressed a preference for design option 2 but also had concerns over the “ultra-modern” architectural style and use of metal siding in the downtown. Members were comfortable with the absence of a pedestrian connection between the live-work unit and Park Street, and were generally accepting of the request for a height exception if the building's appearance of massiveness was reduced. Members voiced concern over use of the in-lieu parking fee, which they saw as unrealistic for addressing downtown parking despite its being an allowed option by the Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan.  
Action: Applicant received comments including a preference for the improvements proposed to the existing building in Option 2, and a desire for more warmth in the materials and window layout and a reduction in the perceived mass of

the new building. The applicant will return to the DRC at a future meeting with project refinements.