
From: Atascadero Cemetery <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2023 9:34 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: public comment 8-30-23 B. Council Workshop - General Plan Update
Attachments: Scan - City Council public comment B. Council Workshop - Genera.pdf

Cindy Summers
Atascadero Cemetery District

1 Cemetery Road
Atascadero, CA 93422
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 425
Atascadero, CA 93423

atascaderocemetery.specialdistrict.org

Office: 805-466-1242
Fax: 805-466-0143
AtascaderoCemetery@gmail.com

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

Atascadero Cemetery District

PINE MOUNTAIN CEMETERY AND DISTRICT OFFICE

As the Atascadero City Council evaluates their plan for the future, the Atascadero Cemetery District also plans for long-range future needs. Expansion of full body graves and cremation sites on land already owned and zoned for this purpose is in the early planning stages at the Atascadero District's Pine Mountain Cemetery.

The current burial ratio is 40% full body graves to 60% cremation sites with 70 to 100 burials per year. The cremation rate is trending up. Cremation sites require less land space, which is in conformity with the City's General Plan Vision and Guiding Principles of ensuring access to nature and preserving our environmental resources. Although cremation sites require less land space, expansion is still necessary to ensure grave space is available in the future. The Atascadero District's Pine Mountain Cemetery maintains a rustic, natural and historic landscape.


The cemetery functions as a Special District and is not specifically mentioned in the General Plan Update. However, this agency is required to have the city determine if it's plans for expansion conform to the City's General Plan. Increased population brings with it increased need for more burial space. It is the fiduciary responsibility of the district to ensure there is adequate burial space available.

We understand that the acknowledgment of this planning for expansion is not pre-approval, we just think it is important for the City to be aware of the cemetery expansion needs as they evaluate and analyze their plan alternatives.



Cindy Summers

District Manager



From: Chalk Mountain <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2023 12:13 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: B. Council Workshop - General Plan Update

To Whom it May Concern:

Please consider including the previously applied for general plan amendments on parcels that I own into the revised general plan updates. Specifically, my request was for 5205 Carrizo Road and for 3995 Monterey Road. The Carrizo parcels are within 100' of City serving sewer facilities and are abutted by smaller lot sizes. This would be a perfect example of a neighborhood compatible development that will extend City facilities through the development of this project while remaining compatible with the adjoining neighborhood. The Monterey parcel is at the corner of Monterey & San Anselmo, surrounded by commercial. Allowing the rezone of this parcel (or a split zone of this parcel) would add additional commercial property into the City into an area that is already generally commercial in nature. From reviewing the staff report, these general plan amendments appear to be in line with the direction that the general plan update is heading.

Regards,
Michael Hawkins

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

From: Preston Jones <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2023 12:31 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Kelly Gleason
Subject: B. Council Workshop - General Plan Update

Dear Council,

I would like to commend staff on the work they have been doing towards the City's General Plan Updates. I grew up in Templeton and watched Paso Robles boom into the tourist destination it is today. As I have chosen to stay in this area and raise a family here, I love what Atascadero is doing for its local population - offering great family events and really creating a sense of community. I am excited for what the proposed General Plan offers - more exciting choices for the residents of Atascadero while retaining the small town feel that the citizens love.

I appreciate the delicate balance between providing affordable housing to an area while not exceeding the number of head of household jobs - the intricate balance between keeping Atascadero the "Geriatric Ghetto" that it has so infamously been named by the local economist which does not provide a tax base for our community and providing affordable housing to attract head of household jobs.

Special SFR Zoning Overlay for Orderly Growth

I would like to propose the Council consider creating a special SFR zoning overlay to be applied to areas that are just in reach of existing City provided facilities such as sewer and water. There are a number of properties in Atascadero that are just outside the reach of the City's sewer system, yet the underlying zoning does not provide any opportunity for further subdivision. If the City allowed for an overlay zoning district in these areas immediately adjacent to existing facilities, developers would look to subdividing these areas and installing facilities to the benefit of the City which would allow for the continuation of orderly growth. If it were written as an overlay zone, this would provide the flexibility of this orderly growth continuing throughout this master plan cycle and not require a single developer to submit a general plan amendment for a small subdivision (which becomes cost prohibitive and stifles this orderly growth) or wait for the next general plan update.

Focus Area 8 - Infill Flex Zone

I would like to discuss my support of looking at rezoning these relatively dead zones in the City as identified on the exhibit. While the idea of rezoning commercial areas to residential areas is definitely a hot topic (it expands the notion of the geriatric ghetto without bringing in additional revenues), I do believe that creating better, higher density, more vibrant commercial areas that are walkable and rideable from these mid-block residential areas will result in further development of these commercial areas. No longer will Atascadero be one long, continuous strip mall, it will have vibrant centers. There is one parcel in particular in Focus Area 8 that, in my opinion, definitely requires looking at. While generally falling along parcel lines, zoning designations do not have to fully encompass a parcel. The property at the South West corner of Pueblo and El Camino Real would serve to have a zoning line running through the middle of it as all of the adjoining parcels that have frontage on Sinaloa are zoned MDR, while this entire parcel is zoned GC.

Thank you for your consideration.

Preston Jones
(805) [REDACTED]

ATTENTION:
This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

From: Harry Hamilton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2023 5:29 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Kelly Gleason
Subject: Agenda Item B - Council Workshop - General Plan Update

Dear Members of Council,

I grew up in the City of Atascadero, own a business in the City, a business in San Luis Obispo, have worked with developers for years as an engineer, and have finally been developing my own projects in San Luis and in Paso Robles.

I would like to encourage you to continue directing staff towards the vision that they have for our City.

The City is in a unique position with its commercially zoned property - it relies upon it as a tax base and has no ability to increase the commercial zones by expanding. Yet our commercial areas largely remain undeveloped or underdeveloped. Staff's vision of creating commercial nodes - highly developed, quality commercial areas, surrounded by high density residential, buffered with medium density residential is a welcomed change to our current City.

The idea of studying Focus Area #8 is a perfect example of this concept. I would like to see some of the parcels on the East side of El Camino Real allowed to become a medium or high density residential zone. This would drive development of the neighboring commercial zones which would then become flanked by residences that will use these zones while creating and maintaining a buffer to the residential single family zones that exist further East.

While this works perfectly within Focus Area #8, the current policy of not allowing residential uses on the ground floor of a commercially zoned lot falls apart in other zones. There needs to be a way to view a development on a parcel by parcel basis. In Focus Area #7, there are some very deep commercial parcels along Morro Road. These parcels have a residential use immediately abutting them to the rear - and I am concerned that the idea of forcing commercial only on the first floor of some of these parcels will lead to poorly performing commercial uses in the rear of these parcels. Provided that the underlying density is met, why can a project not propose a horizontal mixed use development as exists along Spring Street in Paso Robles. This provides quality commercial uses along a main thoroughfare while allows for a residential component on the rear of the parcel that serves as a buffer to the adjacent uses.

The same could be said for the areas currently zoned public lands, specifically those in Focus Area 10. It makes sense for a public benefitting use to be adjacent to an existing park, but does it make sense for this use to continue from the park frontage to the El Camino Real frontage? Or does it make sense to allow a development that may provide a commercial serving use abutting El Camino that then offers a portion of the parcel abutting the park to continue to be a public benefitting use? Does a land use zoning have to follow a parcel line, or can it split a parcel in half?

Why not write a general plan in a way that says to developers "hey - we're a friendly City that is looking for good ideas. Come up with something and pitch it to us and we'll see if we can make that fit within our City." Provide Staff the power to work with developers to come up with a project that benefits the vision of our City. Seat the DRC with developers, architects and local real estate brokers familiar with leasing and provide them with the power to provide direction with what our City values and what this would look like in a project.

Thank you for your time and efforts this evening. I apologize as I was not able to join you in tonight's focus group - but I look forward to continuing to be a part of the development of Atascadero. It truly is a great place to live.



Harry Hamilton
Principal

Main: [\(805\) 540-5115](tel:8055405115) | Direct: (805) 548-1171 | Cell: (805) 674-2316
[245 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401](https://www.ci.sanluisobispo.ca.us/245-Higuera-Street)

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

From: David Broadwater <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2023 6:11 PM
To: City Clerk; Heather Moreno; Susan Funk; Charles Bourbeau; Mark Dariz; Heather Newsom
Subject: Special Session and General Plan Update Workshop 8-30-23

to:
Atascadero City Council
re: Special Session and General Plan Update Workshop 8-30-23
date: 8-29-23

Below are some excerpts from the documents generated as a result of the General Plan updating process to date. I emphatically urge you to take them into account during this workshop. They represent the accumulation of the desires and wisdom of the Atascadero community regarding its future.

Thank you,
David Broadwater
Atascadero resident since 1972 & homeowner since 1977.

https://www.atascadero2045.org/files/managed/Document/84/AGPU_Comm%20Engagement%20Series%201%20Summary_7.25.23.pdf

Community Engagement Series #1 Summary: Vision for the Future

City of Atascadero 2045 General Plan Update – July 25, 2023

...

Existing Conditions Atlas (January 2023) [page 6]

...

Summary of Major Themes [page 7]

...

Recreation and Open Spaces [page 11]

- Increase Walking/Biking Trails. Recommendations to **create more walking** and **biking** and **walking trails** and **make connections** between existing trails, parks and **open spaces** and throughout the city. ...
- Increase or Improve and Maintain Parks and Open Space. **Acquire and create more** parks and **open space**, including multi-use parks. Extend or incorporate into open space and/or revitalize locations such as Atascadero Lake, Eagle Lake, Three Bridge Oak Preserve, Paloma Creek, among others. ...
- Value Rivers as a Community Asset. **Create more** community amenities, **open space, access points and paths** all along creeks and rivers (**particularly the Salinas River** throughout town) with amenities (tables/benches, places to recreate) to make them safer and more enjoyable. Maintain regular stream/creek cleanups. **Create a river center** for **research** (Cal Poly/Cuesta students/professors) and **education**.
 - Parks and Open Space as Economic Opportunity. As also addressed under Economic and Fiscal Health, **creating more** attractions, **open spaces, increasing and improving** parks, **river-related features** and recreational options and events promoting their use will help create jobs, draw visitors interested in nature and ecotourism.

- Protect and Preserve Native Flora, Fauna and Habitat. **Plant more trees** in the city (also addressed under Infrastructure); **regenerate/protect native wildlife, habitat**, and plants, **specifically beavers** and native oaks (e.g., extending Three Bridges Oak Preserve)

- Provide **More Outdoor Recreational Facilities and Activities.** ...

· Provide Family-Inclusive and Age-Specific Activities. Provide activities that are inclusive of all ages... caring for playgrounds and connecting them to trails providing easy hikes and nature walks with educational signage.

...

<https://www.atascadero2045.org/files/managed/Document/62/AGPU Atlas Revised%20Admin%20Draft 01-24-23.pdf>

Existing Conditions Atlas

Revised Administrative Draft | January 24, 2023

...

Recreation and Open Spaces [page 14]

Challenges and Emerging Opportunities

Parks, Open Spaces and Trails: ...

... Opportunities exist to **improve linkages** to parks through **new or expanded trails** (... **Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail**).

... **New trail connections** could be created to better **link** major recreational destinations and the **Salinas River**...

...

Creeks and Rivers: ... The waterways **provide important wildlife corridors** connecting the **Salinas River** to the Santa Lucia Mountains are designated **critical habitat** areas for South-Central California Steelhead Trout. They also **provide recreational opportunities** for many residents. The creeks have been highly impacted by problems with trash, illegal dumping, off-road vehicle use, and urban pollution that has significantly degraded the quality of the habitat. **Protecting and enhancing** these areas can better **support the local ecosystem**, and improve water flow (and reduce localized flooding risks), and **increase the quality of life** for residents. In addition, the **Salinas River** has been identified as a **key natural resource** that should be **protected and bolstered** as a **regional attraction** for **tourism, recreation, and education**.

...

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

From: Max Zappas <max@zvillages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2023 12:11 PM
To: Loreli Cappel; City Clerk; Heather Moreno; Susan Funk; Charles Bourbeau; Jim Lewis; Mark Dariz; Heather Newsom
Cc: Harry Hamilton; Larry Greene; [REDACTED] Jim Moresco
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED] Kelly Gleason; Sydney ZVillage;
Jessica Diercks; Nichole Harris; Jordan Meaney
Subject: Re: City Council General Plan Meeting - Aug 30th
Attachments: image001.gif

Loreli/City Clerk,

Below are my comments for the hearing this afternoon in the event I am not able to attend in person:

I provided input, thoughts, opinions, and responses for each of the "Action Items" for the council.

Action Item 1 - 3 no comment

Action Item 4 - We have commercial development occurring at one location, del rio. Huge investment and risk is being undertaken there. At the same time, now, all of that commercial space(some of which is already sitting vacant for long periods) will be pulling demand for commercial space from the rest of our city. If we want this commercial "node" as you refer to it, to survive, then, we really need as much high density housing around that location as possible. If we want jobs, we need housing. if we want retail restaurants, and jobs, they all depend on population rings and traffic counts. Traffic counts and population rings are how we add jobs/commercial viability. We need massive upcoming if we want commercial to succeed. The reason commercial is beginning to succeed again in the downtown is that we have continued to building housing around our downtown due to zoning. So, if you want Del Rio, Santa Barbara, or Curbaril to be strong business locations, then we need massive upcoming to high density residential and mixed use zones. As we move further from those commercial areas, we need to begin to decrease residential zoning to allow for a nice mix of housing types.

Action Item 5 - NO, IT SHOULDN'T ONLY GO TO 30 UNITS AN ACRE! WE NEED AT LEAST 35 UNITS AN ACRE IN OUR HIGH DENSITY ZONES! At least 35 units an acre but 45 units per acre makes projects much more viable. The reality is we, as developers, likely won't even be able to provide 45 units to the acre but it gives us the ability to propose projects with more flexibility. We can in certain instances and not in others but the density should be dictated by what is realistic such as setbacks, sparking, heights, etc. Those factors should drive the density calculation but the maximum allowable needs to be much higher because it is a "maximum".

Action Item 6 - Yes, get rid of this and replace with high density residential or some new, reliable, form based, mixed use zoning.

Action Item 7 - Yes, it should be high density(35-45 units per acre), reduced parking requirements because it is somewhat commercial in nature, 4 story heights, 12 foot plate heights along frontages only(form based code).

Action item 8 - This one is very involved, see comments below by focus area:

Focus area 1 - good to go

Focus area 2 - I would suggest steering away from requiring certain uses and instead regulate it by the form of the project being proposed. That will be a common theme for all of these. Go towards a "form based" code rather than a "use based" code. We want building forms that make sense and occur where they should so that 50 years down the road it is flexible and can be used for the highest and best use whatever it may be at that time. We want our buildings in Atascadero to be efficient rather than empty. If someone moves out, we want someone else in there right away. Whether it is tourist, retail, industrial or residential, it is better filled than empty. Inefficiencies, waste, and blight is the reality with "use based" codes. Flourishing downtowns, redevelopment,s and cool new businesses open where there is "form based" code. However, I will add that this area is natural for industrial uses as compared to Sycamore Road for example where access is an issue.

Focus area 3 - Again, consider form based code here to allow for more flexibility. People want to get creative and propose things that make sense, we need more flexibility.

Focus area 4 - Allow mixed use and form based code here.

Focus area 5 - The quote in this section is funny to me: "create a business park character". How? There are no large flat areas to build anything that resembles a business park. There is really only one area that is underutilized and it is a brownfield site from what I know, the hay and feed site and area behind it. Even if that area was entirely redeveloped into a business park it would be tiny.... Business parks are huge, with wide streets, massive high ceiling buildings, right next to major freeways, with minimal to no residential around them because they are so big and expansive. I would consider abandoning Sycamore for any fitter industrial as it doesn't make sense from any logistical/practical standpoint. If the goal is more of these types of uses then taking semi trucks through long swaths of residential neighborhoods is unrealistic. No developer would build huge high clear ceiling buildings in those locations. The only industrial uses that could fit there are the ones being proposed, self storage... Along el camino, close to 101, that is where it makes sense. The focus area 12 might be a location for something like this as there is large areas of flat land over there but the vision for that focus area is that of an ant. We need to dream bigger, see #12 for more.

Focus area 6 - Downtown needs a density of at least 45 units per acre if we want to see things happen. La Plaza was able to achieve some efficiencies due to its size but that was financially very tight and it was put together at a time before the downtown was anything worth talking about. We need way more density to make smaller projects viable. There are so many one story buildings in downtown and even empty lots but we need way way way more density if we want those to improve and people to invest here. With that higher density, we must decrease parking requirements (fractional density helps) and we also really need to allow more stories and higher buildings. Whatever the highest height the fire truck can reach, that is the height we need allowable in the downtown zone. Also, consider a program where the city sells excess land, puts aside general fund funds, or creates some new financing mechanism to literally incentive the office uses to move elsewhere. By incentives, I mean dollars. I mean writing checks to these people to move.

Focus area 7 - Form based code and higher densities. This location is critical to increasing density across the board. These lots are all close to shopping, medical care, transportation, downtown, events etc. Commercial isn't working well here but is somewhat viable along the frontage of 41.

Focus area 8 - Form based code and higher densities.

Focus area 9 - Form based code and higher densities. This location is critical to increasing density across the board. These lots are all close to shopping, medical care, transportation, downtown, events etc. Commercial isn't working well here but is somewhat viable along the frontage of 41. Same as 7, could all be treated the same.

Focus area 10 - Form based code and higher densities. Density trances for flooding is huge and would be very helpful.

Focus area 11 - Allow for residential here too! Mixed use , form based, attractive projects.

Focus area 12 - dream WAY bigger! This is our opportunity! Annex as much as possible from the county. Say you will provide housing and share RHNA numbers with them. Come up with some way to get as much of this land as possible. There is huge flat areas, high potential there. All I would caution is allow flexibility in what is proposed. It needed to be master planned or something like that so there is a mix of uses and it is laid out in a logical way that makes sense. We have no new areas to build any larger single family housing developments in town. This is a huge opportunity for that and for a business park or industrial park. I would caution against more office or retail uses there as I feel we already have a lot, especially if we want Del Rio, San Anselmo, Downtown, Curbaril, and Santa Barbara to all be realistic "nodes".

Sorry it's after noon! I wrote as quick as I could this morning! Thanks everyone, I am looking forward to continuing to support this process and I love seeing really positive changes come down the pike. Great work all around, this is really headed in the right direction to move the needle here.

On Thu, Aug 24, 2023 at 11:32 AM Loreli Cappel <lcappel@atascadero.org> wrote:

Hi Gentlemen!

I just spoke to Harry and thought it would be helpful to send along the agenda packet for the upcoming 8/30 Council study session/Workshop on the **General Plan Update Project**.

<http://records.atascadero.org/WebLink/ElectronicFile.aspx?docid=119600&dbid=0>

At this interactive discussion with Council, we'll be discussing key policy direction, such as increasing density, changing the mix of use and character of districts/notes, and areas of potential change for the city vision through 2045.

Also, elements of the **Draft Objective Design Standards (ODS)** went before DRC on 8/10 ([see PG 41 of ODS STAFF REPORT](#)). These are a work in progress and will provide clearer direction for MFR and Mixed Use Projects.

ODS is slated to go to Planning commission on 10/3 and for Council adoption on 10/24. Your input will be instrumental on these Standards as they include small lot subdivision pieces and aim to give developers certainty and create a ministerial review process.

Loreli Cappel

Deputy Director of Economic & Community Development

City of Atascadero | Community Development

6500 Palma Ave | Atascadero, CA 93422

P: 805.470.3480 | E: lcappel@atascadero.org



From: Harry Hamilton <harry@abovegradeengineering.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2023 10:14 AM
To: Loreli Cappel <lcappel@atascadero.org>
Subject: City Council General Plan Meeting

Can you call me to chat about this?

(805) 674-2316

Thanks!



Harry Hamilton

Principal

Main: [\(805\) 540-5115](tel:(805)540-5115) | Direct: (805) 548-1171 | Cell: (805) 674-2316

[245 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401](https://www.zvillages.com/245-Higuera-Street-San-Luis-Obispo-CA-93401)

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

--

Thank you,

Max Zappas
Z Villages Management & Development
6100 El Camino Real Suite B
max@zvillages.com
805-674-4743
RE Lic # 01997012

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message.

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

From: Jim Moresco <jmoresco@midlandpacific.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2023 1:47 PM
To: Max ZVillage; Loreli Cappel; City Clerk; Heather Moreno; Susan Funk; Charles Bourbeau; Jim Lewis; Mark Dariz; Heather Newsom
Cc: Harry Hamilton; Larry Greene; parnold@covelop.net; MITCHSTAFFORD@ATT.NET; Kelly Gleason; Sydney ZVillage; Jessica Diercks; Nichole Harris; Jordan Meaney
Subject: RE: City Council General Plan Meeting - Aug 30th

I won't be able to make the hearing myself. But my comments are much more succinct. And keep in mind, we're an SFR builder and haven't built multifamily since the early 90's, and have never built something taller than 2 stories.

Atascadero needs density, density, density.

As we know, Atascadero doesn't really have any room to expand out. We may not want to hear it, but Atascadero is the north county version of Grover Beach. There's no more room to expand out, so we need to start expanding up. And why limit what that looks like? Build a two story building within the Urban Service Line now? Cool. Well in 10 or 20 years, we're going to wish it was a 3 or 4 story building. I'll reference all the structures around The Sunken Gardens as an example. Back in the day I'm sure those buildings were cool. Now I'm sure we all wish those buildings were higher density. Set the density and height limits to the maximum code allows, and then let the free market figure out the best use.

And regardless of what is done, the neighbors are going to complain anyway, so might as well get the most bang for your buck!

Jim Moresco
Chief Operating Officer
Midland Pacific Building Corporation
www.midlandpacific.com

From: Max Zappas <max@zvillages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2023 12:11 PM
To: Loreli Cappel <lcappel@atascadero.org>; City Clerk <cityclerk@atascadero.org>; Heather Moreno <hmoreno@atascadero.org>; Susan Funk <sfunk@atascadero.org>; Charles Bourbeau <cbourbeau@atascadero.org>; Jim Lewis <jlewis@atascadero.org>; Mark Dariz <mdariz@atascadero.org>; Heather Newsom <hnewsom@atascadero.org>
Cc: Harry Hamilton <harry@abovegradeengineering.com>; Larry Greene <Larry@greenedev.com>; parnold@covelop.net; Jim Moresco <jmoresco@midlandpacific.com>; MITCHSTAFFORD@ATT.NET; Kelly Gleason <kgleason@atascadero.org>; Sydney Sima <sydney@zvillages.com>; Jessica Diercks <jessica@zvillages.com>; Nichole Harris <nichole@zvillages.com>; Jordan Meaney <jordan@zvillages.com>
Subject: Re: City Council General Plan Meeting - Aug 30th

Loreli/City Clerk,

Below are my comments for the hearing this afternoon in the event I am not able to attend in person:

I provided input, thoughts, opinions, and responses for each of the "Action Items" for the council.

Action Item 1 - 3 no comment

Action Item 4 - We have commercial development occurring at one location, del rio. Huge investment and risk is being undertaken there. At the same time, now, all of that commercial space(some of which is already sitting vacant for long periods) will be pulling demand for commercial space from the rest of our city. If we want this commercial "node" as you refer to it, to survive, then, we really need as much high density housing around that location as possible. If we want jobs, we need housing. If we want retail restaurants, and jobs, they all depend on population rings and traffic counts. Traffic counts and population rings are how we add jobs/commercial viability. We need massive upcoming if we want commercial to succeed. The reason

commercial is beginning to succeed again in the downtown is that we have continued to building housing around our downtown due to zoning. So, if you want Del Rio, Santa Barbara, or Curbaril to be strong business locations, then we need massive upcoming to high density residential and mixed use zones. As we move further from those commercial areas, we need to begin to decrease residential zoning to allow for a nice mix of housing types.

Action Item 5 - NO, IT SHOULDN'T ONLY GO TO 30 UNITS AN ACRE! WE NEED AT LEAST 35 UNITS AN ACRE IN OUR HIGH DENSITY ZONES! At least 35 units an acre but 45 units per acre makes projects much more viable. The reality is we, as developers, likely won't even be able to provide 45 units to the acre but it gives us the ability to propose projects with more flexibility. We can in certain instances and not in others but the density should be dictated by what is realistic such as setbacks, parking, heights, etc. Those factors should drive the density calculation but the maximum allowable needs to be much higher because it is a "maximum".

Action Item 6 - Yes, get rid of this and replace with high density residential or some new, reliable, form based, mixed use zoning.

Action Item 7 - Yes, it should be high density(35-45 units per acre), reduced parking requirements because it is somewhat commercial in nature, 4 story heights, 12 foot plate heights along frontages only(form based code).

Action item 8 - This one is very involved, see comments below by focus area:

Focus area 1 - good to go

Focus area 2 - I would suggest steering away from requiring certain uses and instead regulate it by the form of the project being proposed. That will be a common theme for all of these. Go towards a "form based" code rather than a "use based" code. We want building forms that make sense and occur where they should so that 50 years down the road it is flexible and can be used for the highest and best use whatever it may be at that time. We want our buildings in Atascadero to be efficient rather than empty. If someone moves out, we want someone else in there right away. Whether it is tourist, retail, industrial or residential, it is better filled than empty. Inefficiencies, waste, and blight is the reality with "use based" codes. Flourishing downtowns, redevelopment,s and cool new businesses open where there is "form based" code. However, I will add that this area is natural for industrial uses as compared to Sycamore Road for example where access is an issue.

Focus area 3 - Again, consider form based code here to allow for more flexibility. People want to get creative and propose things that make sense, we need more flexibility.

Focus area 4 - Allow mixed use and form based code here.

Focus area 5 - The quote in this section is funny to me: "create a business park character". How? There are no large flat areas to build anything that resembles a business park. There is really only one area that is underutilized and it is a brownfield site from what I know, the hay and feed site and area behind it. Even if that area was entirely redeveloped into a business park it would be tiny.... Business parks are huge, with wide streets, massive high ceiling buildings, right next to major freeways, with minimal to no residential around them because they are so big and expansive. I would consider abandoning Sycamore for any fitter industrial as it doesn't make sense from any logistical/practical standpoint. If the goal is more of these types of uses then taking semi trucks through long swaths of residential neighborhoods is unrealistic. No developer would build huge high clear ceiling buildings in those locations. The only industrial uses that could fit there are the ones being proposed, self storage... Along el camino, close to 101, that is where it makes sense. The focus area 12 might be a location for something like this as there is large areas of flat land over there but the vision for that focus area is that of an ant. We need to dream bigger, see #12 for more.

Focus area 6 - Downtown needs a density of at least 45 units per acre if we want to see things happen. La Plaza was able to achieve some efficiencies due to its size but that was financially very tight and it was put together at a time before the downtown was anything worth talking about. We need way more density to make smaller projects viable. There are so many one story buildings in downtown and even empty lots but we need way way way more density if we want those to improve and people to invest here. With that higher density, we must decrease parking requirements(fractional density helps) and we also really need to allow more stories and higher buildings. Whatever the highest height the fire truck can reach, that is the height we need allowable in the downtown zone. Also, consider a program where the city sells excess land, puts aside general fund funds, or creates some new financing mechanism to literally incentive the office uses to move elsewhere. By incentives, I mean dollars. I mean writing checks to these people to move.

Focus area 7 - Form based code and higher densities. This location is critical to increasing density across the board. These lots are all close to shopping, medical care, transportation, downtown, events etc. Commercial isn't working well here but is somewhat viable along the frontage of 41.

Focus area 8 - Form based code and higher densities.

Focus area 9 - Form based code and higher densities. This location is critical to increasing density across the board. These lots are all close to shopping, medical care, transportation, downtown, events etc. Commercial isn't working well here but is somewhat viable along the frontage of 41. Same as 7, could all be treated the same.

Focus area 10 - Form based code and higher densities. Density trances for flooding is huge and would be very helpful.

Focus area 11 - Allow for residential here too! Mixed use , form based, attractive projects.

Focus area 12 - dream WAY bigger! This is our opportunity! Annex as much as possible from the county. Say you will provide housing and share RHNA numbers with them. Come up with some way to get as much of this land as possible. There is huge flat areas, high potential there. All I would caution is allow flexibility in what is proposed. It needed to be master planned or something like that so there is a mix of uses and it is laid out in a logical way that makes sense. We have no new areas to build any larger single family housing developments in town. This is a huge opportunity for that and for a business park or industrial park. I would caution against more office or retail uses there as I feel we already have a lot, especially if we want Del Rio, San Anselmo, Downtown, Curbaril, and Santa Barbara to all be realistic "nodes".

Sorry it's after noon! I wrote as quick as I could this morning! Thanks everyone, I am looking forward to continuing to support this process and I love seeing really positive changes come down the pike. Great work all around, this is really headed in the right direction to move the needle here.

On Thu, Aug 24, 2023 at 11:32 AM Loreli Cappel <lcappel@atascadero.org> wrote:

Hi Gentlemen!

I just spoke to Harry and thought it would be helpful to send along the agenda packet for the upcoming 8/30 Council study session/Workshop on the **General Plan Update Project**.

<http://records.atascadero.org/WebLink/ElectronicFile.aspx?docid=119600&dbid=0>

At this interactive discussion with Council, we'll be discussing key policy direction, such as increasing density, changing the mix of use and character of districts/notes, and areas of potential change for the city vision through 2045.

Also, elements of the **Draft Objective Design Standards (ODS)** went before DRC on 8/10 ([see PG 41 of ODS STAFF REPORT](#)). These are a work in progress and will provide clearer direction for MFR and Mixed Use Projects.

ODS is slated to go to Planning commission on 10/3 and for Council adoption on 10/24. Your input will be instrumental on these Standards as they include small lot subdivision pieces and aim to give developers certainty and create a ministerial review process.


Loreli Cappel

Deputy Director of Economic & Community Development

City of Atascadero | Community Development

6500 Palma Ave | Atascadero, CA 93422

P: 805.470.3480 | E: lcappel@atascadero.org



From: Harry Hamilton <harry@abovegradeengineering.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2023 10:14 AM
To: Loreli Cappel <lcappel@atascadero.org>
Subject: City Council General Plan Meeting

Can you call me to chat about this?

(805) 674-2316

Thanks!



Harry Hamilton
Principal

Main: [\(805\) 540-5115](tel:8055405115) | Direct: (805) 548-1171 | Cell: (805) 674-2316
[245 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401](https://www.cityofatascadero.org/245-Higuera-Street)

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

--
Thank you,

Max Zappas
Z Villages Management & Development
6100 El Camino Real Suite B
max@zvillages.com
805-674-4743
RE Lic # 01997012

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message.

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

From: Pat Arnold <parnold@covelop.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2023 2:46 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Kelly Gleason
Subject: City Council General Plan Meeting - Aug 30th

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I have been a developer in our County for 20 years and have worked on projects primarily in the City of SLO and Counties of SLO and SB. We have done projects in a few other cities here locally but have yet to find the right opportunity in Atascadero. We are encouraged with has been happening there recently in terms of projects and I am excited about this general plan update as it illustrates that the City is thinking toward the future. Don't get me wrong, I love the small town feel of Atascadero and spend time up there regularly enjoying the family friendly events and great food and beverage establishments. I also appreciate that there is no specific architectural style to Atascadero except in the Downtown core as an homage to EG Lewis.

In my opinion the zoning in Atascadero has to allow for flexibility to entice developers to look at the City. Paso Robles has a form based code that allows developers to submit a use that works with their parcel. It isn't a straight "commercial only" type zoning code. The City of San Luis Obispo has multiple overlay zones that encourage layering types of projects on one parcel. These two styles allow developers to propose a project that works not only for them, but also for the needs of the respective City. I encourage the City to direct staff to write flexibility in these zones and then use the oversight of an appointed body such as DRC or Planning Commission to ensure that the project meets the needs of the City, while still remaining financially viable. Zoning codes need flexibility so that they can adapt with the market and not be so restrictive that another 20 years has to pass before a property is considered viable for development during the next general plan update.

In general, the idea of creating commercial zones surrounding by decreasingly dense residential areas provides for neighborhoods that thrive and are alive after 7pm. Atascadero should continue to evolve from a bedroom community to a vibrant place that residents can sleep, eat, and work! I look forward to the time when Atascadero is considered a place to spend development dollars in and the newfound excitement that has been created by the recent downtown development becomes contagious.

Thanks,
Pat

Pat Arnold, CEO
CA DRE #01913543
CSLB License #995386



Office: 805.781.3133 x103
Cell: 805.441.0706
parnold@covelop.net

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**

From: Julie Merrill <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2023 4:08 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Agenda Item B1 Focus Area 5 Table 2 ID5 Special Meeting August 30, 2023

Dear City Council Members,

We are the property owners of 7025 Sycamore Rd next to the Industrial Park and are being considered for a zoning change. We are presently zoned Residential /Suburban. We do not want to become an Industrial Park. This property has always been a wildlife corridor between the Salinas River and the mountain. We have three parcels with a home on the parcel next to the river. We want to eventually save this property for our three children to live on, anticipating the possibility of building a home on each of the two remaining parcels. If our children choose to not build here we are considering making this a permanent green space, maintaining it as a wildlife corridor to the mountain across the way. The mountain lions, quail, foxes, coyotes, deer, rabbits and migratory birds consider this their home too, the beavers have recently moved downstream after the torrential rains of last winter and now also consider this to be their backyard. Thank You, Julie Merrill & Tom Robinson.

If you are interested in the history of this property as an organic farm and homestead please inquire.

ATTENTION:

This email originated from outside the City's network. **Use caution when opening links and attachments.**