

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

3:30 PM Monday – January 9, 2017

Meeting Location: The Development Review Committee will meet at the Large Conference Room on the second floor of City Hall, at 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California.

DRC Members Present: John Donaldson, Bob Rollins

Staff Present: Darren Nash, Darcy Delgado

Applicants and others present: Louie Aguilar, Bob Fisher

File #: Site Plan 16-015
Application: Remodel building that used to be Petco into three tenant spaces.
Location: 2051 Theatre Dr.
Applicant: Louie Aguilar / Donahue Schriber
Discussion: Louie Aguilar presented the plans for the remodeling of the existing building, from one tenant space to four tenant spaces. The plans include removing the entry element that was built for the previous Petco tenant and replacing it with two new tower elements on both ends of the north elevation. The plans also show wrapping windows on to the east elevations adjacent to the street. No tenants were identified at this time, but it was indicated that they will most likely be food related.
Action: The DRC approved the remodel plans as proposed.

File #: B16-0813
Application: Review enclosure of drive thru canopy for the Wayne Stanley industrial building
Location: 3350 Riverside Ave
Applicant: Robert Fisher Architect
Discussion: The applicant presented the project to the DRC noting the canopy has already been enclosed and that the material of the panels for the walls of the canopy differ from the material of the rest of the building. Mr. Fisher also noted the panels for the walls were a different color. The DRC asked to see photos of the project prior to making a decision. The applicant said he would provide the photos at a future DRC meeting.
Action: The DRC continued review of the project to a future date.

File #: Sign Plan
Application: Retrofit existing monument sign for Spirit Gas
Location: 1637 Spring Street
Applicant: United Signs

Discussion: Staff presented the proposed sign plan noting the applicant was informed prior to the DRC meeting that the sign did not conform to the Sign Code due the use of white as the sign's background (does not apply to corporate logo). Staff also noted the applicant had requested the item be presented to DRC as is, since the owner did not want to change the sign. The DRC indicated the sign cannot be white and the logo needs to be opaque white. The DRC also asked that the landscape planter (in which the sign is located) be planted with drought-tolerant plants.

Action: The DRC members did not support this sign plan since it does not conform to the City's Sign Ordinance. They suggested the applicant resubmit with an alternative proposal.
