1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. FLAG SALUTE:
   Berlin

4. AGENDA REVIEW:
   The Committee may revise the order of agenda items depending on public interest and/or special presentations.

5. COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:
   This public comment period is an invitation to members of the community to present issues, thoughts, or suggestions. Comments should be limited to those matters that are within the jurisdiction of the Architectural Review Committee (ARC). The Brown Act restricts the ARC from taking formal action on matters not scheduled on the agenda.

6. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:
   Correspondence or supplemental information for the Architectural Review Committee received after Agenda preparation. In compliance with the Brown Act, the Committee will not take action on correspondence relating to items that are not listed on the Agenda, but may schedule such matters for discussion or hearing as part of future agenda consideration.

7. CONSENT AGENDA:
   7.a. Consideration Of Approval Of Minutes
   Recommended Action: Approve the minutes of the October 7, 2019 Regular Meeting.
   Documents:
      ARC 2019-10-21_7a Approval of Minutes.pdf

8. PROJECTS:
   Members of the public may speak on any of the following items when recognized by the Chair.
   8.a. Consideration Of Materials Proposed For City Hall Re-Roof; Location -- 300 E. Branch Street; Applicant -- City Of Arroyo Grande; Representative -- Jill McPeek, Capital Improvement Project Manager
   Recommended Action: It is recommended that the Architectural Review Committee review the proposed project and make a recommendation to the Public Works Director.
   Documents:
      ARC 2019-10-21_8a City Hall reroof.pdf
8.b. Consideration Of Conditional Use Permit 19-002; Assisted Living Facility With 78 Assisted Living And 20 Memory Care Units, Totaling 120 Beds; Location -- 207 Pilgrim Way (Orchard Street); Applicant -- Noble Ventures Properties, Inc.; Representative -- David Mi

Recommended Action: It is recommended that the Architectural Review Committee review the proposed project and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Documents:

ARC 2019-10-21_8b Orchard Assisted Living.pdf

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

None

10. COMMITTEE COMMUNICATIONS:

Correspondence/Comments as presented by the Architectural Review Committee.

11. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Correspondence/Comments as presented by City staff.

12. ADJOURNMENT

All staff reports or other written documentation, including any supplemental material distributed to a majority of the Architectural Review Committee within 72 hours of a regular meeting, relating to each item of business on the agenda are available for public inspection during regular business hours in the Community Development Department, 300 East Branch Street, Arroyo Grande. If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. To make a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, contact the Legislative and Information Services Department at 805-473-5414 as soon as possible and at least 48 hours prior to the meeting date.

This agenda was prepared and posted pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2. The Agenda can be accessed and downloaded from the City’s website at www.arroyogrande.org. If you would like to subscribe to receive email or text message notifications when agendas are posted, you can sign up online through our Notify Me feature.
1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Hoag called the Regular Architectural Review Committee meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL
ARC Members: Chair Hoag, Vice Chair Bruce Berlin, and Committee Members Jon Couch, Lori Hall and Kristin Juette were present.

City Staff Present: Assistant Planner Andrew Perez was present.

3. FLAG SALUTE
Chair Hoag led the Flag Salute.

4. AGENDA REVIEW
None.

5. COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS
None.

6. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
None.

7. CONSENT AGENDA
Committee Member Couch made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Berlin to approve the minutes of the September 16, 2019, Regular Meeting as submitted. The motion passed 4-0-1 on the following voice vote:

AYES: Couch, Berlin, Hall, Juette
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Hoag

8. PROJECTS
8.a. CONTINUED CONSIDERATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SIGN PERMIT 19-008; REPLACEMENT OF ONE (1) EXISTING WALL SIGN AND ONE (1) EXISTING GROUND SIGN FOR AN EXISTING BUSINESS; LOCATION – 214 E. BRANCH STREET, SUITE B; APPLICANT – ASSIST HOME LOANS; REPRESENTATIVE – CHRISTIAN STEARNS (Perez)
Assistant Planner Perez presented the staff report, briefly reviewed the Committee’s previous comments about the proposal, and the options presented by the applicant in an effort to comply with the Village Design Guidelines.

Justin Stearns, business owner, spoke in support of the project and informed the Committee that the design is trademarked, and the business has made a significant financial investment on materials with the proposed logo.
The Committee spoke in support of the project and appreciated the applicant’s flexibility with the revisions to the color scheme that better complements the building color. The Committee also expressed an understanding that a trademarked logo was important for brand recognition and was supportive of the sign as proposed, without requiring either of the two revisions proposed in the staff report.

Vice Chair Berlin made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Juette, to recommend approval of the project to the Community Development Director as submitted.

The motion passed 5-0 on the following voice vote:

AYES: Berlin, Juette, Hall, Couch, Hoag
NOES: None

8.b. CONSIDERATION OF PLOT PLAN REVIEW 19-020; RELOCATION OF AN ANTIQUE WATER TOWER BASE AND CONVERSION TO PERMANENT RESTROOM FACILITIES; LOCATION – 126 S. MASON STREET; APPLICANT – SOUTH COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY; REPRESENTATIVE – CHUCK FELLOWS (Perez)

Assistant Planner Perez presented the staff report and provided details about the structure proposed for relocation, the purpose of the project, and the receiving site at Heritage Square Park. He made the Committee aware of the other historically significant structures at the park and how this project achieves the primary objective of the Design Guidelines. He also clarified that a recommendation from the Committee would be to the City Council, rather than the Community Development Director, because the relocation site is City owned property.

Chuck Fellows and Paul Provence, representing the South County Historical Society, spoke in support of the project, provided additional details about the phases of the project, timing of the phases, and the benefits the tank house will bring to Heritage Square Park.

The Committee expressed support for the project and appreciated the efforts to preserve a structure with historical significance. The Committee spoke in support of the rehabilitation and reuse of the structure, and encouraged the applicant to maintain the historical aesthetic inside the restroom when it added within the tank house structure.

Committee Member Couch made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Berlin, to recommend approval of the project as submitted to the City Council.

The motion passed 5-0 on the following voice vote:

AYES: Couch, Berlin, Hall, Juette, Hoag
NOES: None

8.c. CONSIDERATION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW 19-003; REPLACEMENT EXISTING SIDING, RELOCATION OF FRONT DOOR AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SLOPED ROOF; LOCATION – 525 LE POINT STREET; APPLICANT – GUY & TERESA TORELLI; REPRESENTATIVE – MARK VASQUEZ, DESIGN GRAPHICS. (Perez)

Assistant Planner Perez presented the staff report and presented the existing development at the project site and what alterations are proposed. He explained that the project is subject to the Village Design Guidelines due to its location in the Historic Character Overlay District, and how the project complies with those guidelines.
Mark Vasquez, architect for the project, spoke in support of the project and explained that the purpose of the project was twofold: to add character to the house, and replace the brick veneer that was failing due to improper installation.

The Committee spoke in support of the project and appreciated that the proposed alterations will improve the aesthetic of the structure and increase its compatibility with the rest of the neighborhood. The Committee suggested that the applicant consider utilizing other materials and techniques instead of the stone veneer, but ultimately was comfortable with the project as proposed.

Committee Member Juette made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Hall, to recommend approval of the project as submitted to the Community Development Director.

The motion passed 5-0 on the following voice vote:

**AYES:** Juette, Hall, Couch, Berlin, Hoag
**NOES:** None

9. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
None.

10. **COMMITTEE COMMUNICATIONS**
Committee Member Juette informed the Committee that she will be absent from both the November 4, 2019 and November 18, 2019 Regular Meetings.

11. **STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**
Assistant Planner Perez informed the Committee that the proposed assisted living facility on Orchard Street will be on the next agenda.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.to a regular meeting on October 21, 2019 at 2:30 p.m.

_____________________________   _____________________________
ANDREW PEREZ     WARREN HOAG
ASSISTANT PLANNER      CHAIR
(Approved at ARC Meeting ________)
TO: ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
FROM: ANDREW PEREZ, ASSISTANT PLANNER
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF MATERIALS PROPOSED FOR CITY HALL RE-ROOF PROJECT; LOCATION – 300 E. BRANCH STREET; APPLICANT – CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE; REPRESENTATIVE – JILL McPEEK, CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT MANAGER
DATE: OCTOBER 21, 2019

SUMMARY OF ACTION:
Recommendation of approval to the Public Works Director will allow for the re-roof of the City Hall building located in the Historic Character Overlay District.

IMPACT ON FINANCIAL AND PERSONNEL RESOURCES:
None.

RECOMMENDATION:
It is recommended the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) review the proposed project and make a recommendation to the Public Works Director.

BACKGROUND:
In March 2010 the City Council approved the relocation of City Hall staff and services from 214 E. Branch Street to the building at 300 E. Branch Street. City Hall is home to the Administrative Services, Community Development, Legislative and Information Services Departments, and the City Manager’s Office. Built in 1984, the building was formerly the home of Farm Credit financial services. The roof is in need of repair as several leaks have been detected over the course of the past few years. City Hall is located in the Historic Overlay Character District; therefore any exterior alterations require a recommendation from the ARC prior to building permit issuance (Attachment 1).

ANALYSIS OF ISSUES:
Project Description
The existing building has a concrete tile roof that is approximately 35 years old and in need of replacement due to multiple leaks and increased maintenance costs associated with the leaks. A composite shingle is proposed as the replacement material as the type of concrete tile that is currently on the building is no longer being manufactured and composite shingles are cost effective while still complying with the Design Guidelines...
(Attachment 2). The metal flashing is proposed to be painted a dark brown color that complements the color of the fascia and the building’s color scheme (Attachment 3).

**Design Guidelines**

The Design Guidelines note that public facilities located in the Village shall comply with standards established for the Village Mixed-Use areas. The Design Guidelines specifically mention composition shingles as the most common roofing material in the district. The Design Guidelines also state that new roofing materials shall incorporate composition shingles or other nonflammable material that simulates the appearance of wood. The Design Guidelines promote colors that match the natural environment and are compatible with the historic character of the area. The project proposes to install brown shingles and painting the flashing brown, both of which complement the surrounding area and the building’s color scheme.

**ADVANTAGES:**
The proposed project will repair leaks in the existing roof and the replacement materials comply with the Design Guidelines.

**DISADVANTAGES:**
None identified.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**
The project was reviewed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and determined to be categorically exempt per Section 15301(a) of the Guidelines regarding maintenance of existing structures.

**PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND COMMENTS:**
The Agenda was posted at City Hall and on the City’s website in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Project Location
2. Design Guidelines
3. Proposed Materials & Color
Village Mixed Use (VMU)

This section of the Guidelines and Standards applies to areas between the Village Core Downtown and the Village Residential districts surrounding the Village, as shown on the Design Overlay map including the Public Facilities district. The Village Mixed Use district is intended to provide space for intensified mixed use projects compatible with adjoining commercial or residential districts. The Guidelines and Standards for this area are intended to enhance these transitional areas.

An objective of the Village Mixed Use district is to maintain and develop mixed uses in a manner that allows a transition from the intense commercial character of the Village Core Downtown to the surrounding traditional Village Residential neighborhoods. Adaptive re-use of existing houses is encouraged to accommodate new uses while maintaining the historical residential heritage. The Village Mixed Use district should enhance pedestrian accessibility and activity and minimize the visual impact of automobiles.

EXISTING CHARACTER

The Village Mixed Use districts contain a combination of commercial, office and residential uses rather than exclusively residential or commercial character evident in adjoining areas. Generally, the character of existing development reflects the period of the late 19th Century, however, it derives its diversity from the combination of residential and commercial uses over time.

Diversity in Scale

Many of the buildings surrounding the Village Core Downtown are small residential structures that are being used as homes, offices, or small retail stores. The lot sizes and building types are more consistent with Village Residential areas. Most of the buildings are one story, however, some two story homes and offices exist proximate to the Village Core Downtown. Generally, the scale of the Village Mixed Use neighborhood is smaller with moderate sized separated buildings.

Similarity of Material

Building materials used in the Village Mixed Use district generally reflect those used in Village Residential neighborhoods rather than Village Core Downtown commercial buildings. The most common cladding material is either weatherboard or clapboard wood siding. Other popular materials include stucco or plaster, and shingles of various designs are often seen as accent materials or ornamentation, especially on gable ends. The most common roofing material is composition shingle, and
to a lesser extent wood shingle. Yellow indigenous sandstone, which is a distinct building material in the Village Core Downtown, is not as common for Village Residential and Village Mixed Use buildings, but it is sometimes used as a foundation material or a trim material along with stone or brick. Window frames are almost exclusively wood, and door materials incorporate wood panels with glass, in varying proportions.

**Sense of Experimentation**

Most Village Mixed Use districts exhibit a Village Residential rather than Village Core Downtown commercial character. Use of similar building materials, colors, or styles with individual building design or unique ornamentation brings out a more eclectic nature within Village Mixed Use districts. Such diversity is encouraged.

**Variety in Building Form**

Buildings are single and two-story with varying architectural styles and sizes. Varying setbacks and distinct wing arrangements create a unique streetscape. Landscaping adds character by screening and accenting the buildings in the Village Mixed Use district. Variety in building form is due to historic mixed uses and diversity of individual infill developments between the Village Core Downtown and Village Residential areas over time. Materials and building styles incorporate details from both residential and commercial building types.

**DESIGN GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS**

The following building elements shall NEITHER overpower the project or detract from the visual continuity of the streetscape or neighborhood NOR produce redundancy in feature or pattern that is discordant with the historic character of the district:

- Building scale
- Building form
- Building façade
- Building entrance
- Roofline
- Fencing, rails or trellis
- Archways, columns or towers
- Doors and windows
- Signage or feature designed for sign placement
- Colors

**Site Design**

All new projects or substantial alterations and additions are required to adhere to site development standards of the Development Code.

Front Setbacks in the Village Mixed Use district should be in line with traditional houses along the block generally ten to twenty feet (10’ –20’). Where setbacks vary, a new building shall fit within the range of setbacks of the block.
When a structure is built in or altered in or is facing a predominantly residential block, it should take on a residential design character regardless of its proposed use.

For a Village Mixed Use district project that is predominantly residential in use, the design of the project should reflect a residential character.

Residential and mixed use buildings in the Village Mixed Use district shall comply with the design standards for the Village Mixed Use district, unless otherwise approved by the ARC and Planning Commission. Exceptions may include retail commercial uses in close proximity to the Village Core Downtown.

Connective elements such as walkways, common landscaped areas, building orientation, and unfenced property lines are encouraged.

Particular care should be taken to assure convenient pedestrian and bike circulation through all parts of a project and to adjoining properties in the Village Mixed Use district.

Any surface parking should be provided in well-screened parking lots at the rear or sides of projects. Parking that is intended to support commercial or office uses should be placed in convenient proximity to such uses. At least one on-site parking space shall be provided for each dwelling unit, regardless of dwelling size.

New outbuildings, including garages and enclosures for service areas, trash or recycle containers, or storage structure should be compatible with materials, textures and colors of the principal buildings. Projects that propose potential newspaper racks shall include a designated area consistent with the building architecture. Vending machines in public view shall be placed within an enclosing structure. Plans for the structure shall be subject to ARC approval.

Existing trees should be retained where possible. A Tree Removal Permit may be required (“Municipal Code 12.16”). Judicious pruning and shaping will be allowed. Street trees and other sidewalk area landscaping shall be incorporated if pedestrian circulation will not be obstructed. (Streetscape improvements within the public right-of-way require an Encroachment Permit from the Public Works Department.) Front yards should be landscaped compatible with the majority of neighboring properties and maintained on a regular basis. Each residential unit shall provide a private outdoor patio, courtyard, atrium or balconies, regardless of unit size.

Street furniture and fixtures shall complement the existing sidewalk paving, lighting schemes, and street furniture within the Village Core Downtown.

A site plan incorporating the project within adjacent development shall be submitted as part of the application for Architectural Review.

**Building Design**

The height of new buildings shall not exceed Development Code standards: generally one and two stories are allowed. New building additions and alterations should be compatible with the adjoining area and not exceed height, lot coverage and floor area ratio requirements of the Development Code.

The use of consistent architectural styles from the years 1870 to 1940 is strongly encouraged rather than additions or alterations from more recent or different design styles (see Architectural Styles for examples).

New construction should include elements such as cladding, roofing material, roof structure and ornamentation common to the district.
The existing pattern of building facades generally respecting pedestrian or human scale design should be incorporated into new development projects. Façade designs that incorporate either brick or stone elements and parapets are appropriate for commercial structures. Roof types generally associated with residential buildings such as gable, hip or gambrel are also appropriate for structures within the Village Mixed Use district.

A building front should provide visual interest and a sense of human scale.

All decorative fixtures, including awnings, signs and lighting, shall be integrated with other design elements of the structures.

Building elevations shall be submitted as part of the application for ARC review. Perspectives, accurate sections or a model of the project may be required to depict the height, mass and scale of the proposed project with respect to its setting and adjacent development.

Construction Materials

Clapboard, weatherboard cladding, and cement plaster, including stucco, are building materials used in the Village Mixed Use district. Cement plaster is most prevalent in more recent designs and on Spanish Eclectic style buildings. All cladding or wood materials should be painted or treated to preserve the wood, and to give the structure a more finished look. New roofing materials should incorporate composition shingles or other nonflammable material that simulates the appearance of wood. For Spanish Eclectic or Pueblo styles, the use of mission tiles is appropriate.

New or replacement door frames and window sashes should be made of wood or an approved substitute material that approximates the appearance of original materials.

Some existing buildings incorporate materials that do not reflect historic styles such as synthetic siding, concrete block and aluminum, which are the result of prior additions or remodels. Further use of these materials is not permitted unless necessary for minor changes to elevations already composed of such elements. Additions or alterations to buildings shall use the original building materials where possible, or approved materials that simulate original materials.

Original decorative details should be retained where possible. If original historic materials have deteriorated and must be removed, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original design, color and texture.

Sample materials shall be submitted as part of the application for ARC review.

Building Colors

Building colors should be compatible with the historic character of the area, and should not conflict with other colors in the surrounding areas. The building colors in the historic districts primarily include tones that match the natural environment such as earth tones. Some Victorian homes in the Village Residential and Village Mixed Use portions of the Village use brighter colors to accent the style of these buildings.

Neon or day-glow colors are not appropriate. Bright colors, such as those on the Victorian homes, shall be limited to accent details or portions of the buildings. Color samples shall be submitted as part of the application for ARC review.
ATTACHMENT 3

Proposed shingle style & color

Proposed paint color for roof flashing
MEMORANDUM

TO: ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

FROM: ANDREW PEREZ, ASSISTANT PLANNER

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 19-002; ASSISTED LIVING FACILITY WITH 78 ASSISTED LIVING AND 20 MEMORY CARE UNITS, TOTALING 120 BEDS; LOCATION – 207 PILGRIM WAY (ORCHARD STREET); APPLICANT – NOBLE VENTURES PROPERTIES, INC.; REPRESENTATIVE – DAVID MI

DATE: OCTOBER 21, 2019

SUMMARY OF ACTION:
Recommendation for future action by the Planning Commission will result in the development of an assisted living facility on a vacant parcel.

IMPACT ON FINANCIAL AND PERSONNEL RESOURCES:
There is the potential for an increased costs associated with the anticipated number of calls to the Five Cities Fire Authority typical of assisted living facilities.

RECOMMENDATION:
It is recommended that the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) review the proposed project and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

BACKGROUND:
Location
The project site is located in the Public/quasi-public (PF) zoning district located between Orchard Road and US Highway 101 right-of-way. An application for a lot line adjustment approved by the Planning Commission on August 20, 2019 between 631 Arroyo Avenue and 103 Pilgrim Way created the 2.8 acre project site (Attachment 1).

The project site is a vacant parcel that is relatively flat that abuts a parcel developed with a religious facility and a single family residence to the north, and undeveloped parcels to the south and east. A seasonal drainage channel is located between the project site and the religious facility to the north. Approximately 300 feet south of the project site is the next closest residential development. The project site is accessed from Orchard Street to the west. Existing vegetation consists primarily of weeds and grasses with some trees adjacent to Orchard Street.

Item 8.b - Page 1
Pre-Application Review
The applicant processed Pre-Application 18-003 in July and August 2018 to obtain preliminary feedback from the Staff Advisory Committee (SAC) on the project. The comments from staff resulted in minor alterations to the unit mix, bed count, and parking configuration. Staff provided direction about development standards applicable to the project, particularly lot coverage, floor-area ratio and maximum height. Other issues identified included emergency department access, water consumption and neutralization, stormwater management, and flood hazard management. The applicant revised the project based on these comments and subsequently submitted the application now under consideration.

Staff Advisory Committee
The SAC reviewed the project on multiple occasions, most recently on October 9, 2019. Items of discussion included the project’s fire access, site circulation, stormwater management and conditions of approval relating to an anticipated increase in calls for service to emergency medical services, particularly Five Cities Fire Authority, and cost recovery for that anticipated increase. Members of the SAC were in support of the project.

ANALYSIS OF ISSUES:
Project Description
The proposed project is described as a residential care facility for the elderly, licensed by the State of California Community Care Licensing Division (Attachment 2). The facility will consist of 78 assisted living units and 20 memory care units. Within the assisted living portion of the facility, there are proposed to be 31 studios, 41 one-bedroom units, and 6 two-bedroom units. The memory care portion of the facility is proposed to consist of 10 single occupancy rooms and 10 double occupancy rooms. The maximum occupancy for the entire facility would be 120 residents. The facility would also include a conference room, reception area, and offices for sales, marketing, and management staff.

Each of the 78 assisted living units is proposed with private laundry facilities, private full bathrooms, and kitchens with a sink, dishwasher, cabinets, microwaves, and ovens with range tops. Residents would have access to three (3) daily meals plus snacks available throughout the day in addition to other amenities such as exercise programs, a movie theatre, an onsite beauty/barber shop, a gift shop, and entertainment and various activities. There is also approximately 7,000 square feet of outdoor living space located in the two (2) interior courtyards.

The residents of the memory care units would be served their meals in a communal dining area, because these units will not have private kitchens. Residents in the memory care wing of the facility would also have access to communal activities and living areas and 3,000 square feet of outdoor space located in an interior courtyard and the memory care garden.
General Plan
The General Plan land use designation for the subject property is Community Facility. Community Facilities are defined as public or quasi-public uses that fulfill neighborhood, community, or regional needs. The proposed assisted living facility meets General Plan Policies LU9-1, and LU9-2 of the Land Use Element and Policy J.2 of the Housing Element, which state:

**LU9-1:** The Community Facilities (CF) designation includes public or institutional uses that provide a community facility or service. The uses allowed in this designation include but are not limited to the following: cemeteries, churches, lodges, City Hall, city yard, fire and police stations, places of general public assembly, senior centers, women’s centers, museums, other facilities that are primarily contained within a structure, and public or private schools, parks, playgrounds and sports complexes, South County regional center and other public agency facilities.

**LU9-2:** Community facilities other than schools, parks and recreation areas may also be conditionally permitted in any other land use designation based on the specific function of the facility, compatible with the site and environs. Schools, parks and recreation facilities may be conditionally permitted in or adjoining residential neighborhoods or mixed use areas where the facilities are intended to serve the areas in which they are located.

**LU11-2:** The City shall permit larger group housing for seniors in appropriate multiple-family or mixed-use locations, subject to discretionary review.

Development Standards
The subject property is zoned PF. The primary purpose of the PF district is to designate land for the conduct of public, quasi-public, and institutional activities, including the protection of areas needed for such future facilities. The proposed project qualifies as a recreational use, per the Municipal Code, and is allowed with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The development standards for the PF district and the proposed project are identified in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standards</th>
<th>PF District</th>
<th>CUP 19-002</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>98 units total 35 units/acre</td>
<td>No max. density for this type of project. Maximum size is dependent on meeting all site development standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size</td>
<td>25,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>122,000 sf (approx.) 2.8 acres</td>
<td>Code Met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width</td>
<td>140 feet</td>
<td>288 feet</td>
<td>Code Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standards</th>
<th>PF District</th>
<th>CUP 19-002</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>49 feet</td>
<td>Code Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>79 feet</td>
<td>Code Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Yard Setback</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>Code Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Size Limits</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>47,153 sf</td>
<td>No max. building size in this zone. Maximum size is dependent on meeting all site development standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Building Height</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>36 feet</td>
<td>Building height above 30’ allowed through the CUP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37.68%</td>
<td>Code Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Code Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>Covered in Table 2 below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access and Parking

The project site proposes a single public access point from Orchard Street. An island and monument sign divide the ingress and egress lanes of the driveway. Parking areas surround the proposed structure on the north, east, and west sides, and an emergency access road encompasses the entire project site. A porte cochere covers an unloading area near the main entrance on the north side of the facility.

A total of 69 parking spaces are required for the proposed project. The parking rate for assisted living facilities, per Section 16.56.040 of the Arroyo Grande Municipal Code, is one (1) parking space for every three (3) resident beds and one (1) space for every employee on the largest shift. Employees will work one of the three (3), 8-hour shifts with an anticipated maximum of 29 employees during the busiest shift. These requirements are broken down in Table 2 below. Development Code Section

### Intentionally left blank.
Table 2: Parking Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Code Requirements</th>
<th>Resident Parking</th>
<th>Employee Parking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Code Requirements</td>
<td>1 parking space/ 3 resident beds (120 beds proposed)</td>
<td>One space per employee on the largest space (29 employees on the largest shift)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Required:</td>
<td>40 spaces</td>
<td>29 spaces</td>
<td>69 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Parking</td>
<td>67 standard spaces, and 3 ADA spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>70 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architecture
The architectural character of the development resembles a Mediterranean style, utilizing a mix of exterior colors and materials as listed in Table 2 (Attachment 2). The resident will primarily be located around the perimeter of the building, with the communal areas and two (2) courtyards located in the center. The building design features a hipped roof and a tower element that rises above the roofline.

The exterior walls of the structure are proposed with a stucco finish proposed with a base color named “Hollywood Golden Age”, which is a yellowish-beige color. A brown color, called to as “Calico Rock” is proposed as an accent color and to break up the massing, and for the fascia and trim. The wood shutters are proposed to be painted a greenish-gray color, called “Marsh Maverick”. The design incorporates a number of decorative elements throughout the design, such as the aforementioned shutters, Juliette balconies, and gable feature consisting of a stucco ring with perpendicular iron bars. The window and door frames are proposed to be an anodized bronze, and the Juliette balconies would be a crimson red. A charcoal colored asphalt shingle roof is proposed for the entire structure.

Table 3: Building Materials and Colors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color Scheme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Shingles</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>“Hollywood Golden Age”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim &amp; Base Elements</td>
<td>Calico Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows &amp; Doors Frame</td>
<td>Anodized bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>“Marsh Maverick”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliette Balcony</td>
<td>“Deep Crimson”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trees and Landscaping
As identified previously, the site is relatively devoid of vegetation with the exception of weeds and grasses throughout the site and nine (9) pepper trees near the Orchard Street right of way. Three (3) of these trees are proposed to be removed, while the other six (6) will remain. The landscape plan proposes a wide variety of trees to be planted throughout...
the site including Redwoods, Liquidambar, California Sycamore, Cottonwood, Japanese Flowering Cherry, and Crepe Myrtles. The landscape plan also includes a number of shrubs, grasses and succulents around the perimeter of the building. Each of the courtyards will include numerous trees and potted plants, and the memory care garden will include a turf area, surrounded by groundcover and shrubs. The landscape plan currently complies with the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The landscape plan proposes low-voltage light fixtures to provide uplighting around the facility for aesthetic purposes and illuminate walking paths for safety. Additional exterior lighting is provided through decorative light fixtures affixed to the building.

**Signage**
The application also proposes the installation of a monument sign at the vehicular entrance to the facility. The monument sign would be installed on an island between the entrance and exit lanes. The exact dimensions and colors are to be determined, but the sign would sit on a concrete base, and include name of the facility.

**ADVANTAGES:**
The proposed project will develop a vacant site with an assisted care facility that will provide housing for seniors consistent with the General Plan. The design of the development respects neighboring church facility and nearby residential neighborhood and lessens impacts to those properties with extensive landscaping buffers between the properties.

**DISADVANTAGES:**
Due to the nature of the proposed project, it is likely to increase the number of calls of service to the Five Cities Fire Authority, which in turn may increase the City’s costs for service.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**
The proposed project is being reviewed under the California Environmental Quality Act.

**PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND COMMENT:**
The Agenda was posted at City Hall and on the City’s website in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2. No comments have been received.

**Attachments:**
1. Location map
2. Licensing and Operations
3. Color and Materials
4. Project plans
LICENSING AND OPERATIONS

The entirety of Westmont's Arroyo Grande project will be licensed by the State of California Community Care Licensing Division-Department of Social Services (DSS) as a residential care facility for the elderly (RCFE). The retirement community is a 24-hour per day operation. Westmont Living’s typical resident age is 80-years or older, single, with either a desire for a socialized environment and the convenience of dining, activities and amenities immediately available, or experiencing a growing need for personal assistance with daily activities. Approximately 10% of residents will be couples. Services onsite will include three meals per day plus snacks available to all residents as required by licensing (and included in the monthly fee). Additionally there will be entertainment, and onsite activities/exercise programming, a movie theatre, an onsite beauty/barber shop, a gift shop that will sell various sundries, as well as transportation to various activities within the greater community of Arroyo Grande.

Each of the 78 assisted living units contains its own stackable washer/dryer and private full baths with handicap accessible shower enclosures. The 41 one bedroom and 6 two-bedroom units contain kitchens with a sink, dishwasher, cabinets, microwaves, and ovens with range tops. Westmont’s experience in their other retirement communities has taught them that apartments are more marketable to the adult children of resident seniors and to the seniors themselves if they contain kitchens and stackable laundry equipment. By giving residents the choice of doing their own laundry or preparing a meal, independence is reinforced, although most take advantage of the convenient and personalized services offered onsite. By providing the services and conveniences of home within the community, the program also helps to smooth the transition process for residents into higher levels of care when those services become necessary.

Westmont Living’s memory care neighborhood is located on the first floor (west wing), and contains 20 units and a large communal dining, activities and living area. The units each have their own full baths but do not contain kitchenettes or stackable washer/dryers. The memory care neighborhood will also be fully licensed by the State of California Community Care Licensing-Department of Social Services (DSS) and will have a secured perimeter, offering superior individualized care for residents suffering from Alzheimer’s Disease or other age-related dementias.

Westmont Living will staff the community 24-hours per day, using three three employee shifts (7 AM - 3 PM, 3 PM - 11 PM and 11 PM - 7 AM). The daytime shift will have the maximum total staffing and will include 29 employees (assisted living and memory care combined). Licensing regulations do not specify staffing requirements for assisted living facilities. Title 22 regulations do require that the project has a State certified Executive Director, one awake staff member during nighttime hours, one activities person for the assisted living building and for the memory
care residents and that the project provides overall staffing to meet the needs of community residents. Westmont Living anticipates having 29 employees on the day shift (7AM to 3 PM), 20 employees on the (3 PM to 11 PM shift), and 2 employees on the night shift (11 PM to 7 AM) for a combined total for the three shifts of 51 employees.

The maximum number of private contractors who regularly work or visit the premises is estimated to be 4 non-employees on the premises. This anticipates a worst case scenario, in which food delivery, hospice care and landscaping were to occur at the same time. Food delivery will typically on a weekly schedule and at non-peak traffic times, such as very early mornings, mid-mornings or early afternoon.

An operational estimate of the peak hour visitors is 5. Most visitors arrive throughout the day at varying times with most visits occurring from 9 AM to 7 PM. On a typical day, the project would not anticipate having more than 5 total visitors.