



**MEETING MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
154 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET
GROVER BEACH, CALIFORNIA
TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2008
6:30 P.M.**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in a City meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office (473-4568) at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to ensure that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER 6:30 p.m.

FLAG SALUTE: Rebecca Chapman led the flag salute.

PRESENT: Commissioners Blum, Coleman, Long, Marshall, Nielsen, and Chair Peterson.

ABSENT: Vice Chair Snow.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: *At this point of the meeting, members of the public may bring up any items within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission that are not on the agenda. Please limit your comments to three (3) minutes. The Planning Commission will listen to all comments; however, in compliance with the Brown Act, the Commission cannot act on items not on the agenda.*

There was no one present who wished to comment.

ORDER OF ITEMS: Chair Peterson suggested that Item 5 be moved to be heard before Item 3, and the Planning Commission agreed.

CONSENT AGENDA:

The following routine items listed below are scheduled for consideration as a group. The recommendations for each item are noted in parentheses. A member of the audience may speak on any items listed on the Consent Agenda. Any Planning Commissioner or Staff may request that an item be withdrawn from the Consent Agenda to allow for full discussion.

- 1. Approval of Minutes of Planning Commission meeting of August 14, 2007. (Recommendation: Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the minutes as submitted.)**

Commissioner Long made the motion to approve the minutes, as written. Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 6-0-1-0.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

- 2. Capital Improvement Plan: General Plan Finding of Consistency**

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is a funding mechanism that provides for implementation of the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the City's General Plan. It identifies capital construction and repair activities of public facilities (primarily infrastructure) essential to the growth and maintenance of the community. Projects identified in the CIP relate City funding sources to capital construction, repair, or improvement projects with an estimated cost of \$50,000.00 or greater and an estimated life of twenty years or greater within the framework of

the City's General Plan. As part of the implementation process of the City's General Plan, the Planning Commission annually reviews and makes a recommendation to the City Council of a finding of consistency between the Five Year Capital Improvement Plan and the City's General Plan. Staff Report presented by Administrative Services Director Gayla R. Chapman.

Administrative Services Director Gayla Chapman presented the staff report. She presented the background of the CIP program and the purpose. There are no fiscal impacts associated with the CIP document, and it is not defined as a project by CEQA. As each individual project comes forward, the applicable environmental review processes will be completed.

The Planning Commission is charged with the responsibility of program review and report to the City Council with a Finding of Consistency between the CIP and the General Plan.

She described the various components of the CIP document under review. The programs and projects listed in the CIP are essential to the orderly growth and development of our community.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the resolution with the Finding of Consistency.

Director Chapman answered questions that had been submitted by Commissioner Marshall. She described Proposition 1B funds, and indicated that the City received \$400,000 in funding.

Regarding the sewer line, she indicated that it is being installed with Redevelopment Agency funds and Wastewater Enterprise funds to promote development in the industrial area. She also indicated that upon completion, the sewer line will be turned over to the Sanitation District.

Regarding the bus station at Ramona Park, Director Chapman indicated that the work done is being performed according to the Ramona Specific Plan, with some slight deviations related to parking.

Commissioner Nielsen asked if there were discretionary funds to address safety issues. Director Chapman indicated that there are no discretionary funds in the CIP.

Commissioner Blum asked if they anticipate receiving more grants during this period. Director Chapman indicated that they always keep their eye out for grant opportunities, but there is nothing in the pipeline at the moment.

Chair Peterson opened the public hearing; there was no one present who wished to comment, and the public hearing was closed.

Chair Peterson stated that she was pleased to see the hard work that the City has done to obtain funding.

Commissioner Marshall made the motion to adopt staff's recommendation; Commissioner Blum seconded the motion, and it carried with a vote of 6-0-1-0.

3. Development Permit Application 08-003

Applicant - Cameron Realty Partners, LLC

This application is a request for a time extension to file a Final Parcel Map for a three-unit airspace condominium project (Previous Development Permit Application No. 05-072). The subject property is located at 524 Longbranch (Assessor Parcel No. 060-271-017) in the Multiple Residential (R-3) District. The project planner is Planning Manager Diana Gould-Wells.

Planning Manager Diana Gould-Wells presented the staff report. She indicated that the request is for a time extension to file a Final Parcel Map for the subject property. She reviewed the background of the project and stated that the applicant filed the extension in a timely manner. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission grant a 1-year time extension.

In response to a question from Commissioner Marshall, Planning Manager Gould-Wells indicated that the project could be eligible for one more 1-year extension.

Chair Peterson opened the public hearing. Shannon Ferris, applicant, indicated that the reason for the delay is due to the financial issues related to the economy.

Chair Peterson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Coleman made the motion to adopt the resolution extending the application for one year. Commissioner Long seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 6-0-1-0.

4. Development Permit Application 08-005

Applicant – Captive Hearts

This application is a request for a Use Permit to allow a general office counseling center and window signage. The subject property is located at 882 West Grand Avenue (Assessor Parcel No. 060-228-007) in the Central Business District (C-B-D). The project planner is Janet Reese.

Planning Manager Gould-Wells presented the staff report and gave a background of the business. She indicated that it is an existing business which is relocating due to space issues, requiring a new permit. She described the findings required for the Planning Commission to make in order to approve this project. She described what kind of uses will occur in the business. She described the proposed window sign as 3 sq. ft. in size, about one percent of the building face. Staff believes that the window sign could be allowed in lieu of a wall sign. This is the only sign proposed for the business. Staff recommends approval of the Use Permit.

Chair Peterson opened the public hearing.

Chaplain Judy Bowen, applicant, was present, and described their need for a larger space. She described the business and the work that they do in the community.

Chair Peterson closed the public hearing. Commissioner Blum made the motion to approve Resolution 08-017 granting the Use Permit and allowing the window sign. Commissioner Nielsen seconded the motion, and it carried with a vote of 6-0-1-0.

5. Development Permit Application 07-041

Applicant – Byron Grant

This application is a request for a General Development Plan for a 64-lot, 62-unit residential development. The subject property is located at 1601 Farroll Road (Assessor Parcel No. 060-572-002) in the Residential Agriculture (R-A) Zoning District. The project planner is Planning Manager Diana Gould-Wells.

Note: This item was heard as the second public hearing item on the agenda.

Planning Manager Diana Gould Wells indicated that the applicant requested that the subject item be continued, and staff is recommending that the item be continued to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on June 10, 2008. The Planning Commission can open the hearing and take public testimony before continuing, or open the hearing and continue

without taking public testimony.

Chair Peterson opened the public hearing. Commissioners Nielsen, Coleman and Marshall expressed interest in hearing from members of the public who came to speak about this item. Blum expressed concern about the noticing of the properties. Commissioner Blum made the motion to open the public hearing, take public testimony, and then continue the item to June 10, 2009. Commissioner Marshall seconded the motion, and it was carried with all voting in favor.

Chair Peterson opened the public hearing.

Ann McDowell, 1793 Farroll Road, adjacent to the subject parcel. She opposed the subject proposal. Changing the property from RA to R-2 is too big of a leap. It changes the number of houses from 2 houses per acre to six-9 per acre. The density is not in conformance with the General Plan, which designates the area for Low Density housing. The parcel in question is surrounded on all sides by existing low-density. The proposed density would exceed that of all adjacent neighborhoods. The number of units proposed is excessive. She also brought up concerns about the pollution impacts, infrastructure, traffic, and noise.

Ted Skardinski, resident, asked if there was an impact statement. Chair Peterson indicated that they have not received a report yet, since the staff report wasn't presented. Mr. Skardinski opposed the project, noting traffic, school and property values.

Wayne Allen, Rose Ct., to the east of the property; he knows that this will be developed. He would like to see a transition from RA, such as R-1, and strongly opposes the R-2 proposal. He also expressed concern about two-story houses that are right on the boundary between the RA and the subject area. Also expressed concern about property values. He wants the area to be single story housing, R-1.

Sandra True, Farroll resident, expressed concern about traffic. Expressed concern about the higher density, with 16th street going through, it would make things difficult. They don't want Farroll to be a main thoroughfare with high density traffic.

Nancy Bergstad, Baden Ave. resident, expressed concern about traffic on Oak Park, in addition to the traffic concerns mentioned by the other residents.

Cindy Cleveland, resident, has parents who live adjacent to the subject property. Before they bought the property, they checked the zoning, and was disappointed to hear that there is a proposal for R-2, because she was told that the City didn't want R-2 in that area. She expressed concerns about privacy issues, if 2-story houses were constructed, and concern about property values. She expressed concern about the biological resources in the area, and also concern about the last-minute withdrawal of the project. Stated that staff has done a good job of keeping them informed.

Anna Barbosa, resident, expressed concern about traffic at the intersections in the area. If 16th Street is extended, traffic will increase, and speed will increase making dangerous. She also expressed concern about density.

Arlene Casey, LaSelva resident, stated that she bought the property with the thought that the undeveloped portions would be at an R-1 density. She knew there would be homes built there. She expressed concern about density and feels strongly that property values will go down, and is against the higher density zoning.

Bob True, Farroll Road resident, expressed concern because everything around their neighborhood is R-1. There is no precedent set for an r-2 development. He indicated that if 16th goes through, there should be a stop sign on Farroll Road, either at LaSelva or 16th.

John LeFerrier, Loreto Court resident, stated that the opinions he will be expressing are his own, personal comments, and not those of the Parks Recreation Beautification Commission that he serves on. He stated that the property had been discussed at previous Planning Commission and City Council, and encouraged the Commission to review those previous meeting minutes to get an idea of what the City Council had commented.

Chair Peterson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Marshall indicated that the City will be doing a Land Use Element update which may impact the Farroll Road area, and encouraged participation in that process.

WORKSHOP/DISCUSSION ITEMS:

6. Cal Poly City and Regional Planning Graduate Student Project

Kevin Bank, from the Cal Poly City Regional Planning Department Graduate program, introduced his fellow students and instructor, and they presented a project to work on a long range planning process for a community. They started on a project in Grover Beach in 2007, finishing up in March of 2008, titled Grover Beach 2030 Community Planning Project. He described the number of students working on the project and thanked the City for the opportunity to do this project. They reviewed the process that they went through, and also the preferred scenario and look at some of the other effects of future growth between now and 2030.

He described the public meetings that they held in the City. Professor Nuworsoo also spoke to the Commission about the project.

City Manager Bob Perrault thanked the students for the work that they have done.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:53 p.m.

/s/

CHAIR COLEMAN

/s/

SECRETARY TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION
PAT BECK, INTERIM COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

(Approved at PC Meeting: December 08, 2009)