



SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
154 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET
GROVER BEACH, CALIFORNIA
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2009
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 pm

FLAG SALUTE Commissioner Long

PRESENT: Commissioners Alex, Blum, Marshall, Vice Chair Long, and Chair Coleman.

ABSENT: Commissioner Roberson.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

1. 2009 Update of the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan—Continued from November 10, 2009 (previously Item 3)

Public Hearing to consider the Public Hearing Draft of the Land Use Element update and the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) and to make recommendations to the City Council for their consideration of adopting the Land Use Element.

Recommended Actions:

1. Adopt Resolution 09-035 recommending that the City Council certify a Final Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) including the Errata, Responses to Comments, findings of fact and a Statement Overriding Considerations for the Land use Element.
2. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 09-036 recommending that the City Council adopt the 2009 Land Use Element Update with revisions recommended by the Commission.

Interim Director Pat Beck described the previous meeting's actions and outlined additional materials that were distributed at this meeting, including copies of two letters that had been received after the meeting on November 10, 2009. She indicated that the consultant would be addressing the Planning Commission related to the comments received regarding the MEIR.

Chair Coleman asked for input from the Commission on each of the areas addressed in the Land Use Element.

Farroll Road

Commissioner Marshall stated that staff's original recommendation regarding Farroll Road was sufficient, since the specific project would have to be presented to the Planning Commission for approval.

Commissioner Alex stated that initially he felt that lower density would be more appropriate for the area, but after the testimony and correspondence received, especially related to second units, he now concurs with Alternative 1.

Commissioner Blum stated that placing a small amount of R-2 in the middle of R-1 zoning may not be appropriate for the neighborhood. He didn't feel that second units would create a significant impact in the lower density areas but that the impact would be greater in an R-2 area. He indicated that he is leaning toward Alternative 2.

Commissioner Long agreed with Commissioner Blum and feels that this site is more appropriate at a lower density. He acknowledged the concerns of the public regarding traffic impacts. He stated that he preferred either Alternative 2, or leave the designation as it exists currently.

Commissioner Coleman stated that Alternative 2 is the most appropriate alternative for that area. She noted that there was already significant amount of traffic in that area and also felt that 2-story projects in that area would not be a good fit.

Commissioner Marshall stated that this area is a good place to have more housing and that the Planning Commission would have the opportunity to review any future projects. He stated that limiting the area to single-family units places limitations on the City's ability to meet the housing provisions.

Commissioner Coleman expressed concerns related to traffic impacts with a Medium Density area.

Commissioner Marshall stated that the EIR addressed the issue and the intersections would be Level of Service (LOS) C, which is what it is currently. He stated that it is better to have more development within the City rather than pushing development to the open space areas. He stated that it is premature to limit it to Single family, but agrees that the west side should remain Single Family.

Commissioner Blum made the motion to recommend Alternative 2, Commissioner Long seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 4-1-1-0 (Commissioner Marshall voting no).

Atlantic City/Oak Park

Interim Director Beck described the options available for each of the three properties.

Commissioner Alex was glad to see that each property would be allowed to be considered separately. He likes Alternative 2 Option A, and thinks the area is good for higher density housing.

Interim Director Beck stated that both Medium and High Density Residential allow for senior or assisted living housing.

Commissioner Blum stated that he doesn't have a problem moving the higher density over to 16th Street, but is it most appropriate for a potential project.

Interim Director Beck indicated that the change would impact the overall densities. Mary Reents, SWCA, stated that higher density with senior housing does not impact traffic concerns. With other types of higher densities, traffic impacts would be more significant, and could reduce the intersection to LOS D.

Commissioners Blum, Coleman, Marshall and Vice Chair Long concurred with Commissioner

Alex and expressed support of Option 2a.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that any project that deviated from the MEIR would have to be environmentally reviewed again, with a focused EIR at a minimum.

Current HD proposal is 3.4 acres.

When the housing element was adopted, this site was identified as affordable. Staff concerned about the higher density because of the transition to the Laguna neighborhood which is lower density. For commercial areas there, it will require a significant buffer.

Marshall recommended Alternative 1 for the Tanner property, Commissioner Long seconded the motion and was carried.

Interim Director Beck indicated that she's never seen an LUE offer an either/or situation. By changing the category, may have more flexibility, but it would apply to other areas in the City.

Dave Moran stated that they hadn't reviewed potential issues, and reviewing the current uses in the Retail Commercial Service would still be within the levels of impact that they reviewed. Housing would not be allowed in all circumstances, and housing would not be allowed in every case because it would be a conditional use. The existing places don't have a lot of potential. He doesn't believe that the environmental impacts would be beyond what was reviewed.

Blum stated that something like that he would prefer 3a.

Long stated that that scenario is only applicable to that area. Long stated that it is such a landlocked piece; he feels it might be better zoned Medium density. Leaning toward option b.

Blum stated that though they are looking at each of these separately, they should consider how they will fit together. He stated that when they look at the middle and northern properties they should make sure they fit. 3A seems the best to him.

Coleman stated that if they build in the flexibility, they can go from there. She supports 3A to give that flexibility. Marshall 3A. Alex 3a.

Dorfman—PB leave it commercial, or go the same way as the previous property. MDK stated that if it is their intent to change the zoning to include housing, it should be applicable to all pieces of property proposed to be that density.

Blum stated that he concurred with MDK. MDK due to the prior action makes Alternative 1 for this property will allow the same flexibility.

Long asked about neighborhood serving mixed use. Beck stated that the proposed area doesn't have much of a neighborhood currently and will likely be highway-oriented.

Beck described the Strawberry field alternatives and proposed language.

Alex –Alternative 1; Marshall: Alternative 2, seemed to provide more flexibility; Coleman: 2, based on comments from the owner, to give more flexibility; Blum: Likes 2, with the new category for office and light industrial with mixed and live work; Long: Alternative 2, with the large property it is good to have options.

Marshall: correcting Agriculture RESERVE

Mary: if they go with option 2, then there will be changes to the SOOC to be considered addressing those changes.

Ron's Nursery:

City Attorney Koczanowicz asked if it would be possible to Retail Commercial Service?

Beck stated that this area is more appropriate for Neighborhood Serving/Mixed Use.

Alex: Ron's nursery has been there a long time; stated that the med. Density residential wouldn't fit with the surrounding neighborhood. Alternative 3; Long, initially preferred 3, doesn't know that senior housing would be appropriate. He stated that they should maintain consistency; Long prefers alternative 3; Blum: asked on the 92 land use, this parcel is designated as low density; Blum: supports senior housing; because there is med. Density in the area, it wouldn't be a bad thing. Supporting alt. 2. Marshall agrees w/Blum, but is torn. Blum stated that he doesn't think it would be out of character with the neighborhood. Coleman, leaning toward Alt. 2, for Med. Density. To make better use of the land.

Industrial Areas

Beck described background. Recommendation to transition from industrial to visitor serving. Not a lot of feedback from neighbors or property owners.

Marshall why weren't other industrial areas considered? Buckingham indicated that the area is already developed and likely won't change.

Marshall is ok with change in designation; it would be nice to have the area softened. Ok w/staff's recommendation

Long: how does the change impact existing businesses? PB stated that the zoning would have to be changed which would require a public hearing. The existing use would be non-conforming, and could continue as long as it was a continuous use. Long asked about the Forde property; beck indicated that his property had significant improvements made in preparation for an industrial project. Forde didn't see that there would be a high demand for visitor serving area on Front Street.

Blum: stated that there is a lot of turnover on front street; would a new business be able to continue the non-conforming use. Beck—depends

Blum: Vision says it should remain industrial. Leery of changing it to visitor serving. Doesn't know how a VS would effect that entire neighborhood north of Grand. South of Grand would be better visitor serving and it wouldn't be displacing a lot of industrial uses. Alternative 3.

Long: concurred with Blum; concern about existing uses. Marshal supports 3; Alex could be ok with 1 or 3. Alex thinks it is a great area for visitor serving. Prefers Alternative 1.

Blum made the motion; Marshall seconded and it carried.

Grand Avenue

Beck—any thing that they would like to recommend to City Council? LU18; staff proposed language changes.

Marshall kind of likes the way it is now, the way staff has proposed, alternative 1. Blum stated that in reality we are a visitor serving community; things in the CBD are going to be visitor serving. Is there anything gained by changing to VS rather than CBD. Buckingham

Beck; many of the uses are compatible with both, next level is fine tuning the use tables

Beachfront area had no comments from property owners or the state parks.

Other:

Marshall: Figure 2, p. 8, legend Coastal Zone corrected to be more visible; LU7 exhibit: seems that the little bubbles on Grand should be going away from Grand instead of toward; should be straight lines. Atlantic City park is owned by the school; Ramona was designated community facility rather than park because it has community serving.; LU7 match LU23. Beck suggested park/public facility.

EIR LU80 (Marshall) Item 10; public works and parks should be responsible. add parks along with urban trail plan. LU84 44:

LU86: #43, Traffic calming, add “neighborhood” to traffic circles.

LU31: LU1.3 Bollards, replace that with “road closures or cul-de-sacs” rather than bollards. Implementation measures: change to traffic calming in stead of street calming. LU2.2 why isn’t “very low” included. Beck: good point, could assume Low is inclusive of very and extremely low. LU37: change performance criteria to development criteria. Dave Moran stated that performance is appropriate because they are measurable. LU5.1 Change to Master. LU49: 11.2: no implementation measure. First bullet, change “policy” to “policies”. LU64: 19.2 New implementation measure: implement new curb/gutter/sidewalk measures (ask pat). LU73 first bullet—reword to include LID, hydromodification, etc.

No other commissioner comments.

Beck-provided two pages of clean-ups. Staff will identify to City Council the recommendations that was the majority decision of the Commission.

Mary—SOOC section 8.3 to address the changes; added in the first.

Beck asked if any other changes were needed in the SOOC because of the alternatives. Reents said that she covered all but the strawberry fields.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:06 p.m.

/s/
CHAIR COLEMAN

/s/

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

(Approved at PC Meeting: January 12, 2010)