



**MEETING MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
154 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET
GROVER BEACH, CALIFORNIA
TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 2010
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 Commissioner Evans.

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

ABSENT: Commissioner Alex.

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.

CONSENT ITEMS:

1. Approval of Minutes of Planning Commission meeting for March 9, 2010.

Vice Chair Long made the motion to approve the minutes as written; Commissioner Roberson seconded the motion, and it was carried with a voice vote of 6-0

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

**2. Development Permit Application No. 09-012
Applicant – Loren Pritchard**

This is a request for a Variance, Use Permit and approval of Site and Architectural Plans for an addition to a single family residence located at 944 Brighton Avenue (APN 060-162-019) in the Public Facilities (P-F) District. The project planner is Janet Reese.

Recommended Action: Adopt the resolution granting the Variance, and then adopt the resolutions granting the Use Permit and approving the Site and Architectural Plans.

Commissioner Blum recused himself due to distance to project. Planner Reese presented the staff report/power point presentation. She stated that the applicants limited the size of the addition so that fire sprinklers or street improvements would not be required.

She described the zoning, and the reason the residence is allowed in a Public Facilities (PF) zone. She stated that a Variance must be approved before the Site and Architectural Plans are approved due to the size of the addition. She stated that other developments in the area have similar single car garages so the variance would not be granting a special privilege.

She described the findings required for the use permit and the site and architectural plans. Other than parking, the project is consistent with the requirements for site and architectural plans.

Staff is recommending approval of the variance, use permit and site and architectural plans.

Commissioner Marshall asked if another addition was requested by the applicant, would they have to come to the Planning Commission again. Planner Reese stated that yes, it would be required.

Chair Coleman asked if there was a reason why the applicants were limiting the garage to one car. Community Development Director Buckingham stated that the location of the existing garage would be prohibitive to expand.

Commissioner Long asked what would trigger the requirement for street improvements. Planner Reese stated that one can add up to 40% of what is existing without triggering those improvements. Commissioner Long asked if street improvements are expensive. Community Development Director Buckingham stated that a significant amount of paving would be required, which can be costly.

Chair Coleman opened the Public Hearing. Loren Pritchard, applicant, addressed the Planning Commission and stated that the purpose of the expansion is not to increase the value of the house, but to make it more comfortable and attractive.

No one else wished to comment. Chair Coleman closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Roberson stated that house is charming, and some of that comes from the 1 car garage, and would be lost with further addition to the garage. Commissioner Marshall agreed with Commissioner Roberson.

Commissioner Marshall made the motion to approve the variance; Commissioner Roberson seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 5-0-1-0, with Commissioner Blum recused and Commissioner Alex absent.

Vice Chair Long made the motion to approve the Site and Architectural Plans and grant the Use Permit; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 5-0-1-0,

REGULAR BUSINESS:

3. Interpretation

Applicant – City of Grover Beach

This is a request for an interpretation on which use category of the Zoning Code to classify a vehicle repossession storage yard in the City's industrial zones. The project planner is Bruce Buckingham.

Recommended Action: Adopt the resolution interpreting that vehicle repossession storage yards shall be classified as “service yards” based on their similar operating characteristics.

Community Development Director Buckingham presented the staff report, and gave background information regarding the site. He stated that the applicant, Terry Carter, submitted letter requesting to operate a vehicle repossession storage yard on the site. Historically, that use has been classified as “vehicle dismantling, scrap dealers, salvage, storage.” Staff has been interpreting that use for many years in that way, but couldn’t find a place where there was any written documentation about the use, therefore, staff is bringing this to the Planning Commission for interpretation.

He described typical use involved and stated that it does not have anything to do with vehicle sales. There would be few, if any, employees on the site, and it is not open to the public. Typically, it isn’t a very intensive use, and wouldn’t be disruptive to existing uses. He stated that not every use is defined in the definition section, and some interpretation is required. The service yard definition seemed to be the closest and seems a reasonable comparison. Both uses have similar circulation and traffic.

Director Buckingham stated that If the Planning Commission were agree with the interpretation, the property owner would be coming forward with an application for the project. Currently, there is an existing building/seatrains containers and there is an active code enforcement case. Mr. Terry acquired the property in that condition, and had a roof without a permit.

He clarified that the interpretation would apply to other properties in the same zone, not just the site being discussed.

Commissioner Roberson asked if the automobiles would be there long-term. Director Buckingham stated that in the current building, Mr. Terry’s own private autos are stored on the site.

Commissioner Roberson asked if cars would be brought in that needed repairs and if repairs would be occurring on the site. Director Buckingham stated that it is a storage yard only, not a repair shop.

Commissioner Blum indicated that he does not have a problem with this interpretation.

Commissioner Coleman agreed with Commissioner Blum. Commissioner Marshall asked if staff was still working on the Municipal Code update. He also indicated that he does not have a strong opinion about this. :

Commissioner Blum asked if things be considered on a case by case basis until the zoning code is updated. Director Buckingham stated that there have not been a lot of interpretations over the years.

Commissioner Long expressed concern that this would turn into something that could be long term. Director Buckingham stated that conditions could be added at the UP approval phase of a particular project.

Chair Coleman opened public hearing.

Greg Soto, 339 N. Elm AG, stated that if this goes forward, he will be the project architect. He stated that Mr. Carter has improved the lot and is trying to make it nice. The applicant agrees with staff's recommendation. Terry Carter, applicant, stated that the main purpose of this lot is related to his antique car collection, and takes pride in what he does.

Commissioner Long stated that he is comfortable with staff's recommendation, since the specific project would be coming before the Planning Commission. Commissioner Marshall supports staff's recommendation. Chair Coleman echoed Commissioner Long's statement.

Chair Coleman closed the hearing.

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

ADJOURNMENT: 7:27 p.m.

/s/
CHAIR COLEMAN

/s/
SECRETARY TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION
BRUCE BUCKINGHAM, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

(Approved at PC Meeting: May 11, 2010)