



**MEETING MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
154 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET
GROVER BEACH, CALIFORNIA
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 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 Laferriere

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

ABSENT: Commissioner Roberson.

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.

REGULAR ITEMS

1. Election of Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that they have several options since the full body is not present, they can continue the item, or proceed. Coleman preferred to move forward. Nominations: Blum nominated Long, Evans 2nd; and it was carried. Chris Long is now Chair. Commissioner Blum nominated Commissioner Alex, Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion. Commissioner Alex declined the nomination. Chair Long nominated Commissioner Evans; Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion, and it was carried.

Chair Long assumed the chair position and thanked Chair Coleman for her work.

CONSENT ITEMS:

2. Approval of Minutes of Planning Commission meeting for June 10 and July 13, 2010.

Commissioner Blum made the motion to approve the minutes; Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion, and it was carried. Commissioner Laferriere abstained from the vote.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

3. Development Permit Application No. 10-020

Applicant – Scott Rice

This Development Permit Application is a request for a Use Permit to allow an attached garage with non-conforming setbacks to be remodeled and converted to living space and construct a two car detached garage. The property is located at 363 North 7th Street (APN 060-151-015) in the Single Family Residential (R-1) District.

Recommended Action: Adopt the resolution approving the Use Permit.

Planner Reese presented the staff report, and described the project and existing site. Staff is recommending approval.

Chair Long opened the public hearing. Scott Rice addressed the commission. He stated that there are a few things they are still working on. Expanding the house to accommodate the family and add a new bathroom.

Chair Long closed the hearing; Blum said he was glad they aren't running cement all the way down the driveway. Mr. Rice stated that they wanted to preserve the lawn area so are looking at alternatives for grasscrete.

Commissioner Alex stated that the garage/parking issue that was raised during the Housing Element adoption should be revisited.

Mr. Rice stated that they will still have off-street parking.

Chair Long stated that the project is well put-together. Commissioner Blum made the motion; Vice Chair Evans seconded the motion and it was carried with a vote of 6-0-1-0, with Commissioner Roberson absent.

4. Development Permit Application No. 10-022

Applicant – Alex deLeon

This Development Permit Application is a request for a time extension for Development Permit Application No. 07-024, a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans to construct a single family residence, at 465 Park View Avenue (APN 060-526-007) in the Single Family Residential (R-1) District.

Recommended Action: Adopt the resolution approving the time extension.

Planner Reese presented the staff report. She described the history of the project, including a previously granted time extension. Staff reviewed amendments that had been made to codes, and they do not impact. Applicant has been advised that if he does not move forward by 1/01/2011, they will have to go through Building plancheck again.

Commissioner Laferrier asked if this project has an expiration date, like a tract map. Director Buckingham stated that the architectural approval does not have a time limit, but they do have a condition to require time extensions to be before the Planning Commission.

Chair Long asked if there was a cost for applying for time extensions. Director Buckingham stated that there is a fee that pays for noticing and staff time.

Chair Long opened the public hearing; there was no one present who wished to comment and the hearing was closed. Commissioner Coleman made the motion to approve the time extension; Commissioner Laferriere seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 6-0-1-0, with Commissioner Roberson absent.

5. Development Permit Application No. 10-021

Applicant – City of Grover Beach

This Development Permit Application is a request to consider and recommend to The City Council changes in the Part 49: “Affordable Housing Density Bonuses and Development Concessions/Incentives” of the Zoning Ordinance to allow additional incentives for projects that will provide all of their units at the affordable level.

Recommended Action: Adopt the resolution recommending the adoption of the amendment to the City Council.

Planner Janet Reese presented the staff report. She indicated that the City Council asked staff to look into additional affordable housing incentives. Staff is proposing an additional incentive for providing exclusively affordable housing. Incentives include parking reductions.

Chair Long asked if this is to give more incentives for providing affordable housing. Director Buckingham stated that the idea branched out from the Habitat project. He stated that the reality is that most of the projects they would see would likely be a non-profit developer. He stated that it makes sense to have a little more flexibility for projects providing 100% affordable housing.

Commissioner Laferriere stated that it seems like they are addressing a previous project but possibly missing a chance for new cases. He stated that with the available land inventories that tend to be irregularly shaped, there won't be homogeneous projects. As the ordinance is written now, there is no way to mix and match with differing levels of affordability. He thinks that they can make it better, and feels that it is incomplete as is. He would like the developers to have more flexibility. He stated that there are many ways to do it including breaking down incentives by ratio of affordability.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that as long as all units are below moderate affordability, they would be eligible for the extra incentive. Director Buckingham stated that moderately affordable units were intentionally excluded because they are currently calculated to be above the market rate for housing.

Laferriere asked if staff is ok with the very low and low income units having the same incentives as the extremely low.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the item is before PC to look at these issues to forward to the City Council with their input.

Commissioner Laferriere expressed concern that the incentives may be too generous for the less affordable units.

Director Buckingham stated that staff the incentives for any of the eligible projects. The

concessions provide flexibility to development standards, but the level of affordability comes down to how much the City or the non-profit developer can subsidize a project. If the Planning Commission wished, they could recommend a 5th incentive for extremely low units.

Commissioner Alex stated that he struggled with it; he doesn't understand with the limited properties available for affordable projects, why don't they look at higher buildings.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that State law requires the City to take reasonable steps to meet the RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Assessment) numbers that are assigned. This is staff's response to those requirements.

Commissioner Blum stated that when they set up incentive 4, it was not to put such tight restraints on developers. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that there was concern that the incentives currently available could be a disincentive to provide more than one unit of affordable housing.

Chair Long stated that it is his understanding that the intent is to provide flexibility to bring in the types of projects that have more affordable units.

Commissioner Evans asked if the reason for offering additional incentives is in order to meet the RHNA numbers. Director Buckingham stated that one of the Housing Element policies was to revisit this section of the Code and look at incentives for 100% affordability for projects with 4 or fewer units. This is implementing a Housing Element policy and is also in response to and recognizing that there will be more 100% affordable housing projects in the near future.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the City doesn't have a quota to put units on the ground, but there is an assigned number of affordable units where the City has to take steps to meet those goals.

Commissioner Laferriere stated that the previous policy did not provide incentive to provide more than one affordable unit. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the difference is that as long as there are 4 units that meet the RHNA numbers. This is directed at projects to provide incentives to deal with small projects. If the Commission wishes to provide different direction than recommended by staff, they may do so and it would be forwarded to the City Council.

Commissioner Laferriere suggested additional incentives for the more affordable units. This changes presented are an improvement but could also be further improved.

Director Buckingham presented some wording that would provide for additional incentives. Commissioner Laferriere stated that the condition is broad enough to make it desirable to propose additional lower-tiered affordable units.

Chair Long asked why the wording wasn't included in the amendments. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that from the legal standpoint of making an ordinance defensible, the condition creates potential for future problems. For instance, if a project comes in with a greater level of affordability and staff provides additional incentives but then a similar project did not receive the incentives. That doesn't mean it can't work, but the preference is that we have a set of rules by which we address each project. He stated that staff can take Planning Commission concerns and suggestions to the City Council.

Commissioner Coleman expressed concern about setting a precedent, and wouldn't want to

have to explain to a developer why they did not receive the incentives.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that additional statement read by Director Buckingham could be the whole code section. The wording leaves the door wide open and everything is fair game.

Commissioner Laferriere suggested that they offer incentives for each subsequent affordable unit after the first.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the concern is not in defining when it would be applicable, but in defining what incentives are received. The Housing Element requirements are met with the proposed amendment.

Director Buckingham stated that when a non profit organization is trying to supply affordable housing comes to the city. There are organizations that are trying to provide extremely low housing.

Chair Long asked if anything hadn't been covered, and asked about incentives for height increases or parking reduction.

Director Buckingham stated that staff did not anticipate many projects that would be 100% affordable.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the only time you will see 100% affordable units will be with non-profit organizations. Developers that are working for profit will not make money.

Vice Chair Evans made the motion to approve; Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 4-2-1-0, with Commissioners Alex and Laferriere voting no and Commissioner Roberson absent.

Commissioner Laferriere stated that he supports the concept of the amendment and it is an improvement over what we currently have, but believes that it could be made better. Commissioner Alex stated that there are incentives in place and it is unfair to add more incentives.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:

Laferriere: part 40 and part 49 were discussed at the last CC, and Ramona Specific Plan were discussed.

Report from City Council Representatives

Other Commissioners' Comments

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Buckingham updated the Planning Commission about recent City Council actions, including Part 40, Planned Unit development standards. He stated that the City Council expressed interest in updating that section, especially related to parking requirements and lot size. He stated that there will be a joint Planning Commission/City Council workshop, probably

in the spring.

He updated the Commission on progress with the Grover Beach Lodge EIR and indicated that the draft is scheduled to come out mid-December, with hearings possibly in April.

He stated that on next Planning Commission agenda in November, a draft of Grand Avenue Master Plan may be ready for the Planning Commission to review, and also, zoning map updates to bring it into conformance with the Land Use Element updates that were adopted.

STAFF COMMENTS: None.

ASSIGNMENT TO ATTEND CITY COUNCIL MEETING(S): October: Commissioner Blum, November: Commissioner Coleman, December: Vice Chair Evans.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:40 p.m.

/s/
CHAIR LONG

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

(Approved at PC Meeting: November 16, 2010)