



**MEETING MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
154 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET
GROVER BEACH, CALIFORNIA
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2012**

CALL TO ORDER: 6:30 p.m.

FLAG SALUTE: Commissioner Long

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Long, Rodman, Vice Chair Blum and Chair Laferriere.
Absent: Commissioners Alex and Evans.

AGENDA REVIEW:

Vice Chair Blum made the motion to proceed with the agenda as written; Commissioner Long seconded the motion, and it was carried.

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.

There was no one present who wished to comment.

CONSENT ITEMS:

- 1. Approval of Minutes of Planning Commission meetings for May 8, July 9 and July 24th, 2012.**

Vice Chair Blum made the motion to adopt the minutes as presented; Commissioner Rodman seconded the motion, and it was carried.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

- 2. Development Permit Application No. 12-07
Applicant –Vernon and Associates, Inc**

The Planning Commission action on this item will be a recommendation to the City Council. This Development Permit Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans, Use Permit, Variance and Tentative Tract Map for a five unit condominium development. Residences would be three story, ranging in size from approximately 767 to 1,571 square feet. The applicant is also requesting three development concessions in return for restricting the units for low-income households. The project is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Farroll Road and South 10th Street (APN # 060-352-018) in the Multiple Family Residential (R-3) Zoning District.

Chair Laferriere introduced the item.

Planner Reese presented the staff report.

Chair Laferriere asked that the applicant's representative come forward with their presentation.

Lenny Grant, of RRM Design Group, presented an overview of the history of the project and introduced Scott Martin to present an overview of the project. Mr. Martin presented various aspects of the project.

Chair Laferriere opened the public hearing.

Peter Uzzi, 911 South 10th Street, provided color copies of his comments previously emailed and provided to the Commission. He stated the project is too dense and too high when compared to the neighboring properties, especially the single family development to the west. He stated he is concerned with his privacy and solar access. He is also concerned with the safety of children playing in the courtyard between Buildings 1 and 2 due to the proposed access on Farroll Road.

Liz White stated that the tree coverage on the drawings look nice, but projects never turn out the way the drawings portray. She also stated that there will be parking issues and no one will be able to put their trash cans on the street because of the semi-trucks that park there. She asked if there will be a Home Owners Association (HOA) and questioned where kids will play on-site due to the limited open space area.

Anita Shower stated that the HOA would not allow the driveway courtyard be a play area. She asked if a unit was resold, would the buyer need to be low-income and if the units would be owner-occupied.

Noelle Uzzi stated she is concerned about the privacy of her yard and kids.

Chair Laferriere closed the public hearing.

Staff responded to the questions raised during public testimony:

- Yes, there will be a HOA;
- The units will be owner-occupied and limited to low income households for 45 years;
- The State Government Code dictates the parking requirements. Therefore, the City does not have the ability to change the parking requirements;
- The final landscape plans will be in substantial compliance with the conceptual landscape plans. The landscaping will be maintained by the HOA.
- Clarified that trucks parking on Farroll Road can receive a violation if they remain there after 72 hours.

Vice Chair Blum stated the applicant's presentation was great, although there were a few things that he disagreed with. He stated that he would not let his kids play in a common area that is adjacent to Farroll Road. He said the Commission has many times discussed the adequacy of the parking requirements and in this case, we have State guidelines for this project that we have to follow. He indicated that this is a viable and good project for this location. He also addressed Mrs. Uzzi expectation of the lot not being developed and indicated that an affordable housing project has been discussed by the City since 2009. He understood Mr. and Mrs. Uzzi's comments regarding safety and privacy. However, he thought it was a good project.

Commissioner Rodman stated he liked the appearance of the project, but would like the two buildings to look more alike and that the west elevation of Building 1 was too stark.

Commissioner Long stated that he is conflicted. He stated that he understands the purpose and priority of the project and it makes sense, but in some respects it contradicts several of the Land Use Policies. He indicated that the Commission often has to make a judgment call, but certainly there is a privacy and solar access issue with the proposed development, for both the house to the west and the apartment complex to the north. He asked if staff had any contact or feedback from the residents of the apartment complex to the north.

Director Buckingham indicated staff had not.

Commissioner Long stated the project concessions for reducing useable outdoor area also contradict with Land Use Policy 20.8, but said that it is a legitimate concession. He acknowledged that there is a balancing act here and that you need to look at privacy for occupants and neighbors of the project. He recognized that this is a City sponsored project and there is a need for low income housing, which is a definite benefit, but that the adjacent neighbors have legitimate concerns regarding privacy and solar access. He commented that he really liked the design and it's a beautiful project.

Chair Laferriere stated he was appreciative of the written letter from the neighbor and commented that it is unfortunate but not uncommon that projects move along in the City process and some people are not aware of them. Chair Laferriere discussed the process the City went through to select a developer for a five unit affordable housing project. He indicated that this is an awkward position to be in because this is really a City sponsored project. He clarified that the Commission would be making a recommendation to the Council. He also indicated that the original project included five three-bedroom units and the project had been reduced by the applicant. He indicated that the zone is R-3 and has been for some time, and that it allows a density of 10-20 units per acre. He stated that we can't take areas zoned for high density and say we live here and so now you can't have a neighbor like you in the same zone, especially a year after updating the Housing and Land Use Element. He stated he was supportive of the project and that the applicant did a great job of maximizing the project consistent with the Council direction.

Chair Laferriere asked if everyone was supportive of a five unit project or whether the Commission needs to make a different recommendation?

Vice Chair Blum stated he thought the proposal was a good project and likes the style of the project. He stated he understands the neighbors' concerns of suddenly having a bedroom window looking into your yard, but it's similar to the issue of losing a portion of your view shed that the Commission often deals with. These are all real concerns, there's no great answer. It is the responsibility of the land owner to understand what can happen when adjacent properties are developed. He reiterated his support for the project.

Commissioner Rodman stated that the project is good for the community, especially with the direction of the State and Council. He would like to see staff work with the applicant regarding windows and materials for Building 1 to be similar to Building 2.

Chair Laferriere stated he thinks the applicant has done a great job of maximizing the project consistent with the Council's direction. He understands how as a neighboring residence you would like to minimize the project, so there's a conflict between. He discussed the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation and the need for 90 additional affordable units. He

indicated he feels bound by the Council's direction to maximize the number of affordable units and bound by the State development concessions/incentives. He stated his support for the project and that the applicant has done a great job in maximizing the project.

Commissioner Long stated that the concept and design was excellent based on the constraints but did not believe the location is appropriate. He likes the design and the concept of maximizing the project, but does not think that this particular location works because the proposed project is in conflict with LUE policies 3.1(b) and 20.8(a) and (b) as they relate to privacy and open space.

Chair Laferriere solicited the other Commissioner's opinions regarding those policies.

In regards to solar access, Vice Chair Blum stated that in this case Mr. Uzzi has a vacant lot to the east of his home and has unlimited solar access, but the proposed development will still allow solar access after noon. His recollection of the Land Use Element policy was to preserve rights to some solar access but not necessarily the morning sun.

Commissioner Long questioned when the policies regarding solar access and privacy would apply if they do not apply in this case. When citing his concerns, he is not just looking at Mr. Uzzi's case, but the apartments to the north.

Vice Chair Blum stated that due to the driveway separating the project from the apartments to the north, the garages for the apartments would be affected, not the units.

Chair Laferriere pointed out that the apartment site will be higher than the project site.

Rodman confirmed that the project site is lower than the apartment site.

Chair Laferriere recessed for an 8 minute break during which the audience and Commission viewed a shade study provided by the applicant.

Upon resuming the meeting, Scott Martin, the applicant's representative, provided an overview of the shade study display.

Chair Laferriere reopened the public hearing for comments related to the solar access topic.

Peter Uzzi stated that he does not get sun during the second half of the day, due to the lack of windows on the southwest portion of his unit and the neighboring home to the southwest.

Chair Laferriere closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Blum made the motion to adopt the resolution recommending the City Council approve the project; Commissioner Rodman seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 3-1-2-0, with Commissioner Long dissenting and Commissioners Alex and Evans absent.

Chair Laferriere recessed the meeting at 8:14 p.m. and reconvened at 8:27 p.m.

3. Development Permit Application No. 12-010 **Applicant – Southpaw Signs**

This Development Permit Application is a request for approval of a Use Permit to construct a new 16 foot high monument sign. The property is located at 684 West Grand Avenue (APN 060-222-014) in the Visitor Services (C-V) District.

Chair Laferriere introduced the item.

Director Buckingham presented the staff report.

Chair Laferriere asked that the applicant's representative come forward with their presentation.

Sean Beauchamp, Southpaw Sign Co., Inc, provided an overview of the proposed sign. Regarding tenant signage, the end unit would have signage on the building, so the middle unit would have the "Beer – Wine – Liquor" section available for signage.

Vice Chair Blum asked why the smaller numbers are 8 inches in height versus the minimum 6 inches, which is what was previously proposed.

Mr. Beauchamp stated that the LED numbers are commonly manufactured with a height of 8 inches. He was able to locate one manufacturer of 6 inch numbers, but the source was questionable.

Chair Laferriere opened the public hearing, and seeing no one wishing to speak, closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Rodman stated that the large "cash" price area was redundant.

Vice Chair Blum stated that 24 inch numbers are large but last time the applicant stated that it was necessary to attract customers.

Commissioner Long stated that the numbers seem large, but did not feel they were an issue.

Chair Laferriere provided examples of other types of signs and their letter size to illustrate how large the 24 inch numbers were and suggested that the size be reduced to something that made sense. Stated that the proposed tenant signage was inadequate.

Vice Chair Blum stated this is the sign people will see. A tenant sign on the building will not be seen. Asked if 12 or 16 inch numbers are readily available.

Mr. Beauchamp stated that both are available. Stated that the property is currently a single address, with no tenant space. Asked if there is an option to postpone the tenant space with the sale of the property.

Director Buckingham stated that as the resolution is currently written, the proposed sign contains one tenant space. If someone wants to add additional tenant signage, the sign would need to be returned to the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Blum stated it would be preferable if there was additional tenant space, but the main issue is the 24" numbers.

Vice Chair Blum made the motion to adopt the resolution granting the Use Permit, with the condition that the sign height remain at 16 feet, but the 24 inch numbers be reduced to a maximum height of 12 inches; Commissioner Rodman seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 4-0-2-0, with Commissioners Alex and Evans absent.

4. Development Permit Application No. 12-011

Applicant – City National Bank

This Development Permit Application is a request for approval of a one year time extension for an approved Specific Development Plan, Site and Architectural Plans and Coastal Development Permit to develop a 134 room hotel. The property is located in the Coastal Zone at 950 El Camino Real (APN 060-011-036) in the Coastal Planned Commercial (C-P-C) District.

Chair Laferriere introduced the item. Director Buckingham added that this time extension request is the third and final extension that could be granted.

Chair Laferriere opened the public hearing, and seeing no one wishing to speak, closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Long made the motion to adopt the resolution granting the time extension; Vice Chair Blum seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 4-0-2-0, with Commissioners Alex and Evans absent.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Director Buckingham reported on recent City Council meetings.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:07 p.m.

/s/

 CHAIR LAFERRIERE

/s/

 SECRETARY TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION
 BRUCE BUCKINGHAM, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

(Approved at PC Meeting: December 11, 2012)