



**SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
GROVER BEACH COMMUNITY CENTER  
1230 TROUVILLE AVENUE  
GROVER BEACH, CALIFORNIA  
THURSDAY, JULY 21, 2011  
6:00 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** 6:00 p.m.

**FLAG SALUTE:** Commissioner Alex.

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

**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.

Giselle Naylor; Oceano resident spoke about creating a South County district to provide water and sewer services.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:**

**1. Development Permit Application No. 10-003  
Applicant –Pacifica Companies**

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 a Local Coastal Program Amendment, Zoning Code Amendment, Coastal Development Permit, Site and Architectural Plans, and Use Permit to allow construction of a 150-room hotel with conference center and restaurant consisting of three buildings not to exceed 40 feet in height, totaling approximately 118,133 square feet. The approximately 13 acre site would also include improvements to the existing public plaza area, new walkways and paths, redesign of the existing parking area, riparian enhancement to Meadow Creek and dune restoration within Pismo State Beach. The project proposes to relocate the existing equestrian parking area and the recreational vehicle sewer dump station. A Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the project consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act and the Planning Commission will consider recommending certification of the Final EIR to the City Council. The Final EIR is available for review at City Hall and on the City's website at [www.grover.org](http://www.grover.org). The proposed project is generally bounded by West Grand Avenue to the south, Le Sage Drive to the north, Meadow Creek to the east and the Pacific Ocean to the west (Assessor Parcel Nos. 060-381-010 & 11, and a portion of 060-380-002). The property is zoned Coastal Planned Commercial (C-P-C) and is located within the Coastal Zone.

Community Development Director Buckingham presented the staff report, outlining the background of the EIR process. He described the site details and surrounding uses and the history of the project, including details about the Joint Powers Agreement between the City and

#### State Parks.

He stated that from the beginning, State Parks had been involved. He gave a brief project overview and stated that the entire site would be developed. He stated that one of the key components is to revitalize and redevelop the State Park amenities and the enlargement of the public area adjacent to the dunes. He described the main access to the proposed lodge and the parking and the relocation plans for the dump station and equestrian parking.

He stated that the Planning Commission would be making recommendations to the City Council, who will take the final action on the project. Once the Council has taken action, the project would then go to the Coastal Commission for approval.

He reviewed development standards for the project and indicated that there is almost 50 percent of open space and parking exceeds City requirements.

Mary Reents, SWCA, described the EIR process and background. She indicated that the draft document was prepared in 2010, in accordance with CEQA; public review was 45 days. They received some correspondence after the closing of the comment period, and those were also reviewed. Changes are shown as strikeout for deletions and underline for additions. All of the comment letters are part of the EIR package.

A majority of the comments were from people concerned about the equestrian parking relocation. Agency comments were received from APCD (Air Pollution Control District), DOT (Department of Transportation), SLOCOG (San Luis Obispo Council of Governments) and the Coastal Commission.

One of the major environmental issues addressed was wave run up. The FEMA map shows that it is in a flood plain. She indicated that all but two issues were mitigated to insignificance: traffic impacts and long term degradation of dune habitat.

The long term use of proposed equestrian staging area would contribute to degradation of central dune scrub habitat. She stated that there are Overriding Considerations recommended in the findings.

She stated that there are two intersections in Pismo Beach that are currently at level d service so any additional traffic will create impacts, and will require a Statement of Overriding Consideration to be made in order to approve the project. CEQA addresses environmental issues but takes into account that there are other benefits that have to be considered when you evaluate a project and allows you to make findings to approve the project.

As part of the EIR process, they look at alternatives to the proposed project. They have recommended the lowest impact alternative.

Regarding the proposed equestrian staging area, she stated that site is already disturbed and would be improved by putting a use there. It provides a public benefit and reduces the interface between traffic and horses. They recommend relocating the dump station to North Beach campground.

CEQA findings are required but modifications can be made. Overriding considerations are highly recommended because they make the document more legally defensible. The Planning Commission should take a look at the EIR and findings and make recommendations. After the City Council acts, then they will file for the final certification of the EIR.

Alison Rolfe, Pacifica Companies, introduced architects and thanked staff and State Parks. She gave a brief background of the project. She stated that they will be using LEED green building techniques. Part of the proposal required that they enhance city and state park lands. They hope that the project will serve as a catalyst for development. She stated that the proposed equestrian site is about the same size as what is actually used currently.

As part of project design, the architect and landscape architect analyzed winds, views and sun profiles to find the best placement of the facility. They want to attract people to the site and have open traffic flow. She stated that they located the buildings in areas that are already disturbed. She also stated that all of the buildings step down at the edges.

They wanted to enhance and take advantage of the natural habitat that surrounds the site and create strong connectivity throughout the site. They relocated the parking to the east and have done a good job creating circulation on the site. There is still a drop off area and a new restroom building. There are shaded and open spaces for people to come out and gather or have events. They are also planning to have a pedestrian connection along Willow Creek. Overall the biggest consideration was to take advantage of the natural habitat of the area.

The buildings and the landscape components sit lightly on the site and it has been kept in a very natural state and they have tried to bring the riparian habitat into the site.

They purposely broke up the buildings to maintain view corridors. They plan to retain water on site and the water that falls on the site would stay there and be naturally treated and they would have natural basins partially filled with water and they could also be landscaped to reflect what the riparian areas are.

Director Buckingham clarified that the Planning Commission is making a recommendation to the City Council, which will take final action in August or September. Staff is recommending project approval.

7:07 break, reconvened at 7:19

Commissioner comments

Commissioner Laferriere asked for explanation regarding how they decided the size of the conference area. Ms. Rolfe stated that in the RFP, there was a size range that was requested. They looked at comparable hotels in the area, and determined that 7500 sf was about right. However, they will continue to refine the conference space as they move forward. When they get through City Council and reevaluate market conditions they may change it upward slightly but not reduce it. She stated that there are opportunities within the same footprint to increase conference facility size.

Director Buckingham stated that per the concession contract, the minimum was 4000 sf.

Vice Chair Evans asked if the dump station relocation was going into Pismo Beach, and if they would have to obtain approval from Pismo in order to do that.

Andy Zilke, State Parks, stated that they will seek a development permit for the relocation.

Commissioner Coleman: thinks the project has been well presented; commended staff and

Pacifica for putting this together. She asked for clarification regarding Coastal Commission approval. She stated that it appears that the project almost ready to go, but when you read correspondence, especially from Coastal Commission, it seems that there is still a ways to go. She asked if there could be some major modifications to the plan based on Coastal Commission comments and recommendations. Ms. Rolfe stated that the Coastal Commission raised issues related to visual impacts, water quality, and vehicles. She stated that they have met with Coastal Commission staff, and they will continue to work closely with them to resolve concerns. They still may end up with a negative recommendation from staff to the commission and have to present to the Commission, who could still approve the project. Commissioner Coleman stated that the biggest issue is the size of the project. Ms. Rolfe stated that from a financial standpoint, the project doesn't pencil with fewer than 50 rooms. They have tried to make the buildings appealing and not be a bulky mass and keep the view corridors open.

Roberson held comments for later.

Blum had no questions at that time.

Commissioner Alex asked if there was a way out of the concession contract for State Parks: or for Pacifica in the event it is unfeasible once it is built. Mr. Zilke stated that after 50 years it would revert back to the state.

Commissioner Alex asked if the existing equestrian area is formal. Mr. Zilke stated that: it is an informal area, not a formalized location.

Chair Long asked for clarification regarding measures to link up with bus, train and vehicle access, as referred to in Chapter 2 of the EIR.

Director Buckingham stated that it refers to public pathways along Meadow Creek. He stated that it is under the LEED section and that this is an ideal site next to the Amtrak station and is a benefit because there is good transit to the location.

Chair Long asked about the Mitigation Monitoring program that mentioned equestrian trail enhancements.

Ms. Reents stated that they are recommending working on trails to offset impacts to the native habitat. She stated that it also gives credit toward greenhouse gas emissions. There are many ways to implement that program. She stated that the applicant would put in the initial revegetation and maintain for a period of usually 5 years, after which it should maintain itself. There could also be a program to adopt the regional area, but it can't be required as there is no way to monitor it.

Chair Long stated that because there are a large number of people wanting to comment, they will be limited to three minutes.

Rob Dobbs, Nipomo resident, stated that he is a frequent rider on the beach. He expressed concern about the size of the proposed equestrian area. He stated that if the alternative to put it on the north side of Grand they would need to provide some kind of path across Grand, and it would not be the most desirable location. He does not believe that this is a minor impact.

Linda Clarke, 1190 Deer Road, Arroyo Grande, is an equestrian and appreciates that they are making it a requirement to have the area relocated. She stated that when Oso Flaco was closed,

they were told that they would be able to stage on Grand Avenue. She agrees with Mr. Dodd. She stated that south of Grand Ave. is fine as long as it is large enough and enables those who are disabled to have a staging area.

Deah Rudd submitted a letter; and feels that this project displaces a higher priority use. She stated that there is not a safer place to stage and to air up and down the tires. She visited the current area during peak times and counted more than 300 vehicles in that lot and on Memorial Day weekend, the vehicles would not be able to be accommodated in proposed hotel parking lot. She agreed with Mr. Dodd that the parking lot is too small. Mixing equestrians with other vehicles would not work. She stated that they need a lot of room and that there is not adequate equestrian handicap access. She suggested that the staging area should be on the southeast side. Placing the hotel near the beach denies access to the beach and the hotel breaks up the view shed. It's too big and parking isn't sufficient.

Diana Muraski, 745 Gibrato Lane was curious how they responded to the Coastal Commission's letter. The letter indicated that they would not support this size of a development nor would they approve the proposed equestrian parking.

Ed Muraski stated that he accesses the beach twice a week, bicycling and walking, and he also sends people from their Bed and Breakfast because it is less crowded than other beaches. He stated that it is packed on holidays. He expressed that the land isn't owned by State Parks, but by the citizens and it is being taken away from them. He expressed that there are a lot of people who can't come to speak who access the beach. He stated that they should be accommodating the citizens.

Giselle Naylor expressed concern about the infrastructure improvements and if things like waste treatment can be accommodated and if there is enough water. She stated that there needs to be more public discussion.

Stephanie Green: 1075 Cheyenne Ct, expressed concern about the height of the proposed hotel and that 40 ft height is an invasion of the view. She stated that it would be the beginning of the end and they would lose the dunes and the quaintness of the area. She felt that Pacifica's presentation was dishonest and that the Commission doesn't care about the area.

Linda McLure, Grover Beach resident and business owner, expressed support for the project. She stated that she goes out the the beach regularly, and she doesn't see very many horses out there. She stated that they are here to make Grover Beach a better place and bring in tourism and jobs, and enhance the area. She stated that there will be a new staging area, and encouraged people to look at the project being presented. She stated that this project was started in the 80s and it's time for it to be finished.

Richard Waller spoke against the project and indicated that he would prefer that this was preserved as a park rather than a hotel. He stated that he is the director for Back Country Horsemen they would be happy to adopt a trail if a staging area is included.

Ronnie Padilla, 261 s 7<sup>th</sup> St. resident, expressed support for the project and that staff and Pacifica had done a good job. She stated that it would bring jobs and tourism into the area.

Ann McClure, 235 Cimmaron Lane, Arroyo Grande, stated that a 20,000 s.f. staging area would only work if it were monitored. He expressed that the times when the staging area was studied were not peak times.

Diana Mead spoke in opposition to the project because it is too big and out of scope for Grover Beach. She also stated that the Snowy Plover hasn't been studied enough and that the EIR is inadequate.

Kagthy Balstage spoke in support of the project because it would provide jobs for the area. She is also an equestrian and understands the need for the staging area, but still wants the project to go forward.

Darcy Murphy appreciated the design of the project, but indicated that the equestrian area was not safe and needed more room.

John Vaughn, 319 n hwy 1; will be seeing the project from his front window expressed concern about a driveway that should be a service driveway only. He also asked who would maintaining the picnic areas.

Chair Long Closed the public hearing and called for a recess at 8:05 p.m. The public hearing was reconvened at 8:17 p.m.

Chair Long thanked the members of the public for their input.

Commissioner Coleman asked if there are any plans to address the vacant lot at the corner of Hwy 1 and Grand Avenue

Director Buckingham stated that the lot is privately owned and it has an approval for a mixed use project.

Commissioner Blum asked if it was a viable option for horses to be staged on the beach. Mr. Zilke responded that it does occur, but not frequently.

Vice Chair Evans asked about traffic at the relocated dump station, and expressed concern about lines creating a backup.

Ms. Reents stated that the traffic engineer took into consideration the number of usages at the existing dump station and there is adequate queuing in the new area.

Vice Chair Evans expressed concern about traffic congestion. Mr. Zilke stated that traffic at peak is always a concern, but with the configuration proposed, not having to turn right in the existing lot will be better. He also stated that they do deploy staff to direct traffic when necessary.

Commissioner Laferriere expressed the desire to have the public comments addressed regarding safety, maintenance and water.

Chair Long asked for clarification about the design of the proposed equestrian parking lot. Landscape Architect David McCullough clarified that the dimension is about 40,000 sf; the turning radius is enough for a fire truck to turn around. He stated that the size was based on median trailer size. He also indicated that there is a bypass lane.

Chair Long asked if this is that the maximum size that can be accommodated.

Ms. Reents stated that the size is based on the damage to the habitat in the area. If it extends any further south, it will disturb more pristine habitat, so this is pretty much the maximum footprint for this location. She also stated that this configuration provides a berm between the parking and habitat.

Commissioner Alex asked where the beach access would be from that location. Mr. McCullough stated that the trail head is south of staging area.

Chair Long asked staff to address questions related to sewage. Director Buckingham stated that the entire lodge project would be served through the city's lines and that there is ample capacity. The North Beach Camp Ground is in the City of Pismo, and that treatment would go to their facility. Pismo Beach staff has indicated that they can accommodate the additional sewage.

Chair Long stated that currently, various events are staged in the project site area. He asked if those were permitted through State Parks. Mr. Zilke stated that they base the staging areas upon available space and displacement of existing uses. As this project goes forward, staging of events would be precluded.

Chair Long asked if access to the beach is minimized and compromised. He stated that it seems that there is more parking.

Ms. Rolfe stated that they are making sure there is no net loss of public parking. They are moving the parking east from where it is currently to achieve the goal of moving more important public uses toward the ocean. They also created paths to add more access to the beach. Mr. Zilke stated that the walkway system will be enhanced considerably with this development; the public is being invited into the project, including to the lodge facility itself. The equestrians can still access the beach, though it may be a bit further south and there are several access points as well as the Oceano campgrounds.

Chair Long asked about off road vehicle staging. Mr. Zilke stated that the paved parking area would still allow the larger vehicles to air down; those types of activities are short term; they go in and air down and leave. He stated that most of the airing down occurs on the beach. There is more concern about the beach getting congested.

Chair Long asked about the snowy plovers. Mr. Zilke stated that the area has not had nesting of plovers. There have been some at Pismo Creek and wintering activity south of the project site. In the 12 years he's been there, there haven't been any plovers there. Ms. Reents stated that there is a mitigation measure related to nesting season.

Chair Long asked about job creation. Ms. Rolfe stated that this project is expected to create 60-80 permanent jobs and hundreds of construction jobs. She stated that they prefer to hire local employees.

Chair Long asked about the Coastal commission. Ms. Rolfe stated that the important clarification is that the letter came from staff, not the Commission itself. She stated that even if Commission staff does not support the project, the Commission can still approve it.

She stated that Commission staff raised concern about the size and mass of the project and that is a common concern. She stated that if they proposed lower buildings, it would take up a larger

footprint; so it makes more sense to go higher and create a soft edge to minimize the footprint to allow more public amenities.

Commissioner Coleman stated that there were concerns about the dedicated equestrian area; she asked if there could be a parking attendant of that area. Mr. Zilke stated that it could be addressed operationally, but if there is an attendant, there would probably be a fee. He stated that the dump station has an employee and that will allow more control over the use.

Vice Chair Evans asked about exclusive parking for Fins Restaurant. Mr. Zilke stated that that is another situation that there will be a tendency to use the area for long term day use; there might be a need to use signs to regulate parking through State Parks and the City of Grover Beach.

Commissioner Roberson expressed that there was a huge volume of information that they had to go through, and she isn't comfortable voting on the project when she hasn't read all of the material. She stated that the sand dunes are always moving, but there wasn't really a plan to address the sand movement.

Mr. McCullough stated that there would be new dunes created, and they do move. He stated that the stabilized dunes are not natural. They are considering creating a dune habitat that is as stable as they could do it and furthermore there is a sea wall that would remain in place and it serves the purpose of containing sand as much as possible. He stated that the buildings are going to feel that they sit very lightly on the ground. Mr. Zilke stated that sand will move and there will be sand maintenance required. He stated that the design of the project will minimize that. Once the sand goes into the street, it has to be disposed off site. With the majority of the parking east of the beach, there will be less sand.

Commissioner Roberson stated that the berm is going to create a trough in the equestrian area and asked who will maintain the area. Mr. Zilke stated that the direction of the berm is designed to minimize that issue.

Mr. McCullough stated that they will plant the berm with native plants to minimize the sand movement.

Commissioner Roberson asked if the trails will be fenced off and what materials would be used. Mr. Zilke stated that once native vegetation is planted as part of a dune restoration, that area would need to be closed for public access and during that process you can plant over trails you don't want utilized. Once it's grown out and they've taken out the fence they could put up symbolic fencing with signage that it is a restoration area.

Commissioner Roberson asked about the mitigation measure for trash removal. Mr. Zilke stated that it is a mitigation recommendation is for monthly trash removal, but the actuality would be more frequent. He stated that manure disposal would be on the honor system for people to deal with, at least in the staging area.

Commissioner Roberson stated that there were mitigation measures that only seemed to address things during construction, with no discussion about what happens after. Ms. Reents stated that most of the mitigation measures are to the point that you can monitor during construction. Erosion control should be self-maintaining after the monitoring period was done. The mitigation measures refer to many "best management practices". The measures are in place to make sure that they are taken care of.

Commissioner Roberson asked about the 5-year contract evaluation. Mr. Zilke stated that it is a routine review for compliance and feedback.

Commissioner Roberson stated that she wasn't comfortable with the JPA language indicating that the City was responsible for all costs. Director Buckingham indicated that it was a typo.

Commissioner Roberson wondered about maintenance of boardwalks. Mr. Zilke stated that some areas will be turned over to the State and some will be retained and maintained by the concessionaire.

Commissioner Roberson asked about water resources. Greg Ray, Public Works Director, stated that groundwater resources are addressed with the gentlemen's agreement between the cities. There are estimates included for agricultural use and private well use and those do not impact the City's allotment. Commissioner Roberson asked if there have been times when we have gotten less. Mr. Ray stated that to date our water supplies have been 100% reliable.

Commissioner Roberson asked if we would have enough water in the future to accommodate this plan. Director Buckingham indicated that we have enough water to service the lodge. Ms. Reents stated that when they did the EIR for the Land Use Element update, they included the hotel as a potential use, and looked at full buildout of the City, and there was adequate water and sewer service.

Chair Long opened discussion about the resolutions.

EIR:

Commissioner Alex liked the way it was written and presented. He stated that it was interesting that the equestrian groups were fighting against something that would give them an official staging area.

Commissioner Laferriere stated that there are very few places to have horses in Grover Beach and that it really isn't equestrian friendly. He stated that this project is part of the visioning plan and that what is a benefit to the equestrian groups isn't necessarily in the best interest of Grover Beach. Regarding certifying the EIR, he stated that this is the right project and there is a fair and equitable sharing of the land. He is supportive of the project.

Commissioner Evans expressed support of the EIR.

Commissioner Blum stated that it is a good report. He hoped that the equestrians would support the staging area on the south side of Grand Avenue, because it would give them the safest access to the trails.

Commissioner Roberson expressed support of the EIR, with one previously mentioned change.

Commissioner Coleman stated that it was a great idea that was in concert with the Land Use Element. She was excited to see the growth and employment that this project could bring. She was disappointed that the equestrian groups left the meeting before the square footage for the staging area was clarified by the consultants. She also indicated that she thought the project design was taking the equestrian concerns into consideration, and that the staging area should be looked at as a privilege. .

Chair Long stated that the EIR was prepared consistent with CEQA and impacts were fairly identified and dealt with the issues being raised.

Commissioner Evans made the motion to recommend that the City Council adopt and certify the EIR. Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 7-0-0-0.

#### Local Coastal Plan

Commissioner Blum stated that Pacifica did an admirable job creating a site that is beautifully landscaped; the scope of the building is a good trade off for what the City will be getting.

Commissioner Blum made the motion to adopt the resolution recommending that the City Council adopt the Local Coastal Plan. Commissioner Alex seconded the motion and it was carried with a vote of 7-0-0-0.

#### Zoning Code Amendment

Commissioner Coleman made the motion to adopt the resolution recommending that the City Council adopt the zoning code amendment. Commissioner Laferriere seconded the motion and it was carried with a vote of 7-0-0-0.

#### Coastal Development Permit

Commissioner Roberson stated that she had recently gone to Fins restaurant on a Tuesday. There was parking on the dirt lots, and it was all people visiting the beach. She didn't feel that Fins would be used in the mornings, nor would parking at the golf course be used in the evenings. She indicated that 30 percent of the parking is proposed to be compact spaces. She recommended changing that to 10 percent. She expressed concern about the recreational vehicles. She stated that the project will be changing from 300 spaces to 64 spaces for visitors to the beach and she asked for a redistribution of spaces to allot more spaces for beach goers. She stated that the parking for the hotel doesn't encourage public transit. She expressed concern about traffic congestion and suggested possibly switching the areas. She stated that Coastal Commission has indicated that they would not approve the proposed equestrian area, and the alternative location would have the equestrians in the regular area and she does not like that for safety reasons.

Chair Long indicated that some of the issues that Commissioner Roberson mentioned related to the equestrian area raised could be mitigated with good design.

Commissioner Roberson indicated that she would prefer a separate horse path. She also stated that the hotel entrance is redundant, and that the driveway could provide another parking space. She didn't want people walking to the beach having to cross traffic.

Commission Long stated that her comments are good regarding, and indicated that the parking design is not final.

Commissioner Roberson stated that there are three things this project should have: blend with the environment, have a "wow" factor, and be timeless. She stated that this contemporary design blends with the dunes and would like to see a structure that incorporated a more natural style.

Commissioner Blum expressed support of the project.

Vice Chair Evans stated that he doesn't support changing the parking from what is proposed. He thinks this design is great and encourages interest on Grand Avenue, and will keep people coming to Grover Beach.

Commissioner Laferriere felt that the convention center portion of the project was not big enough. They have one shot at this project, so he wanted to make a pitch for increasing the size of the conference area in their recommendation to the City Council. He suggested shrinking the rooms to make the conference center larger. He is hoping for a 20-50 percent increase.

Commissioner Alex agreed with Commissioner Laferriere.

Commissioner Blum stated that a 10-12,000 square foot conference space had been tossed out; he would support looking into increasing the conference center size.

Chair Long supported that recommendation.

Commissioner Coleman expressed concern about increasing the size and asked if there were any examples of something that exists of that size to compare it to. She felt that it was already large and asked if this facility was designed for future expansions.

Commissioner Roberson stated that the City benefits from the room tax and asked if they would receive revenue from the conference center.

Commissioner Evans stated that it would increase sales tax revenues and it would have a trickle-down effect.

Chair Long stated that conference goers would be there for a few days, so there would be TOT revenues from the lodging.

Commissioner Laferriere felt that increasing conference center size would increase revenue.

Commissioner Laferriere made the motion to approve the resolution and also recommends looking at increasing conference room size; Vice Chair Evans seconded the motion, and it carried with a vote of 6-1-0-0, with Commissioner Roberson voting no.

#### Site and Architectural Plan

Commissioner Long stated that he was impressed by the master plan and layout. He stated that it would have been nice to have been part of the process earlier regarding the architectural style. He would like to see a recommendation to consider a change in the architectural style.

Commissioner Laferriere didn't know if he would support revisiting the architectural design.

Commissioner Blum stated that this plan came together during the JPA process. There were early renderings that alluded to this style, and that would have been the appropriate time to talk about it. He likes the proposed style and thinks the project is outstanding. He would like to know where they would recapture parking spaces for cars if the alternate equestrian area is used. Director Buckingham indicated that if that occurred, it would have to come back to the Planning Commission and/or City Council.

Vice Chair Evans felt that this design does have a "wow" factor, and is different than anything else out there.

Commissioner Blum made the motion to recommend approval of the site and architectural plans; Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 7-0-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT:** 10:20 p.m.

DRAFT