



**CITY OF SANTA MARIA
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF
JUNE 21, 2006**



Chair John Everett called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Lawnae Hunter, Michael W. Moats, Rodger Brown, Vice-Chair Etta Waterfield, and Chair John Everett.

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Division Manager – Peggy Woods
Deputy City Attorney II – Phil Sinco
Senior Civil Engineer – Rodger Olds
Park/Landscape Planning Tech – Patty Ellis
Recording Secretary – Kathleen Villegas
Police Chief – Danny Macagni
Planner III – Benjamin Kimball
Planner II – Tina Frank

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There was no one present who wished to comment.

ITEM 1 – CONSENT CALENDAR: The consent calendar is approved with one motion.

VOTE: Ayes--Commissioners Hunter, Waterfield, Moats, Brown, and Chair Everett;
Noes--None; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

- a. **ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BLOSSER COMMERCIAL, LOCATED AT 715 SOUTH BLOSSER ROAD, PD-2004-016, E-2004-040.** Review of a one year extension of time for a previously approved Planned Development permit to construct an 18,638 sq. ft. multi-tenant industrial building and telecommunications site with one mono-pine tower. The project is located in a PD/CM (Planned Development/ Commercial Manufacturing) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No. 117-191-058. The project is a Class 32 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Brian Halvorson)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: That the Planning Commission, by motion, grant an extension of time for one year.

ACTION: By motion, grant extension of time for one year.

- b. **GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION FOR A PIPELINE EASEMENT FOR COUNTY FACILITIES AND THE SANTA MARIA FOODBANK, LOCATED ON ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 111-231-004, SP-2006-011.** Review of a General Plan consistency determination for a pipeline easement located on property within the City Limits, owned by the County of Santa Barbara on Foster Road in the County Campus, in a PF (Public Facilities) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel Number 111-231-004. (Project Planner: Kristina Gee)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: By resolution, find that the water pipeline easement is consistent with the City of Santa Maria General Plan.

ACTION: Adopted Resolution No. 2421, finding that the water pipeline easement is consistent with the City of Santa Maria General Plan.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM 2 – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR PARKLAND COTTAGES (MCCOY SENIOR RESIDENCES) FOR A 21 UNIT SENIOR HOUSING PROJECT, 500 BLOCK WEST MCCOY LANE, PD-2005-018, E-2004-058.

Review of a Planned Development Permit to allow the construction of 21 Senior Residences in a PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No. 111-640-002, -003. This is a Class 32 Categorical Exemption from CEQA. No further environmental review is needed. (Project Planner: Benjamin Kimball)

ACTION: By motion, approved subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit.

VOTE: Ayes--Commissioners Hunter, Waterfield, Moats, Brown, and Chair Everett; Noes--None; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

Benjamin Kimball presented the staff report. He stated that this project is a request for a planned development permit to establish 21 detached senior residences in a PD/R3 zone. The project consists of 2-bedroom detached homes along a private drive street system, with common open space and common guest parking. He stated that the proposed architecture reflects that of a traditional American style, and showed the Commissioners examples of the architecture. Mr. Kimball said that a tentative tract map was reviewed by the Planning Commission on May 17, 2006. This planned development permit was also reviewed and discussed at that meeting, with no action taken, and due to the smaller size of the proposed lots, the map was sent to the City Council for review. The City Council reviewed the tentative map on June 6 and again on June 20, when the map was approved. Mr. Kimball went on to say that with the approved tract map, the applicant is ready to proceed with the planned development permit. The issue of access between the two properties was addressed and an agreement was signed to allow access for the refuse trucks. Staff is recommending approval of the Planned Development Permit, and is available to answer questions.

Dan Blough, the applicant, was present, and he had no additional comments. He stated he was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Hunter asked for an update on the elevations, and Mr. Blough responded that his wife and the decorator had made some changes to the specific elevation in question.

Commissioner Hunter also asked Mr. Blough how the age restriction will be handled. Dan Blough responded that he believed that as long as one person 55 years of age or older is living in the unit, that would qualify them. That requirement may be accomplished by deed or CC&Rs. He stated that legal counsel will decide and will have City's approval in accordance with the conditions.

Commissioner Hunter asked Mr. Blough for clarification of the statement on the green sheets that reads: "Each residential unit in this project must be occupied by a resident aged 55 and older unless a future owner of the project first complies with all then-existing Municipal Code requirements for a project without the age restriction."

Mr. Blough responded by stating that if the rules at the state level change as far as how "senior" is defined, then the change would affect this project. That statement refers to any future changes that a government agency might make.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Blough to clarify what changes were made to the elevations. Mr. Blough responded that the architect removed some dormers and lowered the height of the rooflines. The highest roof lines were 6:12, and they were dropped to 5:12.

Commissioner Moats asked about the agreement between this project and the neighbors concerning the easement.

Mr. Blough commented on the history of the easement agreement. He stated that when the issue was brought up, he met with the Homeowner's Association. The neighbors were confused about the utility easement and concerned with the potential noise. Mr. Blough and the neighbors came to an understanding and signed an agreement.

Commissioner Hunter reiterated her concern about the massing of the roof on elevation #2, scheme #4.

Chair Everett asked the other Commissioners for their input on the roof lines.

Commissioner Waterfield stated she did not have an issue with it, and Commissioner Moats also said that he did not. Commissioner Brown commented that he would like to see the before and after depictions of the elevation in question. Chair Everett did not have a problem with the proposed elevation.

Benjamin Kimball showed the two versions of the proposed elevation in question on the overhead projector. He pointed out that they basically looked the same.

Dan Blough commented that the street scheme that was previously shown depicts the overall look of the project, and that it went well together. He stated that he would like to go with the expertise of the architect. The pitch would be taken down from 6:12 to 5:12, which would lower it a bit and lessen the mass.

Chair Everett asked Commissioner Hunter if she still wanted to pursue this. Commissioner Hunter declined, and stated that she believed this is a well designed project.

Chair Everett called for a motion. Commissioner Moats made a motion to approve this project subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit for a 21-unit senior housing project, 500 block of West McCoy Lane, PD-2005-018, E-2004-058. Commissioner Waterfield seconded it, and it was carried, 5-0.

ITEM 3 - SFM CONDOMINIUM PARCEL MAP, LOCATED AT 2624 AIRPARK DRIVE, TRACT 5913, E-2006-018. Review of a tentative parcel map that would create one industrial lot of 1.45 acres for airspace condominium purposes in a PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No. 111-430-018. The project qualifies for a Class 15 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Tina Frank)

ACTION: Adopted Resolution No. 2422, approving the design as shown on the Official Tentative Map and conditions set forth in the April 25, 2006, Subdivision Committee Minutes. Vote 5-0.

VOTE: Ayes--Commissioners Hunter, Waterfield, Moats, Brown, and Chair Everett; Noes--None; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

Tina Frank gave the staff report. She stated that the project is located 2624 Airpark Drive, north of the Santa Maria Public Airport. The project site is 1.45 acres, zoned PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing). The applicant is requesting approval of a tentative parcel map that would create two industrial airspace condominium units. There is an existing building on the site. Parking and landscaping are existing on the site. This project qualifies for a Class 15 Categorical Exemption; therefore, no further environmental review is required. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission by resolution approve the condominium tentative parcel map, Tract 5913, subject to the design as shown on the official tentative map and the conditions as set forth in the April 25, 2006, Subdivision Committee Minutes. Ms. Frank closed her presentation, stating that staff is available to answer any questions.

Ken Fargen, Fargen Surveys, 2450 Professional Parkway, the applicant, was present. He stated that they are in agreement with the conditions, and available to answer any questions.

There were no questions from the Commissioners, and no comment from the public. Chair Everett closed the hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Waterfield made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2422, approving the SFM Condominium Parcel Map, located at 2624 Airpark Drive, Tract 5913, E-2006-018, subject to the design as shown on the Official Tentative Map and the conditions set forth in the April 25, 2006, Subdivision Committee Minutes. Commissioner Hunter seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0.

ITEM 4 - CALE-WEST STREET SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT 302-308 WEST STREET, TRACT 5915, E-2006-023. Review of a tentative tract map that would create eight residential lots ranging in size from 1,774.1 square feet to 1,997.9 square feet and one common lot in a PD/R-2 (Planned Development/Medium-Density Residential) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No. 117-340-069. The project qualifies for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Tina Frank)

ACTION: Adopted Resolution No. 2423, recommending to City Council the approval of the tentative map. Vote: 3-2

VOTE: Ayes--Commissioners Moats, Brown, and Chair Everett; Noes—Commissioners Hunter and Waterfield; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

NOTE: *Tentatively scheduled for City Council meeting of July 18, 2006*

Tina Frank presented the staff report. The project is the Cale-West Street Subdivision located at 302-308 West Street. The project parcel is a 0.76 acre site located west of Broadway and south of Carmen Lane. The parcel is zoned PD/R-2 (Planned Development/ Medium-Density Residential). The applicant is requesting approval of a tentative tract map that would create eight single family residential lots and one common lot that would comprise the U-shaped driveway and common landscaping areas on the north and south portions of the property. The eight residential lots are proposed to range in size from 1,774 square feet to 1,997 square feet. Since the proposed lot sizes are less than the 6,000 square foot minimum interior lot size permitted in the PD/R-2 zone district, the tentative map must be approved by the City Council as required by the Municipal Code. The overall density of the project with the smaller lot sizes is still consistent with the medium density residential MDR 12 dwelling units per acre General Plan Land Use designation. The General Plan would allow up to nine units, and the applicant is proposing eight. Tina stated that she was remiss in that she didn't get the information concerning small lot approvals by the Planning Commission together for this presentation. There are four existing dwellings currently on the property and two accessory buildings. These structures, including four trees, would be removed as part of the proposed

project. There is also an existing oil well on the southwest part of this parcel that would not impact the design of the subdivision. Staff is recommending that a condition that a ten-foot radius “no-build” easement around the wellhead be recorded on the final map. Staff is also recommending that a phase II environmental site assessment be conducted by a Cal-EPA registered environmental assessor or other certified professional, and any and all remediation completed prior to recordation of the map or issuance of any grading or building permits. Staff is also recommending a condition of approval requiring a clearance letter from the applicable regulatory agencies including the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division, be submitted to the Community Development Department prior to recordation of the map or issuance of any grading or building permits. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission by resolution recommend that the City Council approve the Cale-West Street Subdivision Tentative Map, Tract 5915, subject to the design as shown on the official tentative map and the conditions set forth in the April 25, 2006 subdivision committee minutes as modified. Staff is available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Hunter commented that in the four years that she has served on the Commission, she does not believe they have ever approved lot sizes as small as what is being proposed. She stated her concern over the size of the lots, as well as no parking in the driveways, and that the common area includes the street, which is not real common area that can be used. She requested that staff provide information on lot sizes in that area. She stated her belief that this is a precedent setting situation.

Commissioner Waterfield also expressed concern about the lot sizes. She questioned lowering City standards on the basis of the project being “slightly better” than what is presently there. She also stated her desire to see more yard area for these single family homes.

Commissioner Moats asked Ms. Frank why staff allowed this project to come this far in the process if it is proposing unreasonably small lot sizes.

Tina Frank responded by stating that staff has the same concerns as the Commissioners about the precedent setting lot size. However, the project fits the General Plan as far as density is concerned. She also reminded the Commission that other designs were talked about at study session for this site. The project came before staff in a different design, which staff didn’t like, so the project was redesigned, including an attached style development, and that development was presented by the applicant as not economically feasible.

Commissioner Brown noted that if this project meets the requirements, the Planning Commission doesn’t approve the project, but only makes a recommendation to City Council. City Council makes the final decision. Commissioner Brown is in favor of larger lots in large tracts. For this particular parcel, he believes it is a fairly good project, and he would like to hear from the applicant.

Bill Orndorff, 925 S. McClelland, Santa Maria, was present representing the applicant. He encouraged the Planning Commission to look at this project differently: the parcel is zoned R-2, which would allow nine units, and the applicant is proposing eight. The project would allow for single family homes that families can buy. Mr. Orndorff said that Santa Maria has a need for affordable housing, even reducing lot sizes, so that people can purchase them. He stated that there could be nine apartments, or eight or nine planned development units, and the lot sizes would be less. With this project, the applicant has created a nice single family unit with a little common space.

Mr. Orndorff spoke concerning the City’s history with smaller lots and affordable housing. He said that in the late 1980’s, City Council directed smaller lots to create affordable housing.

That direction resulted in the 4,500 square foot lot size with zero setback side yards. He said that in many cases, the lots were smaller and the code was amended so that they could be approved. He commented on the Arbor Walk project, and the fact that the homes there are selling well. The proposed project on West Street would probably sell for less because of the deteriorated area. He spoke of the amenities of the proposed project. He said that he thinks the Commissioners are looking at this project like a single family subdivision, and it is not. It is a multi-family project; a hybrid, detached unit development, a highly desirable place to live for a family. He reiterated that Santa Maria needs affordable single family housing, and that is what they are trying to create with this project. Bill stated that he is available to answer any questions the Commissioners might have.

Commissioner Brown inquired if the applicant addressed any of the additional parking issues brought up during the study session by using grasscrete.

Bill Orndorff responded affirmatively, stating that there could be parking in-between the units; however, that would reduce the landscaping. The project already meets the City requirement for parking with the big garages and the four guest spots.

Commissioner Moats inquired as to the location and visibility of the oil well in the southwest corner.

Mr. Orndorff responded that the well is about 18 inches to 2 feet off the south property line, 3 feet east of the west property line, about 6 feet deep; and it is capped and welded. It was inspected by the State Division of Oil and Gas, and the County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division. Mr. Orndorff stated that based on those inspections, it was recommended to be covered up, and have a 10' easement around the well. The Santa Barbara County Fire Department as well as the State Division of Oil and Gas want to be able to maintain access to the well in case they ever have to work on it.

Commissioner Moats commented that he looked at the parcel, and noticed that there are very dense utilities lines overhead. He asked staff if the utility lines would be staying in place.

Tina Frank responded to Commissioner Moats by stating that the standard condition of subdivisions is that utilities be placed underground.

Rodger Olds added to Tina Frank's comment by stating that it is a standard condition that anything new to the site be underground as well as anything along the property be placed underground as well. There will be some frontage improvements to the site as well.

Commissioner Hunter asked Mr. Orndorff if he had any recollection of smaller lot sizes approved in the past.

Mr. Orndorff responded that the present code allows lots to be as small as 4,500 square feet. In certain circumstances, the Planning Commission and City Council can approve lots smaller than 4,500 square feet, and those are required to be zero lot line. The proposed project has a 13' side yard on one side of the house, instead of the typical 5 and 10 foot setbacks. The rear yard setback is required to be 10'. Two story developments are required to have a 15' rear yard setback. Many lots under 4,500 square feet have been approved. Mr. Orndorff reminded the Commissioners that this project is not a single family subdivision. He said that this project has more open usable space than the projects south of Wal-Mart have. Mr. Orndorff stated that he wouldn't recommend this project if he didn't think it is a good one. He stated that it is a high quality medium density project.

Commissioner Hunter spoke about her concerns with the parking, circulation, and the size of the lots of this project. She said that she believes this is setting a precedent reaching way past where the City has ever been, and she stated that she has great concerns about that.

She emphasized that her real objection is toward the lot design, the size of the lots, and the lack of parking, which she feels very strongly about. She also stated that she doesn't believe that the City Council has given direction to approve lot sizes as small as 1,700 square feet. She said she believes that City Council looks to the Planning Commission to sort through issues and then forward a recommendation to them. City Council believes that the Planning Commission has looked hard at the planning issues, so their decisions are based on trusting the Planning Commission. Commissioner Hunter stated that she cannot support this project.

Bill Orndorff responded to Commissioner Hunter by stating that he agreed that a precedent is being set by this project. However, as he reminded the Commissioners, this project is not for single family lot sizes, but rather for medium density in the R-2 zoning district.

Commissioner Moats asked Mr. Orndorff how theoretically it would work if a family moves into one of these units with two teens with cars; four cars total.

Bill Orndorff responded that the units would have a two car garage, an 18-foot driveway approach, and two spaces in front. He stated that there will be a Homeowner's Association (HOA) with this project that will oversee the parking. If the HOA sees the garage full of stuff instead of cars, they'll take action.

Phil Sinco commented that "yes," that scenario could happen. The City would not enforce that, it would be up to the HOA, or it would need to be specified in the CC&Rs. He also stated that requirement should be part of the Planned Development Permit, not the tentative map.

Commissioner Hunter commented that she didn't believe the HOA can inspect cleanliness of garages, but they can see where the homeowners park. She stated that smaller developments like this proposed project are usually self-managed because it is not economically feasible to have professional management. That means that local residents manage the CC&Rs, which can really be enforced only by a lawsuit. She stated her concern with what she envisions will happen on this site with no driveway parking, that people will park in the apron approach and in the street. She reiterated her belief that people in Santa Maria have lots of cars. Commissioner Hunter stated that this problem needs to be addressed because this project will stand as housing for many years.

Paul Knutsen, Accord Design Group, 2125 South Broadway, Santa Maria, designer of the project, spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Knutsen stated that he understands the Commissioners' concerns. He did at one time design duplexes or attached units for this site, which didn't work well because of the restrictions applied. He said that he and the applicant have been through at least ten or twelve different designs for this site. He stated that with the discovery of the oil well and the requirements for fire and trash, this is the best design that they came up with to have the size of home that people want. He went on to say that parking would be available on the street, which is wide enough for on-street parking. He also said that there will be a nice slumpstone wall with vines and plantings on the west and east property lines.

Commissioner Waterfield expressed her concern about setting a precedent in approving such small lots. She stated her concern with the parking issue, as well as the affordability of the units. She also said that she can't imagine eight houses on such a small space, and stated that she can't see approving lot sizes this small.

Paul Knutsen reiterated that the project has more open space and more landscaping than the new project on the west side of Dal Porto. He commented that it would be nice for families starting out, or those that don't want a lot of yard. He said that lot sizes don't affect the fact that this is a good project.

Mary Iborra, 4605 Hummell Drive, Orcutt, addressed the Commission, and stated her concern about the proposed units being owner-occupied. She believes that rentals become run down.

Tina Frank responded to Ms. Iborra's concern by stating that the City does not have any conditioning authority to ensure that these units will be only owner-occupied.

Kathleen Stanley, 312 West Street, Santa Maria, spoke against the project. She addressed the Commissioners on behalf of her mother, Aletha Stanley, 2094 South Lincoln. She stated that she and her mother have an issue with the project, saying that when the surveyors came to conduct the property surveys, a survey property marker was illegally moved. They are currently working with a civil engineer to have the property resurveyed. Due to the property marker being moved, Ms. Stanley lost 10.7 feet of property. She stated that she has proof that the marker was moved.

Commissioner Hunter commented that perhaps the item needs to be continued until this issue is resolved. She stated that there is no point to vote on a map if the land is in dispute.

Kathleen Stanley stated that she has letters and pictures of where the property marker was dug up and moved. The property marker that is in question now is above ground. She stated that she has lived in the neighborhood her whole life, and her mother has had her place there since 1950. She stated that her grandmother put a fence there, and there was never a property marker where it is now. Ms. Stanley has retained Bill Summer Meyer, a surveyor, to take care of this, in probably two or three weeks.

Paul Knutsen stated that this was the first he'd heard of this. The property was laid out based on the title report provided by Mr. Cale. Mr. John Crawford, licensed land surveyor, recently surveyed the entire street, and as far as Mr. Knutsen knows, there was no discrepancy.

Kathleen Stanley stated that she checked with First American Title, and her mother's property lines match the records. She also said that Mr. Crawford offered to buy that property from her mother for what she paid for it 50 years ago.

Phil Sinco conferred with Rodger Olds, and clarified that this is a tentative map, and won't be recorded. He doubted that the final map could be recorded until this issue was resolved. He stated that he didn't see any reason to delay action on account of this new allegation, because it is a tentative map, not a final.

Chair Everett closed the hearing, and called for a motion. Commissioner Brown made the motion to adopt Resolution No. 2423 to recommend that the City Council approve the tentative tract map for Tract 5915 for Cale-West Street Subdivision, subject to the design as shown on the official tentative map, the conditions set forth in the April 25, 2006 subdivision committee meeting minutes, as modified, for Cale-West Street Subdivision, located at 302-308 West Street, Tract 5915, E-2006-023. Commissioner Moats seconded it, and it passed, 3-2.

ITEM 5 - PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR CALE-WEST STREET FOR EIGHT NEW DETACHED RESIDENTIAL UNITS, 302-308 WEST STREET, PD-2006-002, E-2005-036. Review of a Planned Development Permit to allow the construction of eight new single family residential units in a PD/R-2 (Planned Development/Medium Density Residential) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No.117-340-069. This project qualifies as a Class 32 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is necessary. (Project Planner: Tina Frank)

ACTION: By motion, this item was continued to the July 19, 2006, Planning Commission meeting.

VOTE: Ayes--Commissioners Hunter, Waterfield, Moats, Brown, and Chair Everett;
Noes--None; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

Tina Frank presented the staff report. She stated that the project is the Cale-West Street Planned Development Permit located at 302-308 West Street. This project is being processed concurrently with the previous item, Tract 5915, on a 0.76 acre site located west of Broadway and south of Carmen Lane. The parcel is zoned PD/R-2 (Planned Development/ Medium Density Residential). The applicant is requesting approval of a Planned Development Permit for the construction of eight single family residences and one common lot that would comprise the U-shaped driveway and common landscaping areas on the north and south portions of the property. There are four existing dwellings on the property and two accessory structures. These structures, along with four trees, would be removed as part of the proposed project. There is also an existing oil well on the southwest corner of the property that would not impact the design of the subdivision. Staff would recommend the same conditions as proposed for the map regarding the oil well. Access is from two driveways off of an improved section of West Street as part of a public improvement plan for the area. Proposed parking includes two covered spaces per unit, and four guest parking spaces on the project site within the proposed common lot area.

Ms. Frank continued to say that the floor plans are identical and mirror images of each other. Each unit is two stories and over 1,500 square feet per unit. There are two elevations being proposed. For each elevation, there are two color schemes available. In order to meet the planned unit development standards of the Santa Maria Municipal Code, staff recommends special conditions requiring 300 cubic feet of storage area within each oversized garage and a 6 foot by 3 foot laundry room for each proposed dwelling unit. The proposed landscaping comprises 33% of the property. The project qualifies as a Class 32 Categorical Exemption; therefore, no further environmental review is required. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission continue the item to the hearing scheduled for July 19 after City Council action on the associated tentative map, Tract 5915. Staff will propose an additional condition regarding garages being kept clear and free for the purposes of parking vehicles. Tina Frank concluded her presentation, and stated that staff was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Moats asked staff when City Council will review the project.

Tina Frank responded that City Council will be reviewing this project on July 18th, and then the project will come back to the Planning Commission on July 19th.

Commissioner Hunter brought up a concern about the study/computer room in the proposed floor plans. She said it would be very easy to convert into a 4-bedroom house, which could mean more people living there, perhaps multiple families, and certainly larger families. She stated so as not to misunderstand, her concerns with this project do not mean she's against affordable housing, because she's very much in favor of affordable housing.

Bill Orndorff, 925 South McClelland, Santa Maria, was present representing the applicant. He stated that this project has been designed not to facilitate conversion into two units. He believes that the study/computer room adds flexibility to the buyer. He said he'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Everett asked for a motion. Commissioner Moats made a motion to continue to the July 19, 2006, public hearing, Commissioner Brown seconded, and it passed, 5-0.

ITEM 6 - GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR B3, LLC, FOR SANTA BARBARA COUNTY – CRISIS OUTREACH CENTER, 212 WEST CARMEN LANE, U-2006-013, E-2006-034.

Review of a General Plan consistency determination for purchase of property and a Conditional Use Permit to allow an existing 10,400 square foot building to be remodeled for a new Santa Barbara County Crisis Outreach Center & Short-term Crisis Residential Facility in a PD/C-2 (Planned Development/General Commercial) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No. 117-483-007. The project qualifies for a Class 1 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Tina Frank)

ACTION: Adopted Resolution No. 2424, finding that the purchase of the property by the County of Santa Barbara is consistent with the City of Santa Maria General Plan; and

By motion, approved the project subject to the conditions outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Conditional Use Permit as amended. Vote: 5-0.

VOTE: Ayes--Commissioners Hunter, Waterfield, Moats, Brown, and Chair Everett; Noes—None; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

Tina Frank presented the staff report. She stated that the project is for the Santa Barbara County Crisis Outreach Center, 212 West Carmen Lane. The project parcel is a 26,400 square foot site located west of Broadway. There are apartments in the vicinity as well as other commercial office uses. The parcel is zoned PD/C-2 (Planned Development/General Commercial). The applicant is requesting a General Plan Consistency Determination for purchase of property by Santa Barbara County and approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow an existing 10,400-square-foot building to be remodeled for a new Santa Barbara County Crisis Outreach Center and Short-term Crisis Residential Facility. The first floor remodel would include the 24-hour crisis and recovery emergency services (CARES) and outpatient crisis center for all community residents who have mental health or drug and alcohol related crisis. The second floor remodel would include a 5 to 10 day stabilization center for up to 12 adults. The program would be staffed 24/7. Clients would be brought in by family, friends, may self refer, or be brought in by law enforcement or medical personnel, 24 hours, 7 days a week. All staff would be trained on how to prevent loitering outside by clients. All areas of the building both inside and out would be supervised and monitored by staff. A 24-hour security guard service would be employed as part of the staffing pattern. The entrance to the facility would be in the back, not visible to neighbors and passersby. The applicant proposes to convert two parking spots to a new outdoor break area for employees only. Parking and landscaping are existing. Staff is recommending approval of the project in accordance with the draft Conditional Use Permit. However, it has been recently brought to staff's attention that because the County would own the property, and operate the facility, the City would not have any authority to impose conditions on the project. Staff thanked the County for their cooperation in pursuing the review process thus far. Tina Frank concluded her report, stating that staff was available to answer any questions.

In response to Commissioner Brown's request, Tina Frank clarified that the City cannot impose any conditions to the project. Government code section 65402 in the General Plan Consistency process states that when another agency owns a property and operates a facility, they are not subject to other agencies' conditions, unless it has to do with building or fire code conditions.

Phil Sinco added to Ms. Frank's comments by stating that cities and counties are exempt from each other's building and zoning regulations. Government Code 65402 requires that a county that intends to operate a facility in the incorporated limits of a city bring it to the

planning agency's attention to see if it is consistent with the general plan. That's what the statute requires and that's why the project is being brought to the Planning Commission. Going through the process is a courtesy to the various agencies.

Paul Reinhardt, 3203 Lightening Street, Santa Maria, architect and project manager at RA & Associates, spoke representing the owner and County of Santa Barbara. He stated that he had a couple of questions on the conditions of approval. Pat Polangi, the property owner, sent a letter to be read to the Commissioners by Mr. Reinhardt, stating therein that he is confident that this is a good use, and that he appreciates the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Reinhardt went on to ask a question on condition #5. He said that condition #5 states that mechanical equipment located on the roof of the building shall be completely screened. He asked if this is related to an existing building with existing mechanical equipment, or if it only applies to new equipment.

Tina Frank responded that this condition is only for proposed new equipment, not the existing equipment. She stated that will be clarified in the condition.

Mr. Reinhardt also asked about condition #22, dealing with second floor residential care. It is a building code issue related to how the building is currently constructed and requirements for the use of that. He'd like to submit a letter of understanding that a requirement will be that the patients be ambulatory; otherwise, it will fall into a different building code class. They have some issues to resolve with the Building Division, and he requested that final resolution and understanding will become part of the building permit application process.

Tina Frank concurred that that is the sort of thing that is typically addressed in the building permit stage. This condition was proposed by the Building Official, Bob Marshall. She stated that oftentimes these issues come up at the building permit stage, and it would be addressed at that time.

Dr. Jim Broderick, the Director of Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services with Santa Barbara County, addressed the Planning Commission and asked that they endorse this project. He stated that they have been working with the community for three years to get this facility established. The County Board of Supervisors has been very clear that this is *for* the community, not *to* you, but *with* you. There are currently no crisis psychiatric facilities north of the Gaviota Pass. There are currently 200,000 people in the north county, 90,000 people in Santa Maria, with no resources for this area. They have been actively working with the community—on TV, in the paper—to make sure that everyone understands about the facility and what it is going to do. He stated that he believed they have much support for this project. They have been working closely with the Police Department and Marian Medical Center. They are asking for the Planning Commission's endorsement for this facility. The spirit is that this is something the County is doing with the City. He concluded by stating that he was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Moats stated that he strongly supports this project. He inquired to what degree would there be medically unstable people at the facility.

Dr. Broderick responded that they are not an acute medical facility. It is an acute psychiatric facility. Because they are partnering with Marian Medical Center, anything requiring medical assistance would be handled at the Marian Emergency Room. He stated that this facility would be an outpatient use.

In response to Commissioner Waterfield's question, Dr. Broderick stated that the community has such a need for this type of facility that he doubted very much that there would be any change to how it operates in 5 to 10 years.

Patrick Bergen, 317 West Williams, Apt. C, Santa Maria, spoke in favor of the project. He stated that he's been working diligently along with mental health staff and taking an active part in designing projects, this being one of them. He said that he is tickled pink for Dr. Moats' endorsement, and thinks that it is great for the community. Giving an endorsement is like giving to the community—now it's their turn.

Elizabeth Allen, 840 West Morrison, Santa Maria, spoke in favor of the project. She's a consumer, possibly a patient of this facility. She stated that she knows many people who are alive and in recovery and have a chance at life because there was somewhere to go for help, and are now happy healthy responsible people. She urged the Planning Commission to support this project because it would benefit the entire community.

Commissioner Hunter praised Ms. Allen for having the courage to speak up. She stated that many people are affected by substance abuse, and it was great to see someone have the courage to speak to the Commission.

Bill Hargadon, 831 Firefox Drive, Santa Maria, spoke in favor of the project. He stated that he is a drug and alcohol counselor, and supports this project. This project can be a strong model for other communities in California.

Mike Rylon, 492 North Center Court, Santa Maria, spoke in favor of the project, representing Good Samaritan Services. The Good Samaritan Shelter started in 1988, with 28 beds, and has now expanded to 24 programs. He said that they offer a lot of good programs, but Santa Maria needs a good program like this one being proposed.

Joe Olivera, former president for northern Santa Barbara County, spoke in favor of the project. He stated that the most devastating illness in the civilized world is mental illness. This project will help the Police Department, the court and school systems, and society in general. He reiterated that he is very much for this project.

Iris Willits, 1316 South Broadway, Apt. 302, Vandenberg Senior Residence, spoke in favor of the project. She stated that she has been a private caregiver for 40 years of her life, taking care of people physically and mentally ill. She said that her husband, daughter and granddaughter are all bi-polar, and she went through 30 years of torture trying to figure out what was going on. She urged the Commission to support this facility so that people will have a place to get help.

Shirley Mathews, 280 Valentine Court, Santa Maria, spoke in favor of the project. She is a retired RN of 40 years. She stated that Marian Medical Center emergency room is not capable of handling the numbers of people coming in to emergency. They do not have the staff to handle the mental health clients. She said that this place will mean that people in crisis will have a special place to be—and they won't be frightening other patients in a hospital, including children. She stated that this crisis center will definitely meet a crying need in this community.

Margaret Diaz, 2511 Brunswick Drive, Santa Maria, spoke in favor of the project. She said that she works with the Nanny Program in Santa Maria, and she also has a bi-polar son who lives in Sacramento. She stated that Santa Maria really needs a crisis center. A mentally ill person needs a place that takes them seriously. She gave the example of her son on the streets, needing help, and the crisis center was the only place that could help him. She stressed the need for this kind of facility in Santa Maria.

Sophia Espinosa, 410 East Orange, Apt. A, spoke in favor of the project. She said that four years ago, she never saw the need for mental health facilities. A year later, she had a relative in crisis, and it took a year to get that person any help. She said that if there had been a place

like this, he could have gotten help sooner, and her family would not have gone through the sadness and despair watching this person deteriorate without being able to get help. This project makes her happy, because now there would be somewhere closer to get help. She strongly supports this project.

Richard Miller, Santa Maria, spoke in favor of the project. He stated that there is nothing better than to have professionals available when someone is having a crisis. He has suffered from clinical depression since 1973, and he knows that having professional help available in our community is vital.

Michael Slater, 621 East Church Street, spoke in favor of the project. He said he believes this is an excellent program for the mentally ill.

Tom Urbanske, 3895 La Mesanse, Santa Maria, spoke in favor of the project. He stated that he served on the mental health commission for eight years, and has heard many stories like the ones shared tonight. He stated that having 24/7 care is the best. This project provides a place in the community to work with these people in need. He stated that he believes this program is the best thing for the Police Department and first responders in the community.

Chief Macagni of the Santa Maria Police Department also spoke in favor of the project. He stated that the Police Department strongly supports this project. It is something that is desperately needed in the north county. He said that his officers constantly deal with patients in crisis, and can be with them for four to six hours on calls with nowhere to take them. He said that he's been monitoring this project carefully since its start, working closely with Alcohol and Mental Health, and that the Department strongly supports it.

Commissioner Waterfield commented that the only problem she sees with this project is that it is not big enough. She said that she was taken aback, and appreciated everyone's testimony. She said it touched her deeply, and she would keep each of them in her prayers.

Tina Frank read into the record two letters of concern submitted from the public. The first one was received from Carol Vernon, on June 19, 2006. Among her concerns were that she wanted to have fencing on the side and rear property lines, and also that break areas be designated for employees or staff members only. The letter also suggested that all exits and entrances should have video cameras.

Tina Frank also read into the record a letter received from Phil Tate, an adjacent property owner. Mr. Tate had attended a neighborhood meeting and expressed his concerns and explained problems with previous tenants that had similar patients loitering and intimidating his other tenants. Ms. Frank stated that County staff and management were quick to give verbal assurances that these types of problems would be dealt with quickly and efficiently by the on-site staff. Mr. Tate is also concerned about the perception of this type of use, perhaps making it difficult to lease or sell his property. In the letter, he stated that he does not feel that this use is appropriate for the location; he feels it will seriously impact his property value. Mr. Tate also asked how he will be compensated for these losses. He thinks that the County should look for better alternative sites. Tina Frank did assure Mr. Tate that City staff is working with the County addressing his concerns, and that his concerns will be addressed appropriately by the County.

Chair Everett closed the public hearing, and invited comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Brown stated that he is in complete agreement with Commissioner Moats and Commissioner Waterfield. He also applauded those who got up and spoke.

Commissioner Hunter also voiced her support of this project. She said she thinks it is a good location, and they are to be commended for the work that they do.

Commissioner Moats stated that it is a black and white issue as far as he was concerned. He said that the benefits far outweigh any drawbacks.

Chair Everett also expressed his support of the project, agreeing with the other Commissioners, and applauded the speakers. He said he did disagree with Commissioner Waterfield on one point: he did hope and pray that the facility is too big and that Santa Maria won't need it. He thanked the audience members for caring so much for people that need so much help; it takes a lot of love to love someone going through that.

Chairman Everett called for a motion. Commissioner Waterfield made the motion to approve Resolution No. 2424, to find that the purchase of the property by the County of Santa Barbara is consistent with the City of Santa Maria General Plan; and by motion, approve the project subject to the conditions outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Conditional Use Permit as amended, for the General Plan Consistency Determination and Conditional Use Permit for B3, LLC, for Santa Barbara County – Crisis Outreach Center, 212 West Carmen Lane, U-2006-013, E-2006-034.

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion for the resolution, and it passed, 5-0.

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion to approve the project subject to the conditions outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Conditional Use Permit as amended, 5-0.

ITEM 7 - TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP FOR ADAM BUSINESS PARK, LOCATED AT 222 EAST DONOVAN ROAD, TRACT 5887. Review of a tentative parcel map that would create 2 commercial lots in a PD/CC zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No. 121-012-001. The project qualifies as a Class 15 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is necessary. (Project Planner: Benjamin A. Kimball)

ACTION: Adopted Resolution No. 2425, for the approval of Recommendation No. 2, as amended. Vote: 5-0.

VOTE: Ayes--Commissioners Hunter, Waterfield, Moats, Brown, and Chair Everett; Noes—None; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

Benjamin Kimball presented the staff report. He stated the project is a request for a tentative parcel map to divide one parcel into two parcels. The location is 222 East Donovan Road, the current location of G&S Carpet. The zoning is PD/CC, which is a convenience center zoning with a planned development overlay. A conditional use permit to allow the establishment of G&S Carpet in this zone was approved in 1996. In previous hearings and study sessions, the Planning Commission had expressed concern with some of the outstanding code compliance issues that are currently on the site. The Code Compliance Department is currently working with the applicant to clean up the site.

Mr. Kimball stated that staff had a meeting with the code compliance officer in charge of the case along with the owner of G&S Carpet. The owner of G&S Carpet indicated that he was willing to work with the City on the requirements to clean up the site, and that he was willing to chain across the entries to the site to hinder dumping on the site. Ben Kimball stated that the owner of the business would also be happy to do any anti-graffiti measures required. Also discussed in the meeting was the dumping of carpets outside. In order to address these concerns, staff came up with three options for the Planning Commission to consider:

1. The Planning Commission could, by resolution, approve the tentative map as is, and defer the addressing of the issues to a future item; or
2. By resolution, approve the tentative map with the added condition that the applicant post some sort of security to ensure that the work will be taken care of—either a bond

or treasurer's trust--with a list of what needs to be done and by when, and if not done, use that money to get it done; or

3. Continue to a future study session to allow the applicant time to clean up the site.

Ben Kimball concluded his presentation, and stated that staff was available to answer any questions.

Phil Sinco asked Ben Kimball to show the photographs recently taken of the property showing that it has been cleaned up.

Tom Martinez, architect for the project, narrated the photos as they were displayed, showing the areas on the site that had been cleaned up.

Commissioner Hunter commented that her recollection from the previous study session was that the applicant was going to come up with a list of voluntary improvements that they were willing to make. She asked staff if that had occurred.

Mr. Sinco responded that Tom Martinez contacted him shortly after the last study session and suggested a bond or some kind of security to guarantee that the necessary work would be done as a way to accommodate the Planning Commissioners' concerns. In view of that, the idea of a voluntary agreement fell by the wayside in favor of this new suggestion.

Phil Sinco continued to state that Code Compliance was already working the case and a list of things to be taken care of had been made. Mr. Sinco told the Planning Commission that they had the authority to choose any of the options as presented by staff, but the second option probably would be the most favorable. Mr. Sinco would figure out the dollar amount, and then it would be a condition of approval.

Peggy Woods stated that the subdivision committee minutes start with the pink forms in the packet. She clarified that subdivision committee minutes merely reiterate the various department memos that were discussed at the subdivision committee meeting.

Rodger Olds clarified that the subdivision committee meeting for this project was held on March 16, 2006. The first one was in May of 2005.

Tom Martinez, 2450 Professional Parkway; addressed a question on the memo from Bob Marshall to Marc Bierdzinski, dated April 21, 2005. The memo states that the property line must be a certain amount of space away from the building. This building was originally built to be added on to. He stated that since codes and standards have changed so many times, any attachment to this building would have to come up to current standards. Because of that, the applicant would leave a gap between the two buildings.

Phil Sinco reminded the Commissioners that what was presently being considered was the parcel map only. He stated that concerns about buildings on the site did not need to be discussed at this hearing.

Mr. Sinco also commented that he would not want to condition this map on conditions for code compliance to handle. He stated that those were two different issues. To get approval, the applicant would be willing to post a bond and then fix it.

Commissioner Brown stated his concern that some of the conditions that dealt with aesthetics on the site weren't included in the packet.

Ben Kimball responded to Commissioner Brown that the Planning staff believed that Code Compliance had a complete list of all those items, which included signage, graffiti, paint and other items. He stated that he would like to read into the record a condition of approval that

would refer to that list that Code Compliance currently has in the active code compliance case, and refer to that as the comprehensive list of the items in question.

Phil Sinco stated that the City Planning Commission was limited in the type of conditions they could impose on a map split by what the City ordinance states. He recommended that the Planning Commission let Mr. Kimball tie in the concerns in the manner that he had proposed.

Benjamin Kimball stated that the items that were discussed at the code compliance meeting included painting of the building, fixing the parking lot and alley, sidewalk repair, landscaping, signage, graffiti, trash, and junk cars, as listed in the memo from Wendy Stockton dated June 7, 2006.

Phil Sinco responded to Commissioner Brown's question by stating that while the applicant had agreed to those conditions for the map to proceed, they could not be conditions of approval for the lot split.

Benjamin Kimball read into the record the added condition to the conditions of approval, stating, and "12. The applicant shall post a security deposit in a form acceptable to City Staff, be it a bond, treasurer's trust, or other acceptable form to address the outstanding site clean up and maintenance issues currently being addressed by the City's Code Compliance Division, and outlined in the memorandum provided to the Planning Commission by Wendy Stockton, Senior Deputy City Attorney."

Chairman Everett called for a motion. Commissioner Waterfield made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2425 to approve the official tentative map for Adam Business Park, Tract 5887, subject to the design as shown on the official tentative map and the minutes of the Subdivision Committee meeting of May 24, 2005, and to include condition 12 as read into the record by City staff. Commissioner Moats seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m. to a Study Session on Thursday, June 22, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. in the Community Development Department conference room, 110 S. Pine Street, Santa Maria.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Peggy Woods
PEGGY WOODS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION