



**CITY OF SANTA MARIA
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF
JULY 6, 2006**



Vice-Chair Etta Waterfield called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Chairman Everett

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Division Manager, Peggy Woods
Senior Deputy City Attorney, Wendy Stockton
Senior Civil Engineer, Rodger Olds
Park/Landscape Planning Tech, Patty Ellis
Recording Secretary, Donna Mathews
Planner III, Benjamin Kimball
Planner II, Brian Halvorson, Kristina Gee

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: Bob Ziener, resident at 321 Inger Drive, C-6, Santa Maria, spoke on behalf of putting a full size replica of the Santa Maria (ship) somewhere in the City.

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

VOTE: 4-0 **AYES:** **Commissioners Hunter, Moats, Brown, and Waterfield**
NOES: **None.**
ABSENT: **Commissioner Everett**
ABSTAIN: **None.**

ITEM 1.A – LA VENTANA I DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, SP-2006-017. That the Planning Commission will consider the staff recommendation to adopt a resolution recommending to City Council approval of a Development Agreement for the La Ventana I and if the City and Developer enter into a Development Agreement, the Developer can efficiently provide additional traffic improvements the community needs now. In turn, the City can reimburse the developer for construction costs that exceed the developer’s fair share. The Developer is Inland Pacific Builders. (Project Engineer: David Whitehead)

ACTION: By motion this item was continued to the July 19, 2006, Planning Commission meeting, at the request of the developer. Vote: 4-0

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM 2 – FIVE YEAR EXTENSION OF THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR LAZE DAZE RETIREMENT CENTER, 1316 N BROADWAY, U-1990-009. Review of a request for an extension of time to permit the continuance of a temporary housing unit and use of an existing building for an alcohol/drug recovery program in a PD/C-2 (Planned Development/General Commercial) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel Nos. 121-031-009 and -019. (Project Planner: Kristina Gee)

ACTION: By motion, granted the extension of time for five years. Vote: 4-0, (Commissioner Everett absent).

Ms. Kristina Gee presented the staff report and stated that the application before the commission is for a time extension to permit the continuance of a temporary housing unit and the continued use of an existing building for an alcohol and drug recovery program. The project is located on the site of the Laze Daze retirement center at 1316 N. Broadway. The Conditional Use Permit was first approved in 1991. A condition of approval stated that the permit would expire after five years unless the Planning Commission grants an extension of time. An extension was granted September 15, 2000 for an additional five year period. The applicant has requested another extension for the use. If the extension of time is granted, project approval will expire on July 6, 2011, unless another extension of time request is submitted and approved. The use is under new management and the applicant has been working to improve the site. They have repaired the screen slates on the Sunset Drive side of the property. Staff was available for any questions.

Ms. Peggy Woods responded to Commissioner Brown by stating that this item was not put on the consent calendar, the request is for an extension of the use, staff thought it would give the public a chance to give public input on it, since it did have a five year time limit, and that the project could have some sensitive issues, however, staff has been in touch with the police department and there do not appear to be any issues at this time.

Ms. Gee responded to Commissioner Moats by stating that she coordinated the review of the request with Officer Lopez, who stated that there hadn't been any significant problems with the site. Officer Lopez stated that there had been incidents under previous management, where the management did not allow the Police Department to enter the site, which is why staff made it clear with the new manager that the Police Beat Coordinator have the opportunity to speak up front to make sure there would be no issues.

Ms. Woods clarified that the City is divided into three beats and each of the areas has a Beat Coordinator.

Ms. Gee responded to Commissioner Hunter regarding the landscaping issues by stating that she did go to the site and noticed that there were some bougainvilleas and trees and did note that their ground cover which is grass has been kind of let go and in need of maintenance. Ms. Gee spoke with the applicant earlier that day, and stated that the applicant has made some improvements to the landscaping that the applicant can elaborate on when she speaks.

Ms. Gee responded to Commissioner Hunter's question regarding the time this project was originally approved back in 1991, that there was no requirement in the permit to maintain or install landscaping on the street side, by stating that she reviewed the permit and there was no requirement to install landscaping on the site. Ms. Gee also confirmed that the request before the Commissioners is to approve the renewal for the alcohol and drug center and not the Laze Daze Center.

Ms. Gee responded to Commissioner Hunter's question regarding Laze Daze's expiration of its conditional use permit by stating that most conditional use permits do not expire unless there is a specific provision put on the permit that they expire. This project is unique, in that it is required to be brought back to the commission for renewal; there are only a few other uses like churches in industrial zones that include review of the use permit after a specific amount of time. Most use permits are indefinite when approved.

Ms. Clara Miranda, 1316 N. Broadway, the applicant was present and responded to Commissioner Hunter's concerns regarding the landscaping at Laze Daze, stating that she is the new owner of the center having taken ownership only 14 days ago, and commented that what Commissioner Hunter saw was not her work, but if Commissioner Hunter were to drive by the center now, she would see an improvement, such as replacement of all the missing lattice, stabilization of the fence, and some landscaping. She has every intention of keeping the place up, because it will be a reflection of her. She also mentioned that she is supported by Judge Flores, the Police Department, and the Probation Department it's of the essence that she maintain her integrity in the community.

Ms. Miranda responded to Commissioner Hunter's other concern regarding the other parts of the building maintenance by stating that they are going to be making renovations as needed. She also stated that the landlord is responsible for the exterior of the building, but she was not going to wait, so it will get done.

Ms. Gee responded to Commissioner Hunter's concern with the landscaping in front by stating that staff can review the original conditional use permit for The Laze Daze application and if they are not meeting their conditions staff can work with Code Compliance to make sure the owner bring the landscaping up to par. The applicant of the center is not responsible for the landscaping; they are only there for the use.

Mr. Charles Hefline, 1318 North Broadway, who lives on the other side of the center agreed with everything Ms. Miranda and what she represents. He was there representing the other 87 residents that live on the other side; their concerns are the maintenance of the building, sewer, landscaping, etc. He would like someone to push the property owner to get these things done; the property owner is not a nice person; he wanted this to be stated into the record.

Ms. Gee stated that in her research on the project she did find past code compliance cases with regards to building code issues, but she is aware that Code Compliance has worked with them.

Ms. Wendy Stockton, Senior Deputy Attorney stated that Officer Moreno worked with the owner of the property and resolved the building code issues at the time.

Commissioner Hunter stated that she would like Code Compliance to take another look at the property. She also stated her concerns that the property is permitted for retirement use and should be enforced as such.

Ms. Gee stated that the current use issue is separate from the retirement use.

Commissioner Waterfield closed the hearing to the public and called for a motion. Commissioner Brown made a motion that the Planning Commission grant an extension of five years, authorized by conditional use permit, U-1990-009, at the Lazy Daze Retirement Center at 1316 North Broadway. Commissioner Hunter seconded the motion and it was carried, 4-0.

ITEM 3 – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR PAULETTE LUCIER FOR PLAY THERAPY PLAY STRUCTURES, 219 WEST CHAPEL, PD-2006-007, E-2005-067.

Review of planned development permit to allow the construction of several play therapy play structures in a PD/C-1 (Planned Development/Central Business District) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No.119-273-012. The project is a Class 3 Categorical Exemption based on Section 15303 of the State Environmental Guidelines. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Benjamin Kimball)

ACTION: By motion, approved the project subject to the conditions outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit. Vote: 4-0.

Mr. Benjamin Kimball presented the staff report stating that this application is a request for a planned development permit to allow the construction of four child play structures at 219 W. Chapel, in the downtown area. There is an existing office facility at this location. The play structures would be built behind the office building, in the 'back yard' area. These structures are scaled down and designed to look like a mini child-size village. It is the applicant's intent that these buildings are proposed to include electrical lighting, but no plumbing. These buildings would be used in connection with the existing counseling office to provide children with a place where they could receive play therapy and be monitored by the professional counselors, who have their offices in the existing building on the site. This proposal meets all zoning requirements regarding setbacks, height, and all the other development standards. Staff was available for questions.

Ms. Paulette Lucier, the applicant, was present and addressed the meeting. She stated that there are four counselors at the Little Village who are providing family therapy, individual counseling, play therapy, and other various forms of therapy for the community. It is her belief that this play therapy area will provide a space where the children in the community will feel safe to express themselves freely and feel comfortable in the counseling setting, as opposed to a more sterile office environment.

Commissioner Brown expressed his thanks to the applicant for her endeavors for what he feels will be a plus for the children.

Commissioner Waterfield closed the hearing to the public and called for a motion. Commissioner Moats made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the project, subject to the conditions outlined in the preliminary draft of the planned development permit for Paulette Lucier, for play therapy play structures at 219 W. Chapel Street, PD-2006-007 and E-2005-067. Commissioner Hunter seconded the motion and it was carried, 4-0.

ITEM 4 – TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP FOR CENTRAL COAST PACKAGING, TRACT 5907, E-2006-010. Review of a tentative parcel map that would create two industrial lots in a PD/M-2 (Planned Development/General Manufacturing) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No. 117-630-016. The project qualifies as a class 15 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Benjamin A. Kimball)

ACTION: Adopted Resolution No. 2426, approving the design as shown on the Official Tentative Map and conditions set forth in the March 14, 2006, Subdivision Committee Minutes.

Mr. Benjamin Kimball presented the staff report. This project is located on the west side of Blosser Road, in between Blosser Road and the Santa Maria Valley Railroad. The exact location is described as being the west end of Craig Drive and Jill Street. These are the two small cul-de-sac roads that are on the east portion of the site that gives the site vehicular access. The zoning designation for this site is PD/M2. This is a heavy manufacturing site and was previously approved for the industrial Central Coast Packaging business. The proposal before the planning commission is to divide the property, approximately in half. The original site is 11.24 acres. The newly formed lots would be 5.02 and 6.22 acres. The proposal meets all zoning standards as far as lot sizes. The lots will have access through recorded easements and there are no setbacks or other issues that would cause any concerns. Staff is recommending approval of the project and is available for questions.

Commissioner Moats inquired if there were any landscaping requirements in connection with the proposed split.

Mr. Kimball stated that no, there are no landscaping requirements as part of the lot split proposal, but there was substantial landscaping required with the planned development permit. When the building is constructed, the applicant will need to adhere to those landscaping requirements.

Mr. Jerry Clary, 512 Parkview North, the applicant, was present, and stated that nothing was changed in the original planned development, except that they have two more trees.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Clary why he wanted to split this lot.

Mr. Clary replied that the lot split is proposed because of financial reasons and a stand-alone situation benefits them to split the property according to the banks and the SBA.

Commissioner Waterfield closed the public hearing and called for the adoption of Resolution No. 2426. Commissioner Brown made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2426, to approve the Central Coast Packaging Tentative Parcel Map, Tract 5907, subject to the design as shown on the tentative map, and the conditions set forth in the March 14, 2006, subdivision committee meeting for Central Coast Packaging, Tract 5907, E-2006-010. Commissioner Moats seconded the adoption of Resolution No. 2426, and it was carried 4-0.

VOTE: 4-0; Ayes: Commissioners Hunter, Moats, Brown, Waterfield; Noes: None; Abstained: None; Absent: Chairman Everett.

ITEM 5 – APPEAL OF ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S DECISION TO REQUIRE OFF-STREET PARKING FOR A TWO-STORY ADDITION, 1219 NORTH GOLDEN DRIVE, SP-2006-015. An appeal from Mr. Pedro Ojeda, property owner, of the Zoning Administrator’s decision to require a second off-street parking space pursuant to Municipal Code Section 12-32.03(a)(1)(B). (Project Planner: Peggy Woods)

ACTION: By motion, denied the appeal; Vote: 3-1; Ayes: Commissioners Hunter, Moats and Waterfield; Noes: Commissioner Brown; Absent: Chairman Everett

Ms. Peggy Woods presented the staff report. This item is an appeal of the zoning administrator’s determination for off-street parking. Ms. Woods then read Section Title 12, Chapter 12-32, Section 12-32.03(a)(1)(B), “Off-street parking spaces required”, into the record. She then stated that this issue pertains to a two-story addition to a single family dwelling at 1219 N. Golden Drive. There had been an existing single story residence of approximately 1,200 square feet, consisting of a living room, kitchen, 2 bedrooms, a bathroom, and an office/den with an attached single car garage that measured approximately 10 feet wide by 19 feet deep. The single family dwelling was constructed in the year 1961. Plans for a two-story addition were submitted on November 1, 2005. The proposed two-story addition consisted of approximately 1,200 square feet, double the size of the existing house, and consisted of a family room, laundry room, 2 bedrooms, 1-1/2 bathrooms, and a 240 square foot patio. The off-street parking requirements were noted as one of several Planning Division corrections to the plans during the plan check process for the two-story addition. Upon resubmittal of the plans for the two-story addition, the site plan was revised to show the second off-street parking space. Based upon the applicant’s addressing the corrections on the Planning Division plan check correction list, and showing the second parking space which is a concrete pad, the plans were approved by the Planning Division on February 17, 2006. The building permit was issued February 22, 2006. The appeal for the required second parking space was filed on May 3, 2006. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission deny the appeal and direct the property owner, Mr. Ojeda, to comply with Section 12-32.03(a)(1)(B), of the Santa Maria Municipal Code, and provide the paved off-street parking pad area as shown on the approved site plan. Staff was available for questions.

Mr. Pedro Ojeda, 1219 North Golden Drive, the applicant was present and available for questions.

Commissioner Waterfield asked Mr. Ojeda if he understood that he would have to put in additional parking when the plans were drawn up.

Mrs. Ojeda spoke on Mr. Ojeda's behalf, stating that they did not entirely understand the additional parking requirement, because they were under the impression that they would not need a second pad because they had sufficient parking in the front of the house, with two car parking with two entrances to the backyard.

Commissioner Waterfield asked if they ever questioned the specific area where the pad was to be located on the plans.

Mrs. Ojeda responded that she asked why it would have to be located where the plans showed because it is three times the distance to the entrance of the house from the parking in front of the house. She stated that they are concerned for their safety, as the local area crime is increasing. She stated that they don't feel they need a second pad. She further expressed that they care for a 9-year-old quadriplegic child and opening the existing block wall, for the placement of the pad, would compromise his safety.

Commissioner Hunter recalled that Commissioner Brown had asked staff in the study session meeting, whether there was something that could be done with the front yard parking. She asked staff if there were two front parking pads or there was just one.

Ms. Woods stated that there is currently a single car garage, a driveway leading to that single car garage. She further stated that next to the driveway there are two paved strips, which the owner may be using for parking, but there is no curb cut to provide access to that area and it is behind a short block wall and in the setback area. The off-street parking requirement is that the additional parking space is to be provided outside of any setback area. So technically, the driveway and the parking strips do not qualify as meeting the requirement.

Commissioner Waterfield asked if removing the short block wall and providing a curb cut access to the area next to the driveway would be appropriate.

Ms. Woods stated that, according to the code, the parking would need to be behind the property setback line, which is 15 to 20 feet behind the property line.

Commissioner Brown, asked Senior Deputy City Attorney, Wendy Stockton, to comment on the fact that the beginning of Section 12-32.03(a)(1)(B), of the Santa Maria Municipal Code, could be confusing regarding construction before and after the October 22, 1976, timeline.

Attorney Stockton stated that while the beginning of the Code may be confusing, if you read the whole section, it clarifies that the parking is required to be behind the setback line. She stated that this code only applies when you increase your living area, and Mr. and Mrs. Ojeda doubled their living area. The only exception would be if there is no room for a second parking space, but that isn't the case in this instance.

Mrs. Ojeda asked why a house down the street, which had a larger addition built on it and still has only a one-car garage, did not have to build a second parking pad.

Ms. Woods stated that she was not familiar with the other project, and she did not have the plans to that project with her, she could not state why a second parking space was not provided. She suggested that some possibilities could be that they had never filed plans for the addition, or perhaps there had been special circumstances, such as no room for a second parking space or different setback line situations.

Commissioner Moats asked if the Ojedas had already built the addition.

Ms. Woods replied that the addition was complete and Mr. Ojeda had requested a final inspection. The appeal was filed on May 3, 2006, and at that time the addition was close to completion.

Following a general discussion regarding other options, such as using a gated entrance to the backyard, Ms Woods stated that the City had to “look beyond” the needs of the current owners to the future growth of the City, including parking. She further stated that if Mr. and Mrs. Ojeda wished to submit an alternative parking solution, the Planning Division would review the plans and work with them to achieve compliance.

Commissioner Waterfield stated that while she sympathized with Mr. and Mrs. Ojeda’s concern, they had agreed to the plans, including the second parking pad, before construction began.

Mr. Gilbert Gilmar, of Gilmar Construction, 1735 N. DeJoy, general contractor for Mr. and Mrs. Ojeda, stated that he built the addition in accordance with the original plans. He said that the parking pad “suddenly showed up” on the plans after they had been corrected several times. Mr. and Mrs. Ojeda informed Mr. Gilmar that the City would not issue the permit without additional parking and asked him to draw something on the plan for additional parking. Mr. Gilmar said that he feels that the code which requires the additional parking space in the back does not make sense in this case.

Attorney Stockton stated that it is the job of the licensed professional architects and contractors to know the current building codes and to bring in plans that adhere to those codes. They should not be submitting plans that are not in compliance with the codes for the Planning Division to catch. She feels that if the professionals had done their job correctly in the first place, this issue would not be a problem now.

Commissioner Moats asked Mr. Gilmar why he did not bring the issue before the Commission before starting on the project.

He replied that the plancheck process was taking a long time. By the time they had asked for the additional parking, he and the architect had already begun building the structure. They added the additional parking in the plans, but didn’t think it would be required since the residence already had sufficient parking in front.

Commissioner Waterfield stated that perhaps the contractor and Mr. and Mrs. Ojeda had jumped the gun on the actual construction. She went on to say that perhaps if they had dealt with the additional parking before construction, they might have had other options. Now that the construction of the addition is complete, the only legal option for the additional parking pad is where it is currently shown on the approved plans.

There was a discussion among the Commissioners regarding the possibility of Mr. and Mrs. Ojeda appealing to the City Council, but Attorney Stockton informed them that this issue does not apply to the appeal standards. Commissioner Moats stated that it seemed that legally there was no way they could vote in favor of this appeal. To which, Attorney Stockton replied that would be her legal advice.

Commissioner Waterfield closed the hearing to the public and called for a motion. Commissioner Hunter made a motion that the Planning Commission deny the appeal and direct the property owner to provide the required off-street parking space in the accordance with Santa Maria Municipal Code, Section 12-32.03(a)(1)(B), off-street parking spaces required for SP-2006-015. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion with reluctance. Motion passed 3 to 1 with Commissioner Brown voting no.

ITEM 6 – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP FOR HARVEST GLEN TOWNHOMES, LOCATED SOUTH OF SONYA LANE, EAST OF BISCAYNE STREET (EXTENDED), WEST OF THE SANTA MARIA VALLEY RAILROAD AND NORTH OF CARMEN LANE (EXTENDED), TRACT 5906. Review of a tentative tract map that would create 203 residential lots and 15 common lots on a 13.09 acre lot. The zoning of the site is PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential). Assessor's Parcel No. 117-330-018. The project has been reviewed in a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report prepared for GPZ-2002-007. No further environmental review is required.

ACTION: Adopted Resolution No. 2427, recommending to City Council the approval of the tentative map.

ITEM 7 – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR THE HARVEST GLEN TOWNHOMES, LOCATED SOUTH OF SONYA LANE, EAST OF BISCAYNE STREET (EXTENDED), WEST OF THE SANTA MARIA VALLEY RAILROAD AND NORTH OF CARMEN LANE (EXTENDED), PD-2005-031, E-2005-079. Review of a Planned Development permit to allow 203 townhome units located in a PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential) zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 117-330-018. The project has been reviewed in a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for GPZ-2002-007. No further environmental review is required.

ACTION: By motion, continued this item until August 2, 2006, public hearing. Vote: 3-0; Ayes: Commissioners Moats, Brown and Waterfield; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Chairman Everett; Commissioner Hunter: Stepped down due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Brian Halvorson presented a combined staff report on both Item No's 6 (Harvest Glen Townhomes, Tract 5906) and 7 (Harvest Glen Townhomes, PD-2005-031). The location is east of Blosser Road, west of Biscayne Street (extended), north of Carmen Lane (extended) and south of Sonja Lane. The zoning is PD/R3, which is Planned Development/High Density Residential. The General Plan Land Use designation, specified in the Specific Plan as well, is HDR, (High-Density Residential – 18 units maximum per acre).

The tentative map request is to subdivide a 13 acre parcel into 203 residential lots and 15 common lots. There is also a Planned Development permit for the construction of 203 3-story townhomes on small lots, including a community building, clubhouse with fitness center, two parks, a tot lot, 147 uncovered guest parking spaces and 359 covered spaces. The development also includes on-site storage units, which are located on the western perimeter of the site. All setback requirements for this project have been met.

Mr. Halvorson stated there is a slight deviation from the normal requirement in the Blosser Specific Plan for the height restriction. The height restriction for this zoning district, which is R-3, is 35 feet. Some of these units will approach the height at the top of the roof at 37 feet. The Zoning Administrator does have the authority to recommend approval to the Planning Commission, buildings or structures that are higher than the height requirement in the Specific Plans or per the Zoning Ordinance.

He also said that, as proposed, the project is deficient parking. A total of 47 covered parking stalls are deficient for this project. The code requires two covered parking spaces per unit. The Planning Commission does have the ability to approve this project with variable parking. Approximately 28 percent of the site would be landscaped. The site would also include two parks and one tot lot. Access to the site includes three driveways along Biscayne, on the east. There will also be one additional driveway, which will only be used for emergency access and trash. There will also be a driveway to the south, off Carmen Lane. A regional basin, which is located to the northeast of this project, would serve the storm water needs of this project.

All homes are proposed to be three-stories and would contain a two-car garage, although unit type E would only have a 1-car garage. The units would range from 1,100 to 1,600 square feet in size. All townhomes would have at least two or three bedrooms and at least 2-1/2 to 3-1/2 bathrooms.

He stated that one of the issues to be discussed at this meeting is the parking. This project is deficient 47 stalls of covered parking. The deficiency is due to the applicant proposing Unit Es with a 1-car garage with uncovered parking nearby. The permit is worded for the Planning Commission to either allow the deficient parking or to adhere to the requirement for the covered parking.

He also presented a supplemental memo from Robert Brown, Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc., acoustical consultants. It stated that a three-foot wall along Carman Lane, instead of the previously recommended 5-foot wall, is being recommended now because it will still mitigate noise to a level which would be acceptable according to the City's General Plan. However, the three-foot-wall would not mitigate heavy noise, such as large trucks.

Staff's recommendation is to recommend approval of the tentative map to the City Council. After the tentative map is approved by City Council, then the Planned Development Permit will be ready to act on by the Planning Commission. Staff recommends continuance of the Planned Development. Mr. Halvorson was available to answer any questions.

Attorney Stockton voiced her concerns regarding the noise mitigation issue with the wall. She would like to see evidence that a three-foot-wall would mitigate the 60 decibels required by the city.

Mr. Halvorson said that to his knowledge, there is no definite information stating the correlation between a three, six or eight-foot-wall and the amount of decibels mitigated.

Roger Olds, Senior Civil Engineer stated that Carmen Lane is a "collector" street. While it would be used by fire engines, it is basically a small two-lane street with light traffic. He could not guarantee that large trucks would not use the street, but it is not considered a main street which large trucks would use on a regular basis.

Mr. Halvorson next called attention to staff's concerns regarding the deficient covered parking for the E-units. He stated that the applicant has assigned uncovered parking stalls for these one car garage units, however, in several cases these assigned stalls are up to 100 or more feet from the residence. The applicant informed him that there is "bonus" parking on Carmen Lane and Biscayne Street, which the tenants would probably prefer to use, as it is closer to the units in question. Staff recommends that the uncovered parking stall should be reconfigured so that they are closer to these E-units.

Attorney Stockton stated that in the Subdivision Committee Memo, dated April 4, 2006, and submitted by the Community Development Department, Item 23b states "The design or the improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the applicable General and Specific Plans...", which would mean that the noise mitigation issue must be addressed before the tentative map is approved. The consultant should prepare appropriate mitigation so that the standard should be met.

Staff is recommending that both the tentative map and the Planned Development Permit be continued pending approval of the map by City Council. He proposed to discuss Planning Commission issues and recommendations with the applicant prior to this meeting.

Laurie Tamura, Urban Planning Concepts, spoke on behalf of the applicant, Jay Higgins, Capital Pacific Homes. She stated that originally the Acquistapace project was part of the Blosser Southeast Specific Plan submitted in 1993. This is the last area of the Specific Plan area which is being referred to as Harvest Glen Townhomes. The property was designated for R-3 (High Density 18 units per acre). The density being proposed now is approximately 15-1/2 units per acre. The owners of the homes will actually own, not only the footprint of their home, but also the front and back of the units which include front areas and patios. The price should start in the mid \$300,000 range. These units do have garages. The development is built to incorporate the surrounding community by placing courtyards and entrances facing the streets, with the garages located on an internal service street, or alley.

Ms. Tamura presented a slide show of architecture, landscaping, layout and elevations. She showed where the southern wall, along Carmen Lane, is recommended to be five feet in height. They would prefer a three-foot wall to continue with the open community feel of the plan, but are willing to build the five-foot wall if it is required for the permits. She showed proximity of the project to the park and school, and where the flood basin would be located.

She addressed the parking issue with reference to the E-units, which only have one covered parking space. They can look at more parking in the project, if they remove the excess storage units that are shown along Blosser Road. They do have the necessary 46 parking spaces for the E-units scattered throughout the site. The homeowners association would assign parking stickers for these spaces and police the parking area as well. The guest parking will be clearly marked.

Commissioner Waterfield requested clarification regarding the wall cap and the size of the courtyard.

Ms. Tamura stated that they had decided to round the top wall cap on the three-foot wall to give it a more uniform feel. They are concerned that while some people would probably put nice planters and such on a flat wall cap, it could give an uneven feel to the overall architecture, depending what people decided was appropriate to place on the wall cap.

Commissioner Moats brought up the concern regarding the distance of the additional uncovered parking spaces to the specified E-units.

Ms. Tamura said that they were concerned regarding the distance; they felt the 3rd bedroom was more important than a 2-car garage. She stated that in projects such as this, there is always some distance to walk to shared or common parking areas and they feel that their solution of the uncovered parking spaces is a good compromise. She further stated that there is also parking on the street facing many of the units, which may be closer than the assigned uncovered parking spaces.

Commissioner Moats asked why the Plan D has a much wider lot than the other plans.

Ms. Tamura explained that Plan D is a two-story plan, as opposed to the three-story plans, so it is a wider plan than the others. This would be a premium lot providing fewer stairs and a larger courtyard and patio area. She also stated that this will give some variation throughout the architecture as well.

Mr. Jay Higgins, Capital Pacific Homes, applicant, stated that he has had the civil engineers working on the uncovered parking issue. They are still working to get those spaces as close to the units as possible. Currently, there are only seven units which are located more than 60 feet from their assigned, uncovered parking spaces.

Commissioner Brown stated that in other such projects the issue of uncovered parking was resolved by building a carport structure over the parking spaces, and asked if this could possibly be added to the assigned parking spaces.

Mr. Higgins replied that it is feasible to construct carports over many of the parking spaces, but that they are concerned that carports may create visual canyons in a space with so many three-story buildings. It could also create visual obstructions of the park, school and courtyard areas, which is a concern for to a project that is marketing to families with young children. For these reasons, they would prefer not to build the carports.

Commissioner Moats asked if the carports could be built only on the 47 designated parking spaces.

Mr. Higgins will provide drawings which show all the parking spaces covered, and ones with only the designated parking spaces covered.

Mr. Halvorson advised Attorney Stockton that the Planning Commission does have the ability to approve a project that does not meet municipal covered parking.

Commissioner Moats asked Mr. Halvorson's and Ms. Woods' opinion on the parking spaces that are 120 feet away from the townhomes.

Mr. Halvorson responded that they are concerned that some of the distances are too far away from the townhomes, and they would like these spaces closer. He voiced their concerns regarding parents transporting children and/or groceries, and inclement weather. He compared these plans to similar projects which seemed to be able to provide closer parking. He does feel that the applicant has made good faith efforts to redesign the site, but is unable to.

Mr. Higgins addressed the concerns of Commissioner Moats, and the staff with regards to the parking. He hopes that the Planning Commission and staff will take into consideration the overall design of the project, which is a more traditional open community, as opposed to the many closed and gated communities recently built. He also pointed that there is no competing housing project nearby for street parking, so that once school is out for the day, there is plenty of street parking which is closer to the units in question.

Commissioner Waterfield closed the hearing to the public for both Item 6 and 7 and called for a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2427, for Item 6. Commissioner Moats recommended adopting Resolution No. 2427 recommending that City Council approve the Harvest Glen Townhomes, Tentative Map, Tract 5906, subject to the conditions set forth in the April 4, 2006, Subdivision Committee minutes for the Harvest Glen Townhomes, Tentative Map, Tract 5906, the location is east of Blosser Road, west of Biscayne Street (extended), north of Carmen Lane (extended) and south of Sonja Lane.

VOTE: 3-0; Ayes: Commissioners Moats, Brown and Waterfield; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Chairman Everett. Commissioner Hunter, stepped down, due to a declared conflict of interest

Commissioner Waterfield called for a motion to continue Item 7. Commission Brown made a motion that PD-2005-031 be continued until Tract 5906 is approved by the City Council. Public testimony remains open until the next public hearing on August 2, 2006 for Harvest Glen Townhomes, PD-2005-031, located at the east of Blosser Road, west of Biscayne Street (extended), north of Carmen Lane (extended) and south of Sonja Lane.

VOTE: 3-0; Ayes: Commissioners Moats, Brown and Waterfield; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Chairman Everett. Commissioner Hunter, stepped down, due to a declared conflict of interest

Note: *Tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting of August 2, 2006.*

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. to a Special Study Session on July 13, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. in the Community Development Department conference room, 110 S. Pine Street, Santa Maria.

Respectfully submitted,

PEGGY WOODS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

dJuly06, 2006 minutes FINAL.doc
Approved as written at the PC meeting of November 1, 2006