



CITY OF SANTA MARIA
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF
JANUARY 17, 2007



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

PRESENT: Commissioners Lawnae Hunter, Michael W. Moats,
Rodger Brown, Etta Waterfield, and Adrian Andrade.

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

BY MOTION, APPROVED THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 2, AUGUST 16, SEPTEMBER 6, AND SEPTEMBER 20, 2006, AS WRITTEN.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM 1 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR CENTRAL COAST WINE SERVICES' OUTSIDE STORAGE, LOCATED AT 2717 AVIATION WAY, U-2006-025, E-2005-023. Review of a Conditional Use Permit to allow outside storage in a PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No. 111-292-021. This project qualifies as a Class 3 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Benjamin Kimball)

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

Mr. Benjamin Kimball presented the staff report. He presented drawings and maps of the proposed outside storage area with respect to the surrounding area and other businesses. The proposal is to store the materials for the Central Coast Wine Services and the wine operations. The height of the new storage is a maximum of 24 feet tall. The materials will be stored on metal and solid racks near the buildings. Because the storage area is located to the side and rear of the building, it will not be visible from the main right-of-way. He said that although some parking spaces will be lost to the outdoor storage use, a sufficient number of parking spaces, totaling 288, will be maintained, clear and accessible to meet minimum zoning standards of 281 spaces. A special condition of approval has been added to the Conditional Use Permit to insure that the minimum parking be maintained on the site. The proposal meets all other zoning regulations. This is a class 3 categorical exemption from CEQA. Mr. Kimball stated that staff recommended approval and was available for questions.

Commissioner Moats stated that, in his estimate, it appeared over 100 parking spaces will be lost to the storage area. He asked how they could lose 100 parking spaces and still have sufficient parking.

Mr. Kimball stated that originally there had been over 400 parking spaces. He further commented that while the size of the building appears to need a lot of parking, in actuality, there is very little office space in the building.

Acting Chairperson Waterfield commented that the building was previously owned by Arrow Automotive, which was a manufacturing company. At that time, they had several employees and did use all of the parking spaces.

Mr. Kimball also informed the Commission that, if Central Coast Wine Services were to vacate the site, all of the parking would be restored to the original amount.

Commissioner Hunter inquired if staff had inspected the site for landscape compliance, and if the landscaping was being maintained properly.

Mr. Kimball said that the landscaped area exceeds the landscaping minimum requirements and that he did not notice any unmaintained areas. He further stated that he did not specifically inspect the landscaping, but was sure that any unsightly areas would have stood out.

Acting Chairperson Waterfield then asked the applicant to address the Commission.

Tom Martinez, Martinez & Associates, 2426 Airpark Drive, the architect and agent for the project, came forward. Mr. Martinez stated that they had no reservation with regard to the conditions of approval. He commented that this is actually the fourth and final stage of a previously approved planned development permit. He reiterated that the parking spaces have been maintained and that, should Central Coast Wine Services vacate the building, there would still be sufficient parking to accommodate light manufacturing.

Mr. Martinez also commented on the landscaping, stating that it is well maintained and he has never received any negative comments or complaints regarding it.

After verifying that the Commissioners had no further questions for the applicant, Acting Chairperson Waterfield opened the floor to anyone else present who wished to speak in favor or opposition of the proposed project.

There were no comments.

Acting Chairperson Waterfield closed the hearing and entertained a motion to approve the project.

Commissioner Brown made the motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for Central Coast Wine Services, for outside storage, located at 2717 Aviation Way U-2006-025, E-2005-023, subject to the conditions outlined in the preliminary draft of the Conditional Use Permit. Commissioner Moats seconded it. Motion passed, 5 - 0.

ITEM 2 – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR A MIXED-USE PROJECT THAT WOULD INCLUDE AN ELDERLY RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY ON THE 2ND FLOOR OF AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING, LOCATED AT 117 NORTH BROADWAY, PD-2006-008, E-2006-032. Review of a Planned Development permit to allow an elderly residential care facility within an existing commercial building, located in a PD/C-1 (Planned Development/Central Business District) zoning district. Assessor's Parcel No. 119-276-003. This project qualifies as a Class 32 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Brian Halvorson)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: By motion, approve the project subject to the conditions outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit.

Mr. Brian Halvorson presented the staff report by stating that the location of the project is 117 North Broadway (north of Main Street, south of West Chapel and adjacent to the North China Restaurant), the zoning is in a PD/C-1 (Planned Development/Central Business District) and General Plan is CD-1 (Central District 1). The proposed project is nine (9) elderly/assisted care apartment units on the 2nd floor within an existing commercial building. The 1st floor would remain a retail use. The applicant is proposing the following floor plan improvements: 9 units with no more than two (2) residents per unit, a dining/living area, kitchen with on-site chef, library/recreation room, office/receptionist/24 hour staffing, two (2) restrooms, and a new elevator access and an emergency exterior staircase. All setbacks, parking, (20 spaces required) and height requirements have been met for the existing building and the proposed uses.

Due to the nature of the existing building and its location within the original four-square mile area of the City, the following landscape improvements are recommended as a condition to the Commission based on Municipal Code Section 12-35.201, which allows the Commission to approve variable landscaping requirements: Tree wells in front of the building to contain decorative pavers, a total of two (2) heavy decorative potted plants near the eastern building storefront (Broadway frontage), and new landscape planter at the rear of the building adjacent to the parking lot. Access to the site would be from an existing driveway on West Chapel Street. All storm water for this project would be directed to the adjoining streets.

Mr. Halvorson stated that the applicant plans to make several improvements to both the east and west building elevations. These improvements include new awnings and windows, exposed brick around windows, the roofline, and the base of the building. Staff is recommending that the east building elevation incorporate at least two decorative exterior lighting fixtures. This will help the building architecture and also create more lighting for residents/visitors entering the building at night.

Mr. Halvorson further stated that the Community Development Department had placed one (1) additional Community Development Department Special Condition for this project as described in a supplemental memo distributed to the Commission that evening. The proposed exterior staircase attached to the west side of the existing building shall not cross legal property lines. A Lot Line Adjustment and/or Lot Merger application shall be submitted. The other items in the memo were "clean-up" items to clarify that the landscape and floor plans remain as presented in the plans approved by the Commission. Staff recommended approval of the project and was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Brown asked about the restroom facilities. How many would there be, and would the rooms have any type of sanitary stations, such as sinks or showers?

Mr. Halvorson replied that there are two (2) efficiency unit restrooms, one (1) male and one (1) female on either side of the hall for the use of the staff and residents. He was unsure about any other facilities available to the residents and referred the question to the applicant.

Acting Chairperson Waterfield asked the applicant to come forward and address the Commission.

Mr. George Garcia, with Garcia Architecture and Design, 1037 Mill Street, San Luis Obispo, came forward. Mr. Garcia stated that the intent of the project is a RCFE residential care facility for the elderly. The rooms are laid out in such a way that there is a single occupant, or SRO, with common facilities. The two (2) restrooms being provided are unisex, are fully functional, meaning that they have showers, one (1) with an ADA accessible shower stall and one (1) with an ADA accessible step-in bath facility. He stated that because they expect both ambulatory and

non-ambulatory folks to be living in the facility, they are providing facilities for both types of people. He also clarified that the rooms are basically private bedrooms and will not have sinks or other facilities in them.

Commissioner Hunter stated her approval of having a senior care facility in the downtown area, but was concerned that there didn't appear to be any place for the residents to sit outside in the fresh air. Having visited several care facilities to look for accommodations for her mother, she feels very strongly about a fresh air seating area. She pointed out that although the facility was close to a park and shopping center, it was unlikely that the residents could realistically walk to the public park or that enough staff would be available to assist the residents to the park or shopping center on an individual basis.

Mr. Halvorson replied that there is not an on-site outdoor seating area available, but the facility is located across the street from a park. He also noted that, in this mixed-use area, there is a zero requirement for open space.

Commissioner Hunter reiterated that she feels very strongly about this and that she was open to suggestions for an outdoor area and asked staff and the applicant if a roof area might be possible.

A discussion ensued with suggestions from the applicant, staff and other Commissioners. Among the suggestions were roof top gardens, balconies, and seating areas either in the parking lot or on the front sidewalk. Unfortunately, many of the options offered were met with numerous obstacles. Mr. Garcia stated that because the roof is pitched, a roof top area would not be an option. Commissioner Hunter inquired about a ground level area off the back of the building, but it was pointed out that this would encroach on the parking lot and that the residents would still have to exit at the front of the building and then walk all the way around the building to the back. Mr. Garcia felt that perhaps a seating area on the front sidewalk could be arranged. Commissioner Moats suggested a second floor balcony over the back of the building. Commissioner Andrade felt that there was a safety issue with a balcony over the parking lot because of the large delivery trucks that use the service entrances along the back. Mr. Halvorson stated that a second floor balcony off the front of the building would make more sense because that's where the living area is and it would provide a better view for the residents because of the park across the street. He then recalled that there would be a set-back issue because the front of the building falls on the property line so there would be an encroachment into public right-of-way. He felt that the Engineering Division should be brought in to address these issues to see if a permit would be possible.

After further discussion of the options, Commissioner Hunter stated that she would be happy to just add a condition to the permit that requires an outdoor area of approximately 200 square feet and to let the applicant and staff work out the logistics and legalities of where to incorporate it.

Attorney Wendy Stockton suggested that the wording be "The project shall provide an area for safe, outdoor, open space for recreation in the amount of approximately 200 square feet. The space may consist of a balcony, atrium, patio or similar improvement."

It was finally decided that the wording would permit enough room for the applicant and staff to work with some options, and still not be held up for approval.

Commissioner Moats noted that the signage for the furniture store was outdated and asked if it would be replaced, as was shown in the plans.

Mr. Garcia agreed that the signage would be improved.

Mr. Garcia also stated that he had met with the Building Division with regard to the lot line adjustment or merger, since buildings will be crossing lot lines. They felt that since the owner of all three lots in question is the same person, this would probably not be an issue.

His second concern was with the fees for the project that, according to his calculations, are in excess of the \$60,000 fee calculation. He stated that since this is an infill project the fees seemed extremely high, and that the owner was concerned because he estimated the entire job to be between \$450,000 and \$500,000. They feel that the fee is excessive especially since they would be bringing housing into the downtown area in accordance with the new Downtown Specific Plan.

Mr. Rodger Olds, Senior Civil Engineer stated that they will work with the applicant and review lot lines and review the amount of \$60,000. He indicated that at this time the figure was not a fee but an estimate of what may be required. He will have to see if there is an alley located on the property and if so, whether alley improvements are required.

Mr. Garcia's final concern was with the fee of \$5,159 per dwelling unit. He asked what constituted a "unit".

Patty Ellis, with Recreation and Parks Department, stated that she will go back and take another look at the plans. She initially thought the nine (9) rooms would be self-contained units with restrooms. Ms. Ellis said that now that she understands that this is more of a "group home" she will re-evaluate the fees.

After verifying that the Commissioners had no further questions for the applicant, Acting Chairperson Waterfield opened the floor to anyone else present who wished to speak in favor or opposition of the proposed project.

There were no comments.

Acting Chairperson Waterfield closed the hearing and entertained a motion to approve the project.

Commissioner Brown made the motion to approve the Planned Development Permit for a mixed-use project that would include an elderly residential care facility on the second floor of an existing commercial building, located at 117 North Broadway, PD-2006-008, E-2006-032, with the additions that Attorney Stockton has read into the record and also the memo received dated January 17, 2007, for the RCFE mixed-use project, and subject to the conditions outlined in the preliminary draft of the Planned Development Permit. Commissioner Hunter seconded it. Motion passed, 4-0-1 (Commissioner Andrade abstained).

ITEM 3 – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP FOR TEMPLETON SANTA BARBARA PROPERTIES, LLC, FOR THE TERRACES AT PACIFIC CREST ON PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF WEST BATTLES ROAD AND SOUTH DEPOT STREET, TRACT 5904, E-2005-029.

Review of a tentative tract map that would create 112 airspace condominiums and associated common area facilities on seven (7) lots that range from 0.43 to 1.90 acres in size, in a PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential) zoning district on 8.36 acres, Assessor's Parcel No. 118-010-058. The environmental impacts of the project were analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), E-88-10 (SCH #90010930), prepared for the Sphere of Influence Boundary Amendment and Concurrent Annexation, and Addendums to FEIR E-88-10, E-2001-006, E-2002-055, and E-2005-029. The proposed land division is consistent with the project evaluated in the FEIR and Addendums. Therefore, no further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Bill Scott)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: That the Planning Commission, by resolution, approve the Terraces at Pacific Crest Airspace Condominiums, Tract 5904, subject to the following:

1. The design as shown on the Official Tentative Map; and
2. The conditions set forth in the April 4, 2006, revised Subdivision Committee Minutes.

ITEM 4 – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE TERRACES AT PACIFIC CREST ON PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF WEST BATTLES ROAD AND SOUTH DEPOT STREET, PD-2006-003, E-2006-007.

Review of a Planned Development permit to allow the construction of 112 airspace condominiums ranging in size from 1,360 square feet to 1,645 square feet in a PD/R-3 (Planned Development/High Density Residential) zoning district on 8.36 acres, Assessor's Parcel No. 118-010-058. The environmental impacts of the project were analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), E-88-10, E-2001-006, E-2002-055, and E-2005-029. The proposed project is consistent with the project evaluated in the FEIR and Addendums. Therefore, no further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Bill Scott)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: By motion, approve the project subject to the conditions outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit.

Mr. Bill Scott presented the staff report for Item 3, a Tentative Tract Map, and Item 4, a request for a Planned Development Permit for The Terraces at Pacific Crest Airspace Condominium project. The project site is located on an 8.36 gross acre site in the PD/R3 Planned Development High Density Residential Zoning District on the southwest corner of West Battles Road and South Depot Street. The project site is also designated HDR-16 (High Density Residential – 16 dwelling units/acre) located within the Blosser Southeast Specific Plan.

The Tentative Tract Map, entitled Tract 5904, the Terraces at Pacific Crest, is a tentative subdivision of one parcel into a total of seven (7) lots for 112 residential airspace condominium purposes. Six (6) of the residential lots, ranging in size from 0.93 acres to 1.9 acres would be used for the actual residential condominiums. The seventh 0.43 acre lot would be used for a common area and open space facilities.

The potential environmental impacts of the project were analyzed through the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the original Sphere of Influence Expansion and Annexation for the area and subsequent addendums.

Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission adopt, by resolution, the Terraces at Pacific Crest Airspace Condominiums, Tentative Tract Map, for Tract 5904, subject to the conditions set forth in the April 4, 2006, Subdivision Committee Minutes.

Second, approve the Planned Development permit for the Terraces at Pacific Crest, at the above reference location, to allow construction of 112 airspace condominiums and associated common area facilities.

Access to the site is provided by one driveway off of Battles Road on the north, and two driveways off of Provance Avenue on the south. Vehicular access to the units is provided through eight private streets. The private streets have a 26-foot back of curb to back of curb width and include sidewalks and front yard landscaping. A total of 280 parking spaces are required and 281 parking spaces are provided, including 224 covered garage spaces and 57 uncovered guest spaces. Additionally, 222 potential supplemental parking accommodations are available in the driveways in front of most of the units.

All setback requirements for the project have been met. Approximately 25.6 percent of the site would be landscaped. Perimeter walls will be constructed as specified and a noise report has been prepared for the project.

The project is proposing three unit plans. Some of the units are up to 40 feet in height. The maximum building height in the R-3 zoning district is typically 35, but staff is recommending approval of the additional building height. The additional height of 5 feet would only apply to some of the buildings and would add visual interest by breaking up the otherwise linear roof planes.

Single-family detached residential neighborhoods exist to the west and are under construction to the south. Although most of the condominiums are three story structures, the Terraces at Pacific Crest has provided ample separation with over 45 feet from the neighborhoods to the west and approximately 80 feet of separation from the residences to the south. These distances combined with the orientation of the units and the perimeter walls should ensure privacy and compatibility with adjacent neighborhoods.

The development plan indicates that building coverage is 67 percent. This is incorrect and is actually 31 percent, which is well within the 35 percent building coverage specified by the Municipal Code for Planned Unit Developments. The project provides ample open space in the form of private yards, the common area, an internal network of landscaped pedestrian corridors, and a 22 foot wide public multi-purpose trail segment will be constructed on approximately one acre of landscaped open space along Battles Road. The front of the buildings are setback approximately 18 feet from the streets, which should help give the attached condominium project a more open, single family detached character.

Finally, some of the front porch areas will encroach slightly into the corner cutback at some of the private street intersections. Planning staff, in conjunction with the Public Works Department, has concluded that the slight encroachment on these private streets would not create a safety hazard since these private streets are basically extensions of the driveways and driveway corner cutbacks are only 10 feet.

The potential environmental impacts of the Planned Development Permit were addressed in the previously described EIR and addendums.

Mr. Scott noted a couple of typos as follows:

1. On page 6 of the conditions, it states, "...this project is a part of subdivision 5724, Tract 5904." It should read "...Subdivision 5725..."
2. It should also mention Tract 5786, which is one of the original tracts, and all of the conditions should be carried over to the Terraces at Pacific Crest project.

Mr. Scott concluded the staff report and was available for questions.

Commissioner Moats asked why the lots were separated into seven (7) lots for this project.

Mr. Scott responded by stating that this was the way the applicant presented the project. Staff's concern has been reviewing it for conformance to the Municipal Code requirements. He felt that the applicant might better address this question when she spoke.

Commissioner Andrade asked if they had received any complaints from the potential neighbors regarding privacy issues.

Mr. Scott stated that they had received no complaints to date. He reiterated that they have addressed the privacy issues by providing good separation from the current and future single-family detached homes.

Acting Chairperson Waterfield asked the applicant to address the Commission.

Laurie Tamura, of Urban Planning Concepts, came forward and represented the new owners, Templeton Santa Barbara Properties, LLC. She gave a brief history on the development of this property.

Ms. Tamura addressed Commissioner Andrade's concerns by stating that the buyers of the single-family detached homes to the west and south of this project are being informed of this development before purchase.

She stated that since they have purchased this project from Inland Pacific Builders, they have reduced the number of residential units from 116 to 112, to insure that adequate parking is provided, and added drive-ways, which will add bonus parking in front of the units to all but two (2) units.

They have also added the amenity that they will be working with the City of Santa Maria to install the landscaping off-site between their property and Battles Road, as it occurs towards the railroad intersection, which helps give a finished look to the site.

Ms. Tamura stated that they reviewed the conditions of approval and agree with all but one (1) provision. In Condition Number 52 refers to the driveways having 10 feet of separation from the street trees. There are units along Provance that are fronting the street where the driveways are very close together and it would not be able to have 10 feet of separation from the trees, so they would like that condition removed.

Mr. Olds, Senior Civil Engineer responded by stating that the 10 foot separation is a City standard and it should be maintained. They want to avoid cars hitting the trees as they maneuver in and out of driveways. There is also the issue that as the trees mature they may block a clear sight of the street. A possible resolution would be to supply the minimum number of trees, but rather than place the trees along the street in question, work with the Recreation and Parks Department to place the trees at other locations within the project. He also stated that they could just pay the in-lieu fees for not having the trees at all.

Ms. Tamura was amenable to Mr. Olds' solutions and stated that they would be happy to work with staff to resolve the issue.

She concluded by stating that they are excited to bring this project on board and said that she was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Hunter asked if trash pick-up would be curbside and if a tot lot would be incorporated. She also expressed her enthusiasm for the project.

Ms. Tamura stated that trash pick-up would be curbside, and that there are also garbage can "bay" areas located inside the garage to store garbage cans out of sight. She also informed the Commission that there is an area next to the club house to accommodate a tot lot.

Commissioner Moats noted that compliance wise; they could have opted to build 133 units instead of the proposed 112 units. He commended the applicant for making the financial concession in order to make the project more livable. He also expressed his approval of having the driveways in most of the units.

Commissioner Brown mentioned that there were previous discussions regarding the wall along Depot Street and wanted to know if they were looking into variable wall heights or if the new owners were planning on a continuous wall. He expressed concern regarding possible graffiti and aesthetics of a big block wall.

Ms. Tamura stated that they are planning on a straight wall construction. She said that originally they wanted to put the bike trail and landscaping by the railroad, but since the railroad track is still being used, the bike trail has been moved inside the development and the wall will be placed on the railroad property line.

Following a discussion, Ms. Tamura stated that they could probably plant some sort of ivy or vine along the wall to discourage graffiti.

Ms. Ellis, of Parks and Recreation Department, stated their concern that, with the wall between the bike trail and the railroad tracks, the wall might become the City's responsibility in the future. She agreed that some sort of ivy or vine would be the best solution for low maintenance.

The Commissioners discussed the many amenities the project offers, such as the front court yards, landscaping, backyards, and new three-story trend, with the living quarters beginning on the second floor. They all agreed that it seemed extremely livable and would be an asset to the City.

Commissioner Hunter did ask for clarification of who would be responsible for the common area maintenance. Ms. Tamura responded by stating that there will probably be a maintenance fee paid by the owners and that there would be landscaping standards for private yards.

After verifying that the Commissioners had no further questions for the applicant, Acting Chairperson Waterfield opened the floor to anyone else present who wished to speak in favor or opposition of the proposed project.

There were no comments.

Acting Chairperson Waterfield closed the hearing and entertained a motion for a Resolution to approve the project.

Commissioner Brown made a motion that the Planning Commission, adopt Resolution No. 2450, approving The Terraces at Pacific Crest Airspace Condominiums, Tract 5904, subject to the design set forth in the official tentative map in the April 4, 2006, revised Subdivision Committee Minutes, and also the modification to the Tract map numbers as previously read into the record. Commissioner Moats seconded the Motion. Vote 5-0, by roll call; AYES: Commissioners Hunter, Andrade, Moats, Brown, and Waterfield; NOES: None; ABSENT: None; ABSTAINED: None.

Commissioner Moats made a motion that they approve the Planned Development Permit application for The Terraces at Pacific Crest, on property located on the southwest corner of West Battles Road and South Depot Street, PD-2006-003, E-2006-007, subject to the conditions outlined in the preliminary draft of the Planned Development Permit, as amended. Commissioner Brown seconded the Motion and it passed 5-0.

OTHER BUSINESS:

ITEM 5 – ELECTION OF OFFICERS: CHAIR, VICE CHAIR, SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE MEMBER, ALTERNATE SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE MEMBER, SECRETARY, AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

CHAIR:	ETTA WATERFIELD
VICE-CHAIR:	MICHAEL W. MOATS
SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE MEMBER:	RODGER BROWN
ALTERNATE SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE MEMBER:	LAWNAE HUNTER
SECRETARY:	KIRK LINDSEY
ASST. SECRETARY:	PEGGY WOODS

All Officers were elected by unanimous votes.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m. to a Study Session on January 25, 2007 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