



**CITY OF SANTA MARIA  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF  
MARCH 7, 2007**



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

**PRESENT:** Commissioners Adrian Andrade, Rodger Brown, Tom S. Lopez, Vice-Chair Michael W. Moats and Chair Etta Waterfield.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director – Kirk E. Lindsey  
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 II – Brian Halvorson, Bill Scott

**APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF OCTOBER 18, 2006, NOVEMBER 1, 2006, DECEMBER 6, 2006, DECEMBER 20, 2006 AND FEBRUARY 21, 2007.**

October 18, November 1, December 6 and 20, 2006, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as written, VOTE 3-0-2 (Commissioners Andrade and Lopez Abstained).

February 21, 2007, Planning Commission Minutes approved as written, VOTE 4-0-1 (Commissioner Lopez, Abstained).

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

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**ITEM 1 – KNUTSON AIRSPACE CONDOMINIUM MAP FOR 2370 SKYWAY DRIVE, TRACT 5926.** Review of a parcel map that would allow four (4) airspace condominiums on a 0.98 acre lot. The zoning of the site is PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing), Assessor’s Parcel No. 111-051-024. This project is a Class 15 categorical exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Brian Halvorson)

**ACTION:** Adopted Resolution No. 2457, approving the Knutson Airspace Condominium Map, Tract 5926, and subject to the following; the design as shown on the Official Tentative Map; and the conditions set forth in the October 16, 2006, Subdivision Committee Minutes. By Verbal vote: 5-0

**VOTE:** Ayes--Commissioners Andrade, Brown, Lopez, Moats and Chair Waterfield; Noes--None; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

Brian Halvorson presented the staff report, citing the project site and zoning designation. Mr. Halvorson explained that the site had previously been approved and had already been built, and the applicant is now requesting to record a map for the airspace condominium units. He clarified that the land was not being divided, but this was only an airspace division. He concluded staff’s presentation by stating that he was available to answer any questions.

In response to Commissioner Moats, Brian Halvorson clarified that airspace condominiums had always been the intention of the applicant.

Rodger Olds, of the Engineering Division of Public Works, added that the original intent of the applicant was to build this project as an office building with no intention of subdividing. The decision to subdivide came later. Mr. Olds clarified that normally, a subdivision would be processed with the Planned Development Permit.

In response to Commissioner Lopez, Brian Halvorson responded that the garage space is not part of the airspace condominium map. He added that the garage space would be used for accommodation of vehicles and equipment, but it had not been identified yet as to which unit the garage would be assigned.

Peggy Woods clarified for Commissioner Lopez that it is a brand new building that is under consideration, and any improvements, including parking for disabled, were plan checked and approved by the Building Division.

With no further comments, Chair Waterfield closed the public hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Lopez made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2457, to approve the tentative map for the Knutson Airspace Condominium Map, Tract 5926, subject to the design as shown on the Official Tentative Map and the conditions as set forth in the October 16, 2006, Subdivision Committee Minutes. Commissioner Andrade seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

**ITEM 2 - AN AMENDMENT TO A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR THE RCFE 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.** Review of an amended Planned Development permit which would delete Special Condition No. 13 requiring a minimum of 200 square feet of open space, Assessor's Parcel No. 119-276-003. This project is a Class 32 categorical exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Brian Halvorson)

**ACTION:** By motion, approved subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit. Vote: 3-0-1. (Commissioner Andrade abstained, Commissioner Lopez stepped down.)

**VOTE:** Ayes--Commissioners Andrade, Brown, Moats and Chair Waterfield; Noes--None; Absent--None; Abstained—Commissioners Andrade and Lopez.

*Commissioner Lopez stepped down from this item.*

Brian Halvorson presented the staff report. He reviewed the history of this project and the condition that was included concerning adding a balcony for the elderly assisted care facility on the second floor. The project was approved with that additional condition. The applicant later communicated with staff that the requirement was very difficult to meet because of the limitations of the project site. The applicant is requesting to have the amended condition deleted. Mr. Halvorson pointed out that if the condition was deleted, the project would still be consistent with the Mixed Use Ordinance which does not require open space in the downtown area. He concluded his presentation by stating that he was available to answer any questions.

In response to Commissioner Brown, Mr. Halvorson stated that there is no formal condition requiring the applicant to take residents of the care facility outside. He stated that the applicant has expressed that they do intend to take the elderly residents to a nearby park or other recreational facilities in Santa Maria.

Wendy Stockton added that operational requirements of a building come about through a licensing process. If this facility was to be licensed through the State or County, then they would have the ability to make inspections. The City does not have the authority to make inspections, so if a condition like that was imposed by the City, we would not know if it was being enforced.

Chair Waterfield commented that it is rare to have an applicant with an approved project come back to ask about a particular condition. She acknowledged that the project is very much needed.

Chair Waterfield closed the public hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Brown made a motion to approve an amendment to a previously approved Planned Development Permit for the RCFE 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, subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Amended Planned Development Permit. Commissioner Moats seconded it, and it passed, 3-0-1.

**ITEM 3 - PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR OLIVER'S TOWING, LOCATED AT 1599 WEST BETTERAVIA ROAD, PD-2007-003, E-2007-002.** Review of a Planned Development Permit to allow construction of a 3,200 square foot prefabricated metal building for tow truck storage and servicing on a 3.15 acre site located in the PD/CM (Planned Development/Commercial Manufacturing) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No. 117-320-003. This project is a class 3 categorical exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Bill Scott)

**ACTION:** By motion, approved subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit, as amended. Vote: 5-0.

**VOTE:** Ayes--Commissioners Andrade, Brown, Lopez, Moats and Chair Waterfield; Noes--None; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

Bill Scott presented the staff report, outlining the location and details of the project, including access, buildings on the site, and parking. He stated that the majority of the site is used for the storage of vehicles and equipment. The main issue is a deferral of most of the requisite site improvements. The subject parcel as well as the adjacent parcels were annexed into the City of Santa Maria from the County of Santa Barbara in November 2004 "as is," and does not meet City standards. Staff recommends approval of the project waiving some standard considerations for improvements. Staff would accept some of the bare minimum site improvements now, and make significant landscaping, paving, street frontage improvements and other potential site improvements at a later date. The applicant is preparing for a future development on the property, and when that project comes forward for review, staff would look for substantial site improvements.

Mr. Scott also made two corrections to the staff report: the first, a typo on page four, Condition 17, the parking spaces required should read nine, not 90. The next, concerning a requirement from the Fire Department, Conditions 33 and 34, requiring a fire hydrant. Wendy Stockton clarified that a sentence should be added in Conditions 33 and 34, on page 7: "The hydrant shall be installed at a time acceptable to the Fire Department."

With those corrections, Mr. Scott concluded the staff report by recommending approval of the project, and was available to answer questions.

Tom Martinez, 2624 Airpark Drive, architect for the project and agent for the applicant, addressed the Commission. He stated that the applicant is in agreement with the conditions as written and was available to answer any questions.

In response to Commissioner Lopez, Mr. Martinez explained the time frame of the project. He stated that initially all the phases of the project were started together, but they have since split it up to expedite the process. The building for this project is ready to come in now.

In response to Commissioner Andrade, Mr. Martinez clarified that because there is no public water to the site now, the water line extension would be too costly for the project to install fire hydrants at this time.

With no further comments, Chair Waterfield closed the public hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Moats made a motion to approve the Planned Development Permit for Oliver's Towing, located at 1599 West Betteravia Road, PD-2007-003, E-2007-002, subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit and the conditions related to parking and the fire hydrants. Commissioner Andrade seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

**ITEM 4 - AN AMENDMENT TO THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED 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 an amended Planned Development permit to allow revisions to the exterior townhome building elevations and community building floor plan, 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. (Project Planner: Brian Halvorson)

**ACTION:** By motion, continued the project to the April 4, 2007, Planning Commission meeting in order to allow the applicant time to make the necessary plan changes as recommended by the Planning Commission. VOTE: 5-0.

**VOTE:** Ayes--Commissioners Andrade, Brown, Lopez, Moats and Chair Waterfield; Noes--None; Absent--None; Abstained--None.

Brian Halvorson presented the staff report, reviewing the project location, zoning and details of the project as approved. He also detailed the significant revisions being requested to the exterior townhome architecture and the community building floor plan. He explained that no changes are being proposed for the site plan or the floor plans of the individual units. Parking, landscaping, park and tot lot amenities will remain as previously approved by the Planning Commission on August 2, 2006. The revisions include the exterior stucco being trowel-finish instead of scallop-finish; decorative Juliet wrought-iron balconies instead of wood balconies with tile roofs; the community building reduced from 2,100 square feet to 1,350 square feet with no gym or kitchen. The applicant has proposed a multi-purpose room, a bar and outdoor barbecue area to augment the community building. Patios with non-decorative wrought-iron fencing and perimeter landscaping are being proposed in lieu of masonry stucco walls with no landscaping, and the fireplaces are proposed to be a buyer-option. As previously approved, each unit had a fireplace. Also, square rectangular exterior windows are being proposed instead of some rounded window features. No window grill details, tile building insets, decorative mission-style exterior lighting, rounded or arched building features for walls or doors are being proposed. The site would still include two parks, one tot lot, and a community building with landscaping. Mr. Halvorson concluded by stating that staff provided four options for the Planning Commission to choose from, as detailed in the staff report: to approve the Planned Development Permit in accordance with the preliminary draft planned development permit with improvements to the revised project, including substantial balconies, more architectural details, a larger community building, and combination of ground floor patios with masonry stucco walls and decorative wrought iron fences; or deny the revised project as proposed and recommend

that the applicant construct the project as previously approved; deny the revised project as proposed and recommend that the applicant re-apply for a new planned development permit; or continue the project to another Planning Commission meeting in order to allow the applicant time to make the necessary plan changes as recommended by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Jay Higgins, Capital Pacific Homes, 4050 Calle Real, Santa Barbara, the applicant, made a presentation to the Planning Commission, showing their final proposed architectural changes and modifications to accommodate suggestions that the Planning Commissioners made at prior workshops. He stated that they had made substantial improvements to the elevations based on the Commissioners' comments. Mr. Higgins appealed to the Planning Commission to approve the project, and asked that if there were specific design issues or changes, that they allow staff to make those changes administratively.

Mr. Higgins stated that they narrowed down their changes to four substantial elements: the replacement of the wood decks with Juliet-balconies; the articulation of the front yard patios with wrought iron instead of block wall and stucco; the removal of the exterior stairways to some of the units; and changes to the clubhouse. He reviewed the site plan, highlighting the features of extra circulation, streets, sidewalks, extra points of entry and egress, open space, and courtyards all enhancing the project. He also reviewed the project amenities, including attached garages, fee simple ownership, and privately maintained front yard spaces. Mr. Higgins pointed out that each building on the site plan opens up into a courtyard or open space. He stated that the site has an acre more of open space than is required by the code, provided in three main areas on the site.

Mr. Higgins noted that the site has two common buildings: the pool house and the postal pavilion. The postal pavilion will be the project's center piece, located in the central mall area in the south end of the site.

Mr. Higgins stated that the applicant is trying to stay competitive with other projects in the area. He compared other current projects underway with Harvest Glen Townhomes. Mr. Higgins then reviewed the proposed revisions to the architectural elements of the project.

Mr. Gavin Morris, Division President of Capital Pacific Homes, continued the presentation concerning the design aspects of the project. He commented on the importance of the exterior elevations reflecting the functionality and life style within the project. He encouraged the Commission to look at the elevations, not building by building, but to look at the entire streetscape. Mr. Morris commented on the influence of George Washington Smith as an architect, and that some of his design elements in the simple elegant Spanish Revival style have been incorporated into this project. Mr. Morris then reviewed the proposed exterior elevation revisions. He concluded his presentation by offering to answer any questions.

Jay Higgins again addressed the Commission, outlining details concerning the pool house. Mr. Higgins concluded by inviting comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Moats commented on the chimney component, stating that if homeowners wanted to order one, it would have to be done in the preconstruction phase. He asked the applicant how that would be addressed.

Mr. Morris responded to Commissioner Moats by stating that during the option process, there would be four cut-off dates during construction that relate to the various selection options. He stated that fireplaces are a prominent part of the interior of the homes, and he believes that perhaps 80% of the homeowners would choose to have one. The option runs about \$5,000.

Commissioner Brown asked about the viability of fake fireplaces, and Mr. Morris responded that could be done.

In response to Commissioner Lopez, Mr. Higgins stated that only the front elevations were being changed.

In response to Commissioner Andrade, Mr. Higgins stated that they were willing to work with staff concerning the 1,600 square foot pool house.

Commissioner Andrade questioned Mr. Higgins concerning the stucco decorative walls all being changed to wrought iron, and Mr. Higgins verified that was what they were proposing.

Commissioner Andrade asked staff what they thought about the wrought iron fencing.

Brian Halvorson responded to Commissioner Andrade that staff really favored the stucco walls, but having the landscaping around the patios would also look very nice. Mr. Halvorson stated that it really is a matter of preference. The walls have always been proposed at three feet in height, except along Carmen Lane, where they would be four feet tall to mitigate traffic noise.

Mr. Higgins commented on the noise mitigation measures on Carmen Lane, and clarified that the units fronting Carmen Lane would need to have the five-foot plaster walls to mitigate noise impacts.

Mr. Morris added that on Blosser Road, they would be implementing a median and traffic calming that would be installed in the center divider to slow traffic.

Mr. Higgins clarified for Commissioner Brown that the units on Biscayne were pulled back in some places up to twenty feet to create more of a buffer between the public space and the units. That could also help with noise mitigation.

Mr. Morris responded to Chair Waterfield concerning the longevity of wrought iron versus wood railings and the upkeep required, as well as the various awning materials proposed.

In response to Commissioner Lopez, Mr. Morris stated that they were seeking continuity throughout the units, and didn't want the exterior units to look different than the interior units.

The Commission and applicant discussed a few more concerns, dealing with landscape maintenance, the color pallet, homeowners potentially putting up their own block walls, and security for the outdoor barbecue area.

In response to Commissioner Andrade, Brian Halvorson explained that the recommendation in 1b referred to details on the previously approved application that were left off of the current one. He stated that a few have been put back into the proposal. He didn't itemize them all because there were so many.

Commissioner Moats asked about the outdoor lighting. Brian Halvorson explained that a lot of the outdoor lighting is now a standard plastic light, similar to something at a school, and not decorative as was previously submitted.

Jay Higgins responded that some lighting details were added, and that none of it would be plastic. He stated that they would be comfortable with wording added to the condition that they would work with staff to select lighting standards and details that would be consistent with the style of architecture.

Commissioner Andrade commented that he wouldn't have a problem with some of the changes being proposed, such as the larger community building with the gym, kitchen and meeting room. He also stated that the courtyards as proposed could be acceptable. He expressed his concern that the community building should stay at the 1,600 square foot size.

Chair Waterfield stated her desire for the kitchen to remain in the community center.

Jay Higgins interjected that they would be happy to work with staff to have a condition that the community building would be a minimum size of 1,600 square feet in size, providing an interior kitchen area. He also agreed with Commissioner Brown that they would be happy to put chimneys on the roof as architectural features even if there was not a fireplace in those units.

Commissioner Moats agreed with Commissioner Andrade that a lot of give and take has occurred on this project, and he stated his pleasure with how it was turning out. He agreed with the 1,600 square foot community building, the private patios as they are proposed, the chimneys, and the balconies. He stated he was pleased with the project.

Commissioner Brown agreed that the project now is a big improvement over what was presented the last time to the Commission. He stated that he would be in favor of making the requested revisions as presented.

Commissioner Andrade concurred that what was presented tonight was a significant improvement over the last submission. He stated his concern of graffiti on the masonry walls, and believes that the approach taken now makes more sense. He also reiterated his desire for the 1,600 square foot community center with gym, kitchen and meeting rooms with the modifications as shown. He believes that this will be a very nice project.

Commissioner Lopez agreed that the proposal now is much better than what was presented at the study session. He stated his desire to make Blosser Road a nicer looking thoroughfare, and asked if anything would be done to dress up the units facing Blosser Road.

Jay Higgins responded to Commissioner Lopez that as part of their public improvements plans for the entire tract, they have been conditioned to provide landscaping in the medians on Blosser Road, as well as the landscaping from the curb to the sound wall on Blosser, which ranges anywhere from fifteen to twenty feet with the meandering sidewalk. Mr. Higgins mentioned that they are spending close to a million dollars on that alone. He directed the Commissioners to the site plan, and pointed out that the units on Blosser back up to the sound wall, so none of the front elevations would face Blosser.

Brian Halvorson commented that staff had only the front elevations to look at. The rear elevations—which will be facing Blosser Road—had not been submitted.

Jay Higgins clarified that the rear elevations have not been altered, nor the rest of the amenities.

Brian Halvorson disagreed, pointing out that the rear elevations as previously approved could not be built because those still depict wooden balconies and a totally different façade, but the new elevation information had not been submitted.

Jay Higgins responded that no architectural comments were received from plan check on the last two rounds through the Building Division. He stated that some of the amendments have been made, such as the side deck, the hip roof, but aside from those things, the rear decks stay.

Chair Waterfield concluded that there would be changes, then, to the rear elevations.

Jay Higgins clarified that the rear decks would not be wrought iron, but the material proposed would be enclosed, either stucco or plexi-glass, pursuant to the Building Code. Wood material cannot be adjacent to a property line.

Brian Halvorson stated staff's discomfort over recommending approval on a project with incomplete information. He added that there was a long list of items that needed to be documented accurately. The revisions received by staff have been in email, and have not been incorporated into the staff report yet.

Chair Waterfield agreed with staff. She also addressed Mr. Higgins and stated that she was concerned with his comment at the study session that 'any elevation you see drawn up is never going to look like what we build.' She stated her concern that everything needs to be in order before the project can proceed.

Jay Higgins agreed that the rear elevations must change. When they were submitted to the Planning Division last year, the elevations showed wood decks, which are still shown in the exhibits. The Building Division sent the plans back saying that they could not have wood decks, so they are making that change based on the code.

Wendy Stockton interjected that the requirements for this project need to be regarded as modified. She asked for clarification from the Commission as to what they want to like to approve as modifications for this project. Then the staff could turn those into conditions of approval to be reviewed at the next meeting.

Brian Halvorson concurred that another meeting would be necessary to have time to clearly define the conditions in the staff report and conditions of approval and incorporate the exhibits.

Commissioner Brown commented concerning the rear elevations that he would rather see the solid stucco walls than plexi-glass partitions.

Commissioner Moats commented that it seemed to be the consensus to delay this project to the next meeting, allowing time to define the changed conditions.

Commissioner Andrade concurred, stating that another meeting would be needed so that the conditions could be clarified which would enhance the comfort level of all involved. He stated that he would be inclined to continue the project.

Jay Higgins suggested that perhaps the Commission would give staff the direction to work out the details with the applicant. They would like to be able to move forward, and perhaps work out the wording now on the conditions so that they could do that.

Commissioner Lopez commented on how the rear elevations are going to change because of the roof changes, and he would like to see those elevations depicted.

Peggy Woods commented concerning the wording in the conditions which are currently written to refer to exhibits that are contained in the staff report. With the new elevations that were presented tonight, staff doesn't have those exhibits referenced in the staff report, and the conditions do not reflect the current elevations. The revised elevations all need to be submitted and included in the conditions for reference to what will be approved.

Chair Waterfield asked how soon those things could be done.

Peggy Woods responded that the soonest meeting would be April 4, 2007. The March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting wouldn't work because those staff reports are due this coming Monday, and staff does not have the necessary items to meet that deadline.

Jay Higgins asked staff what the purpose was to submit exhibits at a Commission hearing if they can't be attached to a condition of approval letter at a later date. He stated that they are at their wits' end making these changes, and would like to move forward if at all possible.

Peggy Woods responded that staff could itemize certain details to include in the conditions concerning the elevations, but the elevations that are in the staff report would not be reflective of the proposal. The revised elevations would not be included in the current conditions, unless the conditions state "as presented to the Planning Commission the evening of March 7, 2007."

Wendy Stockton interjected that the problem arises when two weeks, a month or a year goes by, and staff is trying to reconstruct what happened. Staff tries to set things up in advance for the Commission by having the exhibits in advance, so that when the project is approved, staff can carry that over into the project. Ms. Stockton stated that it is difficult to remember what has been said. Staff tries to put things together in an organized fashion, and tries not to say nebulous things, but be specific so that those conditions can be enforced.

Commissioner Andrade moved that this project would be continued to the next available hearing on April 4, 2007.

Chair Waterfield stated that she also wanted to have the details and everything included in a tight package and have staff comfortable with that.

Jay Higgins concurred with Chair Waterfield, stating that they also wanted to bring a tight package forward. He asked for some understanding, perhaps a straw vote, that they at least have a good package conceptually.

Wendy Stockton suggested that the Commissioners give staff direction as to what architectural details were to be included in the conditions of approval.

Chair Waterfield specified that the Commissioners would like to see chimneys on the units; the wrought iron with the stucco columns for the fencing; and the 1,600 square foot community area with the kitchen. On the rear balconies, the Commissioners do not like the plexi-glass.

Mr. Morris clarified that the high quality plexi-glass referred to in the other project was for noise mitigation. Per the Building Code, the material on the rear balconies would either have to be an enclosed material, such as stucco, or wrought iron, and then depending on the sound requirement restrictions on each building, the height may vary on the plexi-glass requirements.

Brian Halvorson responded to Commissioner Brown by stating that the requirement for the balcony walls would be a minimum of five feet based on the acoustical analysis for the ground floor, and four feet for the upper balconies.

Jay Higgins interjected that they would be willing to go with stucco or wrought iron for the balconies, whatever the Commission would like to condition.

Brian Halvorson commented that due to the acoustical analysis, the balconies could not be wrought iron because the sound goes through.

Jay Higgins responded that his comment was, except for the units along Blosser Road that are in the high decibel area, they would be happy to have a condition on the other units that the rear deck material be wrought iron if that was what the Commission wanted.

Chair Waterfield stated that the walls facing Blosser Road would be four foot high stucco, and the rest of the balconies would be wrought iron.

Peggy Woods mentioned two other items to be conditioned: decorative exterior lighting consistent with the architecture; and also complete elevations of the entire buildings to be provided in the resubmittal.

In regard to the awnings, Brian Halvorson stated that he would meet with the applicant and determine a condition as to what material will be used.

The Commissioners concurred that they wanted fabric awnings, not vinyl or plastic.

Wendy Stockton asked the Commission for direction concerning the balconies.

The Commissioners agreed that they all liked the Juliet-style balconies.

Wendy Stockton asked for clarification as to what specific architectural details the Commissioners were interested in seeing staff turn into conditions of approval.

Brian Halvorson stated that a few things in the details had already been discussed, including the courtyards, and the rounded and arched building features, which have been addressed in the walls, not the doors; and exterior lighting has been addressed. Decorative garage doors had been mentioned, and he wasn't sure what was decided on those.

Jay Higgins interjected that they were comfortable with what they submitted in terms of the garage doors on the exhibits. The garage doors currently installed in their single family project are similar to what they would use, which are a pressed metal material.

Brian Halvorson stated that he would be listening to the minutes of the meeting in detail to make sure that everything is addressed.

Peggy Woods brought up the hardscape in the private patio areas, and asked the Commission if having no softscape was acceptable.

In response to Commissioner Brown, Peggy Woods responded that it appeared through the illustration to be decorative paving in the patio areas. Jay Higgins added that it would be stamped concrete, and requested flexibility in their options package to offer different levels of good, better and best for the homeowners.

Commissioner Brown commended Jay Higgins for his tenacity and patience. He acknowledged that this has not been pleasant, and Mr. Higgins has hung in there and he appreciates it.

Jay Higgins responded that it has been his pleasure and duty.

Chair Waterfield called for a motion to continue the item to April 4, 2007. Commissioner Andrade moved that it be continued, Commissioner Moats seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

**ITEM 5 - ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 13 OF TITLE 12 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE, Z-2007-001, E-2007-008.** Review of recommendations to the City Council regarding a negative declaration and an ordinance amending Chapter 13 of Title 12 of the Municipal Code (C-2 General Commercial District) to allow an increase in the height limit of buildings. (Project Planner: Brian Halvorson)

**ACTION 1: Adopted Resolution No. 2458**, recommending that City Council file a negative declaration for E-2007-008; by verbal vote: 5-0.

AYES: Commissioners Lopez, Andrade, Moats, Brown and Waterfield; NOES: None; ABSENT: None; ABSTAINED: None.

**ACTION 2: Adopted Resolution No. 2459**, recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance amending Chapter 12 of Title 12 as amended, by verbal vote: 5-0.

AYES: Commissioners Lopez, Andrade, Moats, Brown and Waterfield; NOES: None; ABSENT: None; ABSTAINED: None.

***Note: Tentatively scheduled for the City Council meeting of April 3, 2007.***

Brian Halvorson presented the staff report, outlining the details of the zoning text amendments being requested. He stated that currently in the C-2 zoning district, the maximum building height is three stories or forty feet, whichever is less. What is being proposed for recommendation of approval by the City Council along with the environmental documentation is to allow building height up to seventy feet in all C-2 zoning districts. Mr. Halvorson stated that there would be certain standards or guidelines for the building elevations in proximity to residential zoning

districts. He summarized that these amendments are height and setback changes to the C-2 zone, with no other changes to the code section. He concluded his report by stating that he was available to answer any questions.

Kirk Lindsey, Director of Community Development, responded to Commissioner Brown by stating that these amendments were to be guidelines, not standards. The reason is so that the Commission would have flexibility, and the guidelines would work in increments of ten feet. For each ten feet above the forty foot limit, there would need to be an additional ten feet of setback, and that applies when next to a residential district. The Commission could take into account the physical features of a proposed project, for instance the topography or proximity to a drainage basin, something that might not be built upon, then the Planning Commission would have the flexibility to allow the greater height to be closer to the property line, which would be considered in the planned development process.

Commissioner Moats stated that he liked the idea of the fractional increments.

Kirk Lindsey responded that the Planning Commission has the authority to decide, and if they thought that an additional increment of that ten foot setback was necessary, they could apply that. As guidelines, these would be minimums, which could be increased.

Kirk Lindsey responded to Commissioner Lopez by stating that in the mixed use ordinance, if the C-2 is the base zoning district, this requirement would apply in terms of the allowable height. The primary zoning district is what dictates the allowable height.

Peggy Woods stated that in a CPO zone, if a property is adjacent to a residential zoning district, there is a conditional use permit required if the building is over eighteen feet in height.

Bill Orndorff, 925 S. McClelland, addressed the Commission, stating that he had a few questions. He said that the Roemer Court Hotels, which instigated this code amendment, is on Broadway, and they have variable setbacks for each of the hotels, the minimum of which is fifteen feet as required by the Entrada Specific Plan. He stated that there seems to be some ambiguity as to whether that should be a zero setback or not. He asked how these code amendments will apply to the proposed hotels. He suggested perhaps changing the last section in C, so that it reads, "Compliance with required setbacks shall be maintained unless there is a compelling reason for a lesser or greater setback."

Kirk Lindsey responded to Mr. Orndorff by stating that staff is in the process of amending the specific plans and bringing them up to date. As far as the setback, the City is in the position to have a setback, and the specific plan could be a compelling reason to have one. Setbacks would still be allowed under this ordinance. In the case of the specific plan referenced by Mr. Orndorff, that is one that is currently being updated, so that may very well change.

Commissioner Andrade asked what the compelling reason could be if the Entrada Specific Plan is changed. He suggested that perhaps the City needed to have a general policy on setbacks unless there is a compelling reason otherwise.

Wendy Stockton stated that what she heard Mr. Orndorff saying he was concerned about in subsection C was that it might require that there be a zero setback. She asked if the word "required" inserted in the condition would help.

Mr. Orndorff disagreed. He stated that if the building was in the downtown, you may not want a setback. But in the major corridors, such as Betteravia, Broadway, and some of the other commercial corridors, it would be appropriate to have a setback unless there is a compelling reason to not have one.

Commissioner Andrade suggested changing *shall* to *may* in the condition, which gives discretion. He added that as it is written, it requires that there be no requirement.

Kirk Lindsey made a suggestion. Perhaps C could be folded into B, "setback guidelines for buildings exceeding forty feet in height" and that would be in the context of allowing something. He stressed that would be only a guideline.

Mr. Orndorff's proposed wording in C, on page 2, would state something like, "compliance with required setbacks shall be maintained, unless there is a compelling reason for a lesser or greater setback when the lot or parcel is adjacent to a non-residential use or zoning district." He stated he was referring to the required setbacks, front, side, rear.

Wendy Stockton stated that there is not currently a required setback as a result of this ordinance, so there would be nothing to reference it to if written that way.

After further discussion concerning wording, Kirk Lindsey suggested: "Unless there is a compelling reason for a building setback, such as compliance with an adopted specific plan, there shall be no setback when the C-2 lot or parcel is adjacent to a non-residential zoning district."

Bill Orndorff and the Commissioners agreed with that.

After some discussion concerning the ordinance and specific plans, Wendy Stockton commented that having "may" instead of "shall" in the wording wouldn't hurt anything.

Commissioner Andrade mentioned his concern about giving the Commission discretion apart from the Entrada Specific Plan.

Kirk Lindsey suggested, "Unless there is a compelling reason for a building setback, such as compliance with an adopted specific plan, there *may* be no setback when the C-2 lot or parcel is adjacent to a non-residential zoning district."

Wendy Stockton responded to Chair Waterfield by stating that the inclusion of the word "may" clarifies that an applicant can have a setback if desired. Otherwise, it may sound as though they are required to have no setback.

Commissioner Andrade underscored that this is a guideline.

Kirk Lindsey responded to Commissioner Lopez that he didn't believe that the building having a fire suppression system alone would be satisfactory to the Fire Department. However, that would be something that would be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

With no further comments, Chair Waterfield closed the hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Brown made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2458 for the Zoning Text Amendments to Chapter 13 of Title 12 of the Municipal Code, Z-2007-001, E-2007-008, and recommend that the City Council file a negative declaration, E-2007-008. Commissioner Andrade seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

Commissioner Brown made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2459 for the Zoning Text Amendments to Chapter 13 of Title 12 of the Municipal Code, Z-2007-001, E-2007-008, and recommend that the City Council adopt an ordinance amending Chapter 13 of Title 12 with the revisions proposed by staff. Commissioner Moats seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

---

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 p.m. to a Study Session on March 8, 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

dS:\Community Development\Admin\Minutes\2007\March 7 PC Minutes.FINAL-Approved.21March2007.doc