



**CITY OF SANTA MARIA
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF
APRIL 4, 2007**



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

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

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Division Manager – Peggy Woods
Deputy City Attorney – Wendy Stockton
Senior Civil Engineer – Rodger Olds
Recording Secretary – Kathleen Villegas
Planner II – Brian Halvorson

BY MOTION, APPROVED THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2007, AS AMENDED.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM 1 - REQUEST TO AMEND THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR LA VIGNA AT WESTGATE RANCH, LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF WESTGATE ROAD AND MARSALA AVE, PD-2004-008, E-2004-030. Review of a previously approved Planned Development permit to allow revisions to roof material and color schemes. Assessor's Parcel No. 117-240-006. This project has been reviewed in a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (E-2003-022). 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 Amended Planned Development Permit.

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

Brian Halvorson presented the staff report. He stated that the applicant is proposing to change the color schemes as well as the roof material from concrete roof tile to a 50-year composition tile. Staff passed around samples of the proposed materials, as well as color boards indicating the proposed color schemes. Mr. Halvorson also passed around the pool house elevations depicting the roof with dimensional shingles instead of the metal roof, as previously approved. Mr. Halvorson concluded the staff report by stating that staff supports these changes and introduced the applicants who were also available to answer any questions.

In response to Commissioner Lopez, Mr. Halvorson responded that there are other projects in the vicinity that are proposing to have composition roofs, including Sienna and La Vigna. Mr. Halvorson clarified that the applicant is proposing to have the entire project switched to composition tiles, not to have a mix of several types.

The applicant, Laurie Tamura, Urban Planning Concepts, representing John Martin of Martin-Farrell Homes, addressed the Planning Commission, and introduced Jeannett Gibson and Lynette Noyes. She stated that Brian Halvorson has worked diligently with them to look at materials and recommend the changes. Ms. Tamura reiterated that the predominate change is the roof materials. She commented that the composition roof is comparable to the architecture, and that it will look softer than the concrete roof. Ms. Tamura stated that these changes are a refinement of the architectural elements. She asked for the Commission's support, and stated she was available to answer any questions.

Ms. Tamura responded to Commissioner Moats that the proposed shingles are comparable in price to the concrete shingles, but the applicant thinks that the dimensional composition shingles will look better on this product.

Commissioner Brown stated that he believed the composition roof would be an improvement over the concrete roof on the proposed elevations. Commissioner Andrade agreed.

With no further comments, Chair Waterfield closed the hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Brown made the motion to approve the request to amend the previously approved Planned Development Permit for La Vigna at Westgate Ranch, located at the northwest corner of Westgate Road and Marsala Avenue, PD-2004-008, E-2004-030, subject to the conditions outlined in the Amended Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development permit. Commissioner Andrade seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0.

ITEM 2 - REQUEST TO AMEND A 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 revised architectural drawings including revisions to the 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, approved subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Amended Planned Development Permit, as amended.

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

Brian Halvorson presented the staff report, citing the location, zoning, and General Plan designation. As previously approved by the Planning Commission on August 2, 2006, the Harvest Glen Townhome project includes 203 townhomes, three stories each on small lots, with a community building, two parks, a tot lot, 159 uncovered guest parking spaces, and 407 covered spaces. Mr. Halvorson stated that the applicant is providing more parking than was originally shown in the staff report. The applicant is requesting significant changes to the project related to the exterior architecture and the community building floor plan. No significant changes are proposed for the site plan layout of the project, or the floor plan layout of the units. The changes to the architecture are shown as Exhibits C-2, C-3, C-4 and C-5. The proposed changes to the community building elevations and floor plan are shown as Exhibits D-1 and D-2.

Mr. Halvorson continued by stating that within the past couple of days, Commissioner Lopez found a discrepancy in Exhibit D-1 included in the staff report concerning the community building. Brian showed the elevation of the community building, and the drawn rendering is different from the elevations displayed below it. Brian displayed the revised exhibit that includes the mission-style bell tower element missing from the original submittal. Brian stated that the architectural changes are clearly specified in the staff report.

Mr. Halvorson continued by stating that as previously approved by the Planning Commission, 28 percent of the site would be landscaped, and the site includes two parks, one tot lot, and a community building with landscaping. Staff concluded the presentation by passing out a three-page memo from the applicant, Jay Higgins, dated April 4, 2007, concerning the changes that the applicant is proposing, seeking clarification, as well as addressing some staff errors.

Commissioner Andrade stated for the record that this three-page single-spaced typed memo was just received from Jay Higgins of Capital Pacific Homes, dated April 4, 2007.

Chair Waterfield requested that when correspondence like this is received in the future, the project should be postponed to give the Planning Commissioners time to review the comments.

Jay Higgins apologized to the Planning Commission for the late notice. He stated that this memo was meant to be recommendations relating to the staff report, not the Conditions of Approval.

Brian Halvorson agreed that many of the noted items relate to the staff report, but several are requests or changes to the Conditions of Approval.

Staff reviewed the April 4, 2007 memo received from Capital Pacific Homes item by item with the Planning Commissioners following Commissioner Andrade's suggestion.

The applicant, Jay Higgins of Capital Pacific Homes, addressed the Commission. Mr. Higgins stated that they agree with all the conditions, and wanted the clarifications and corrections as noted in the memo to be in the record. Mr. Higgins stated that they did want to discuss some of the solar requirements, and clarify that their parking calculations are not under what is being required.

Mr. Higgins stated that there were three significant items that were not clerical in nature that he wanted to discuss. First was the issue of the acoustical analysis. The Acoustical Engineer recommended a five-foot wall in front of the units on Carmen Lane if the units are less than 60 feet away from the center line of Carmen Lane. At this point, the applicant still does not know what that measurement is. Mr. Higgins stated that the condition states that they have to have a wall, but if the building is farther away, then they don't have to put the wall in. He stated that this was a correction to the staff report, which can sometime ripple into the conditions.

In response to Commissioner Brown, Brian Halvorson stated that he believes that the new wall proposal with combination of the decorative pilasters, wainscoting and wrought iron is actually superior to the original design, which was a plain stucco wall. He clarified that to meet the mitigation measures, the wall would have to be a five-foot solid wall if those units are closer than 60 feet to the centerline of Carmen Lane.

Mr. Higgins also commented on the issue of the street tree maintenance found on page 6 in the staff report, paragraph 6.

Peggy Woods clarified that there is a standard condition that is used on all Conditional Use Permits and Planned Development Permits that is found on page 27 of the goldenrod sheets that addresses the landscape maintenance district. Ms. Woods stated that this project will be in that landscape district, so some of the landscaping will be maintained through that district.

Mr. Higgins stated that the last item that they wanted to discuss was the energy efficiency technologies that are being implemented in the project. Mr. Higgins stated that the project is meeting the ordinance, and they wanted to present some of the energy efficiency technologies that they are implementing to get some guidance.

Gavin Morris, Division President of Capital Pacific Homes, 4050 Calle Real, Suite 200-B, Santa Barbara, addressed the Commission on energy efficiency technologies. He also commented that the City energy conservation ordinance is out of date.

Mr. Morris requested that the barbecue feature be an option. He stated that in the interests of safety, they would rather put the kitchen in the clubhouse than provide a facility outside that might make problems later for the pool.

In response to Commissioner Lopez, Mr. Higgins stated that the kitchen can and should have a full stove and refrigerator. That item was discussed at the study session, and staff had it worded correctly in the staff report. Mr. Higgins also stated that they would be happy to put additional amenities inside the building. Their desire is that they not be conditioned to install an outdoor grill area, because they think there might be some safety and noise issues if a barbecue is located near the pool.

Commissioner Andrade stated that he thinks there should be some sort of outdoor barbecue area, consistent with Santa Maria outdoor culture. He commented that he is concerned about the safety concerns raised by Mr. Morris, but if those could be addressed, he would rather see something outside.

Commissioner Moats commented that there should be a place to cook, either inside or outside. He stated that having the barbecue optional outside was fine with him. He also noted the size of the multipurpose room.

Commissioner Moats remarked on the wasted space in the hallway of the building, and suggested that it be incorporated into the multi-purpose room with French doors leading outside. Commissioner Brown agreed that there seemed to be a lot of wasted space with the proposed hallway.

Mr. Higgins responded that the floor plan was designed to have pathways leading to and from the pool facility. He stated that they would be happy to accept any suggestions concerning the floor plan.

Commissioner Brown agreed with Commissioner Andrade concerning the outdoor barbecue area, stating that outdoor barbecue is symbolic of Santa Maria. He stated that if the barbecue could be placed as far away from the pool as possible, he would like to see that happen.

Mr. Higgins responded that they would be fine with doing that.

Mr. Halvorson replied to Commissioner Brown by stating that staff agrees with some of the comments in the memo received from Capital Pacific Homes, but not with others. Mr. Halvorson stated that he and Peggy Woods had been reviewing the memo, and they were concerned about the actual conditions of approval in the permit to be changed.

Mr. Halvorson itemized the conditions to be changed. The first one is found on page 3, the clarification on the 8-foot masonry wall. He stated that the line that is highlighted in blue should be inserted as Condition 35, on page 8 of green sheets, "The following noise attenuation measures shall be consistent with the findings of the acoustical engineer in the April 21, 2006 acoustical analysis and shall be installed as follows." He stated that staff would be fine with that wording, because it is stating that these improvements need to be consistent with the acoustical study.

Mr. Halvorson continued with the next item, Condition 33, the requirement of when to build the lot. Wendy Stockton stated that the condition doesn't specify what building, it just states in the last line of Condition 33 on the green sheets, "building," but not specifically which building.

Mr. Higgins stated that they would like to build the tot lot when that area of the project will be built out. They do not want to have the tot lot built and be by itself.

Brian Halvorson suggested putting “final occupancy of the community building” in the condition.

Mr. Higgins and the Commissioners agreed with that suggestion.

Brian Halvorson also addressed the request for clarification of the exhibits, as sited on page three of the April 4, 2007 memo from Capital Pacific Homes, concerning the front courtyard patio. Exhibit C-1 should reflect the option for decorative river rock strips. Staff asked the Planning Commission if they would like those decorative pots on the patios to be an option or a requirement.

Commissioner Moats stated that he thought the pots should be optional. Chair Waterfield agreed with that view, as well as Commissioner Andrade.

In response to Commissioner Brown, Mr. Higgins clarified that on the exhibit where there are gray rectangles with circles, those are meant to be an option area if the owner would like to have potted plants, then pots could be put on top of river rocks to facilitate drainage. Mr. Higgins stated that they do not want to have pots draining across walkways and causing a safety hazard.

Chair Waterfield responded to Mr. Higgins that at the study session, it was not explained that way. It was discussed to have river rock strips to put the pots in, not as an optional item, but the pots themselves were not discussed.

Mr. Higgins agreed with Chair Waterfield. He commented that if people wanted to have pots, then the option areas would have river rocks where the pots would go. Mr. Higgins clarified that the river rock strips are not an option, and they agree with how staff has written the condition.

Peggy Woods asked the Commissioners about the condition on page 7, #28, item G, of the green sheets, which lists the items called out as mandatory, and the last item reads “and decorative potted plants.” Ms. Woods asked the Commission if they would like that portion deleted from the condition. Ms. Woods also stated that it has not been conditioned to have the river rock strips.

Ms. Woods responded to Commissioner Moats that there is no condition right now about any cut outs in the patios for river rocks, so if the Planning Commission desires it to be a mandatory condition, it needs to be added in the conditions.

Mr. Higgins clarified that the condition is worded for the pots on top of the pilasters, and the exhibits reflect the strips.

Peggy Woods responded to Mr. Higgins that the condition could then read “and decorative potted plants on pilasters.” She reiterated that if the exhibit for the cutouts is mandatory, then that must be specified in the conditions.

In response to Ms. Woods, Commissioners Brown, Waterfield, and Andrade stated that they believed there was to be river rock in the strips.

The Commissioners agreed that in Condition 29, the wording “and outdoor barbecue area” needed to be added.

Wendy Stockton added that a reference would be needed in the condition regarding construction of the building being in substantial compliance with the correct elevation, because there is no reference to an elevation in that condition.

Brian Halvorson agreed that the exhibit would be substituted and the wording can be exactly as Wendy said, "the building shall be constructed in accordance with the revised community building elevation shown tonight, as received April 4, 2007."

Commissioner Brown asked for clarification on the size of the community building.

Brian Halvorson responded to Commissioner Brown by stating that staff wanted to keep the condition for the community building at a minimum of 1,600 square feet. The building would either be modified to include the 1,600 square feet, or if it was slightly under that size, staff could either pass or deny based on the building plan submittal.

Peggy Woods added that it was at the direction of the Planning Commission that the community building be at 1,600 square feet.

Brian Halvorson continued that the new elevations for the community building received April 4, 2007 will be incorporated into the condition on page 7 of the green sheets, Condition 29.

Wendy Stockton added to Special Condition 27, that it needed to be amended to add words "with the following exception, the buildings will have no exterior staircases" to bring the exhibits up to date.

Wendy Stockton also commented on references made in the April 4, 2007 memo submitted concerning Condition 27. She stated that the old elevations C-8 through C-10 do not contain building type C, and are not found in the conditions of approval, so she didn't know how to reference them.

In response to Brian Halvorson, Wendy Stockton responded that the elevations needed to be referenced by date.

Jay Higgins interjected that he meant to convey that the exhibits C-8 through C-10 excluded one of the building elevation types that were submitted a year ago, which was a response to a comment by Commissioner Lopez, who discovered that one was missing.

Wendy Stockton suggested adding in Special Condition 27 on page 6 of the green sheets, a reference to exhibits C-1 through C-10, and putting in an exception that states, "in addition, building type 3 shall also be allowed."

Wendy Stockton clarified that the correct exhibits need to be referenced so that everyone involved knows what is going to be built.

Brian Halvorson added that the confusion may be coming from the fact that the exhibits show the original floor plans, but with the old elevations. The old elevations were not sited, because they aren't being built. Mr. Halvorson stated that the project will be built with the new elevations and those need to be cited. The floor plans must be built in accordance with the exhibits cited in the staff report, except for the exterior staircases.

Mr. Higgins agreed with staff. The conditions reference C-1 through C-5, and they want to build B-1 through B-4.

Chair Waterfield summarized by stating that staff will strike the old elevation Exhibits C-8 through C-10.

Brian Halvorson commented that the exhibits that are relative and should be in the condition that addresses the elevations and floor plans are B-4, B-3, B-2, and B-1 only. C-1 through C-5 are the new elevations. There should be no references to C-8 because it is outdated, as well as C-9 and C-10.

Jay Higgins agreed with Mr. Halvorson, and added that the C-7 exhibit is the old color board, and the new color board is here presented tonight.

Brian Halvorson concurred with Mr. Higgins, stating that the condition acknowledges that by stating "in accordance with the color board received March 22, 2007."

Pedro Paez Navarro, 315 W. Harding, Santa Maria, addressed the Commission. Mr. Navarro suggested that affordable housing developments be built. Mr. Navarro commented that there are many people in support of affordable housing, and they came tonight to the meeting to show their support. Mr. Navarro indicated the group as they all stood. He concluded by stating that Santa Maria needs affordable housing for low-income wage earners.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Navarro for his definition of affordable housing. Mr. Navarro responded that perhaps some could afford \$250,000 or \$200,000.

Commissioner Andrade thanked Mr. Paez Navarro for coming, and encouraged him to continue to attend meetings and have others attend as well, because that is how things can get done. Commissioner Andrade also thanked those in the audience for coming. He stated that it will take some creative thinking and financing to resolve this problem.

Mr. Navarro responded to Commissioner Andrade that they will continue to attend, so they can have knowledge of when developers are bringing housing forward that is affordable.

Mary Jacka, 2226 Signal Avenue, Santa Maria, addressed the Commission. Ms. Jacka expressed her agreement with Mr. Navarro. She stated that affordable housing depends on one's income. Ms. Jacka stated that she had a survey of some people's annual income and family sizes, so that the Planning Commission could see the income scale. Ms. Jacka also requested the services of an interpreter for future meetings. Ms. Jacka commented on barbecue pits, and stated that she would like them to be located where the smoke will not go into people's units.

With no further comments, Chair Waterfield closed the hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Andrade made a motion to approve the request to amend a 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, subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the amended Planned Development Permit, with modifications as follows: Condition 27, no exterior stairways; Condition 29, add outdoor barbecue area, and community building floor plan would include the new exhibit presented at the April 4, 2007 meeting as reflected on the overhead screen; amend paragraph 33 related to play equipment so that the tot lot and equipment will be installed prior to final occupancy of the community building; as part of the conditions, they refer to Exhibits C-1 through C-5, and Exhibits E-1 through E-4, and not include Exhibits C-8, C-9, C-10; also modify Condition 35 so that it would include an additional reference that the five-foot high wall may be required if it is within the 60' requirement consistent with the findings of the acoustical engineer in his analysis of April 21, 2006; also include decorative river rock strips as set in condition C-1, not pots, just pots on the pilasters; also for the decorative archways on certain units, as reflected in Exhibits C-2 and C-4, they would not be on every unit.

Peggy Woods clarified that the energy requirement is to pre-plumb and pre-wire for solar power for each of the units, but it does not specify the method. Staff can look at other methods, as long as they achieve the same intent and purpose, and that can be reviewed during the plancheck process.

Commissioner Moats seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 p.m. to a Study Session on April 5, 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\April 4 PC Minutes Final.Approved02May2007.doc