



**CITY OF SANTA MARIA
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF
MAY 2, 2007**



**SANTA MARIA PLANNING COMMISSION
OFFICIAL COPY
DATED: MAY 16, 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 II– Phil Sinco
Senior Civil Engineer – Rodger Olds
Recording Secretary – Kathleen Villegas
Planner III – Benjamin Kimball
Planner II – Brian Halvorson

BY MOTION, APPROVED THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF APRIL 4, 2007 AS WRITTEN, VOTE 5-0.

BY MOTION, APPROVED THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF APRIL 18, 2007 AS WRITTEN, VOTE 4-0-1 (Commissioner Andrade abstained).

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: Jesus Estrada and Pablo Paez Navarro addressed the Commission.

ITEM 1 - TENTATIVE TRACT MAP FOR COLLEGE SQUARE, SIX COMMERCIAL LOTS AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF BETTERAVIA ROAD AND COLLEGE DRIVE, TRACT 5930, E-2007-001. Review of a tentative tract map for six (6) commercial lots in a PD/C-2 (Planned Development/General Commercial) zoning district, Assessor’s Parcel No. 128-136-036. The environmental review for this project was completed under an addendum to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report that was prepared as part of the General Plan Zone Change for the property, (GPZ-2004-009). No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Benjamin Kimball)

ACTION: By motion, adopted Resolution No. 2464, approving the Tentative Map, Tract 5930, and the following; the design as shown on the Official Tentative Map; and the conditions set forth in the February 20, 2007, subdivision Committee Minutes, as amended.

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

Benjamin Kimball gave the staff report, citing the location, size and background of the project. The current request is to subdivide the project site into six lots. One of the proposed parcels would have no building since it is the location of the parking lot and open space areas. Mr. Kimball stated that this request would not physically change the project, but just divide the site into lots, and possibly ownership of the land.

Mr. Kimball further added that an environmental review was conducted for the site previously under CEQA, and as a result of this proposed action, staff has prepared an addendum to the environmental document to clarify the proposed changes.

Mr. Kimball stated that correspondence regarding the project was received from Trent Benedetti, who owns property to the south of this site. In his letter, Mr. Benedetti wanted to clarify that CC&Rs or a maintenance agreement would be prepared for this site so that the owners of the properties would maintain the vehicular easement section between the two properties. To ensure that, staff prepared a special condition. In the Subdivision Committee conditions of approval, the pink sheets, Community Development Department section, "Attachment D", page 2 of 9, Condition 6 under CC&Rs, staff would add letter "d" and propose the wording "include maintenance of the paved vehicular access areas" to address Mr. Benedetti's concerns. Mr. Kimball concluded his report by stating that staff recommends approval of this project and is available for questions.

In response to Commissioner Lopez, Mr. Kimball stated that the narrow lot lines being proposed are not entirely unusual in commercial projects. He agreed that the property lines themselves are odd-shaped, but the lot split is being proposed primarily for financial purposes, not functional purposes. Mr. Kimball stated that in its entirety, the project meets all the requirements.

Rodger Olds clarified for Commissioner Andrade that the easement condition cited in the conditions of approval is a standard condition. He stated that what is being required for this project is a blanket utility easement for the entire lot, which allows the developer flexibility to bring in the utilities anywhere on the lot.

In response to Commissioner Moats, Benjamin Kimball stated that it is possible to have a single building divided into numerous lots or ownerships, provided that the building meets building code requirements. He added that this is not an entirely uncommon situation, although it is more common in residential than in commercial projects.

Benjamin Kimball clarified for Commissioner Lopez that the project would not require new Planned Development permits. He stated that the site Planned Development Permit would still stand in effect since there will be no change to how the project would look or function.

The applicant, Jeff Emrick, Garing Taylor & Associates, 141 South Elm Street, Arroyo Grande, California, addressed the Commission. He spoke concerning the blanket easement, and how it takes care of reciprocal pedestrian access, parking and utilities. He stated that the applicant intends to maintain the access easement from the southerly access on College Drive down to the bordering project. Maintenance would be taken care of internally. Mr. Emrick also explained that the single building on two lots would actually be two buildings approximately 6" apart. He stated that the configuration of the parcels is a matter of convenience, so that there are different entities that can be financed separately. Mr. Emrick concluded by stating that they are in agreement with all the conditions as presented, and available to answer any questions.

Bill Orndorff, 925 South McClelland, Santa Maria, spoke in favor of the project, representing Mr. Trent Benedetti. He stated that Mr. Benedetti is one of the owners of the commercial condominium to the south of this project on the corner of Southside Parkway and College Drive. Mr. Orndorff stated that Mr. Benedetti was concerned about the continued maintenance of the driveway from his property north to College. It was a condition of approval of his project so that the egress and ingress to his property would have access in two places. Mr. Benedetti wanted to be sure that the two projects would share the maintenance of that easement. Mr. Orndorff stated that with the revised condition, they are satisfied.

With no further comments, Chair Waterfield closed the public hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Brown made the motion to adopt Resolution No. 2464, to approve the Tentative Map for College Square, six commercial lots at the southwest corner of Betteravia Road and College Drive, Tract 5930, E-2007-001, subject to the design as shown on the Official Tentative Map, and the conditions set forth in the February 20, 2007, Subdivision Committee Minutes, as amended, with the addition of Community Development Department Conditions of Approval #6-d, "Maintenance of all vehicular access and parking areas." Commissioner Moats seconded, and it passed, 5-0.

ITEM 2 - PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR THE ROEMER COURT HOTELS TO BE LOCATED EAST OF NORTH BROADWAY, SOUTH OF PREISKER LANE AND WEST OF ROEMER COURT, PD-2006-018, E-2006-008. Review of a Planned Development permit application to allow two hotels (with a total of 160 rooms) located in a PD/C-2 (Planned Development/General Commercial) zoning district. Assessor's Parcel No.: 128-003-038. This project qualifies for 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, as amended.

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

Brian Halvorson presented the staff report, giving the details of the project, including descriptions of the hotels and the proposed amenities. He stated that the parking requirements, building setbacks, and landscaping requirements have all been met satisfactorily.

Mr. Halvorson stated that while staff recommended approval, there were a couple of issues that needed to be discussed. Staff recommended deleting Condition 10 in the Planned Development permit. That condition, found on page 4 of the green sheets of the Planned Development Permit, refers to the Entrada Plan and the requirement for signage to have earthtone colors. The City cannot regulate through the Planned Development permit earthtone colors for signage. Mr. Halvorson stated that staff will work with the applicant on what will look best through the sign permit process.

Mr. Halvorson brought up the issue of screening for the air conditioning units on both hotels. He stated that the applicant brought some renderings depicting various ways of screening the air conditioning units, including decorative trim, wrought iron features, or perhaps having the trim of the building face and the actual mechanical equipment being the same color. The applicant's goal was to show the Planning Commission these examples to see what they liked best. Staff would then condition the project accordingly. The permit is worded such that the applicant is required to screen the units in such a way as to blend with the buildings.

With that, Mr. Halvorson concluded the presentation, and was available to answer questions. He also passed out photos of other hotels that have similar screening of their air conditioning units for the Commissioners' review.

In response to Commissioner Moats, Brian Halvorson stated that FEMA is currently reevaluating the flood areas in the City of Santa Maria. The current flood zone that this project is in may change; however, staff does not have that new information yet. Staff sent a letter to the applicant advising them that this project could have additional requirements from FEMA at a later date.

Commissioner Brown commented on the Santa Maria Inn and how nicely their air conditioning units are screened.

In response to Commissioner Lopez, Mr. Halvorson stated that the sundeck wall on the Fairfield Hotel would match the color of the hotel.

Rodger Olds clarified for Commissioner Lopez that the reason all the traffic to the hotels is off of Roemer Court is because of a previously recorded access denial by Caltrans. He added that Caltrans does this sort of denial from time to time, which is understandable at this location with traffic coming fairly fast along the curve of Broadway.

The applicant, J. Patel, 580 Garcia Road, Atascadero, California, addressed the Commissioners. Mr. Patel addressed the Commission's question concerning directional signage. He stated that they would like to have directional signs off of Broadway. He also commented that the building signs are not at street level—they are 50 feet up in the air. Monument signs would direct the motorists better to the hotels, so they will request monument signs there on Broadway. Mr. Patel also stated that they would entertain talking with Caltrans if they had City endorsement that they would accept turning lanes off of Broadway. Mr. Patel introduced the architect, Ruth Young, who was present to address any questions concerning the screening on the air conditioning units.

In response to Commissioner Brown, Brian Halvorson stated that the project is already entitled to the benefit of monument signs on Broadway. Signs are reviewed through a separate permit process. He stated that no special changes needed to be made, because that provision is already in the Code.

Chair Waterfield brought up the issue of screening the air conditioning units, and stated that she would like to see something that blends in.

The architect for the project, Ruth Young, Vitae Architecture, 640 Second Street (2nd Floor), San Francisco, California, addressed the Commission. Ms. Young presented another air conditioning screening option with louvers, so it looks like a single unit with the window.

Ms. Young clarified for Commissioner Brown that the air conditioning units would be flush with the building.

Commissioners Moats, Brown, Lopez and Andrade all agreed that they liked the units flush with the windows.

After some discussion of the various options, Commissioner Lopez suggested moving the window trim and having the louver cover the same as the building so that the window unit would seem intact and blend in.

The owner, Prakash J. Patel, 1510 N. 1st Street #400, San Jose, CA, addressed the Commission. He commented that it is hard to match colors of windows and the air conditioning units. Mr. Patel stated that the Planning Commission's suggestion would be easier to meet, and they would be happy to do that.

In response to Commissioner Andrade, Ms. Young clarified that the base wall color of the sun decking would be coordinated with the first level of the building, which would be brick. She stated that there would be pilasters on the wall, with an entrance and a gate indicating the entrance.

Chair Waterfield stated that some of the Planning Commissioners wanted to see a full color rendering of the project with everything in place before they made a decision. Ms. Young responded that she could provide that.

Brian Halvorson commented that the applicant had waited a very long time for this project to move forward. With the conditions that he and Peggy Woods were working on, some of these issues could be addressed, such as the details on the wall, the color and the architecture, and the landscaping. Mr. Halvorson stated that those issues could be presented at a study session to review the design, long before building plans are approved. He added that most of these were minor details and could be worked out at staff level.

Phil Sinco stated that from legal perspective, there was not an adequate way to grant approval tonight subject to rendering approval later. If the Commissioners wanted to see the full color renderings before making a decision, then the hearing should be continued to the next meeting.

Bill Orndorff addressed the Commission in behalf of the applicant, and stated that they wanted to avoid a continuance. He observed that through the preceding discussion, the issues had been resolved: the windows would be framed, the air conditioning unit would be below the frame of the window, and the air conditioning louvers would be painted the same color as the stucco. He reiterated that they would like to proceed with those conditions as stated.

Chair Waterfield agreed with Mr. Orndorff, stating that they just wanted to be sure all the details were in order. Chair Waterfield asked each Commissioner for their opinion to proceed, or continue and wait for full rendering, or leave up to staff to condition and make sure it complies.

Commissioner Moats stated that he thought it should move forward.

Commissioner Brown stated that he would like to move it along, but as a courtesy, at a study session, he would like the applicant to bring in something that showed the final project.

Commissioner Lopez stated that he would like to see the entire project in tact. He believes that this is too important of a project to not see those items ahead of time.

Commissioner Andrade commented that he thought the Commissioners had seen enough. If the applicant is willing to include landscaping on the wall, and the modifications as talked about tonight, then he suggested letting the project proceed. Mr. Andrade stated that staff does a good job making sure the details are taken care of.

Mr. Patel asked about a condition on the yellow pages, number 73 on page 21, in reference to existing trees on North Broadway. He stated that those trees are good trees, and the condition states they "must be removed." He would like it to read "may be removed." Mr. Patel stated that they would like to leave them because they are full-grown trees.

Brian Halvorson responded to Mr. Patel that since there was no representative from Recreation & Parks Department present at the meeting, that item would need to be reviewed later. Brian agreed with Mr. Patel that the full grown trees are a nice feature.

Phil Sinco suggested inserting the word "if" in front of the clause, "if existing pine trees must be removed due to construction, the application must be completed . . .". He commented that it was also possible that the Recreation & Parks Department doesn't like these types of trees.

Bill Orndorff suggested the wording: "Existing trees on North Broadway may be removed subject to approval of the Recreation & Parks Department."

Phil Sinco agreed that wording would solve the problem, because then the trees could be removed or not, subject to the discretion of the Recreation & Parks Department.

Bill Orndorff suggested adding a condition to address the ingress and egress issue from Broadway that would state that the Planned Development Permit includes Broadway ingress and egress subject to approval of Caltrans and the City Engineer. He stated that if those two entities would agree to a driveway, then it wouldn't be prohibited by this Planned Development Permit.

After some discussion, Rodger Olds stated that the City had reviewed the project as it is. These changes being suggested would completely change the nature of the site, and staff would recommend that a revision like this should be considered as a whole. That decision should not be up to only Caltrans and the City Engineer, but should include City staff, including Planning. Mr. Olds stated that his recommendation was that if the applicant wanted to pursue that, it would be subject to a new review.

Phil Sinco added that the applicant would be free to come back with an amendment to the Planned Development Permit.

Brian Halvorson observed that adding driveways would remove required parking. This sort of change would need to come back to the Planning Commission with an amended Planned Development Permit. It would also require a revised map. He stated that this type of request is much more complex than just revising a condition.

Chair Waterfield stated that the Planning Commission would defer to staff's recommendation. She commented that it is a very big change to make very late in the process.

Commissioner Lopez commented on a discrepancy in the plans concerning the trash enclosure gates. One calls out for metal railing, and the other one calls out for chain link with redwood slats. He requested that those all match and be metal.

The applicant, Mr. J. Patel, addressed the Commission. He stated that in view of the numerous study sessions this project has been discussed in, he urged the Planning Commission to move the project forward. He thanked them for their consideration.

Chair Waterfield commented that because of this project, Santa Maria now has higher building heights in the zone amendment, and she's excited about that. Chair Waterfield thanked them for their patience going through the process.

With no further comments, Chair Waterfield closed the hearing and called for a motion.

Commissioner Moats made the motion to approve the Planned Development Permit for the Roemer Court Hotels to be located east of North Broadway, south of Preisker Lane and West of Roemer Court, PD-2006-018, E-2006-008, subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit, and subject to the conditions to be read into the record by staff, which are:

Page 3 of the Planned Development Permit, green sheets, starting with Condition 4, "Screening of Exterior Air Conditioning Units", the following shall be added: "All air conditioning units or any mechanical units on the exterior of the building shall be completely screened with an architectural treatment or with building air conditioning units painted the same color per the submitted color materials board, as shown on the lower left portion of the exhibit, dated May 2, 2007. The window trim between the window and the equipment louver color shall blend in with the exterior color of the building wall."

Page 3 of the green sheets of the Planned Development Permit, Condition 5, Fairfield Sundeck Screen Wall, the following shall be added: "The Fairfield Inn and Suites Hotel sundeck shall be screened with a minimum 6 foot high decorative slump stone wall or stucco

masonry wall with vertical landscaping planted adjacent to the screen wall. The wall color shall complement the building wall colors.”

Page 4 of the green sheets of the Planned Development Permit, Condition 10: It will be completely deleted from the Planned Development Permit.

Page 4 of the green sheets of the Planned Development Permit, Condition 12, Trash Enclosure Trellis: “All exterior trash enclosures shall incorporate decorative heavy wood trellises. All trash enclosure gates shall include solid metal framed gates painted to match the color of the buildings.”

Page 21 of the gold sheets of the Planned Development Permit, Condition 73, “Existing pine trees on North Broadway may be required to be removed subject to the discretion of the Recreation & Parks Department due to construction...” and the rest of the condition would remain the same. Also, “The two existing Magnolia trees may also be required to be removed.”

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

Items 3, 4 and 5 were presented simultaneously.

ITEM 3 - ZONE CHANGE FOR NEWLOVE GARDENS, LOCATED AT 580 EAST NEWLOVE, GPZ-2006-003, E-2005-068. Review of a mitigated negative declaration of environmental impact and a zone change to change the zoning designation for the 1.01 acre site from R-2 (Medium Density Residential) to PD/R-2 (Planned Development/Medium Density Residential). The zone change would allow the construction of 11 single family residences at 580 East Newlove Drive, Assessor’s Parcel No. 128-076-028. The environmental Impacts of the project were analyzed in Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, E-2005-068, prepared for the zone change. Mitigation measures have been made a part of the project conditions of approval. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Benjamin A. Kimball)

Planning Commission took the following two actions:

ACTION: Adopted Resolution No. 2465, recommending that the City Council file a Mitigated Negative Declaration, E-2005-068 and adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Project GPZ-2006-003; and

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

ACTION: Adopted Resolution No. 2466, recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance re-zoning the 1.01 acre site from R-2 (Medium Density Residential) to PD/R-2 (Planned Development/Medium Density Residential as shown on Exhibit A to the Planning Commission resolution.

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

ITEM 4 - TENTATIVE TRACT MAP FOR NEWLOVE GARDENS, 580 EAST NEWLOVE DRIVE, TRACT 5910, E-2005-068. Review of a tentative tract map that would create 11 residential lots that are 2,555 square feet in size and one common lot. The zoning of the site is proposed to be changed from R-2 (Medium Density Residential) to PD/R-2 (Planned Development/Medium Density Residential), Assessor’s Parcel No. 128-076-028. The environmental Impacts of the project were analyzed in Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, E-2005-068, prepared for the zone change. Mitigation measures have been made a part of the project conditions of approval. No

further environmental review is required.

The Planning Commission took the following action:

ACTION: By motion, Adopted Resolution No. 2467, recommending that the City Council approve the Tentative Map, Tract 5910 for Newlove Gardens project, subject to the design as shown on the Official Tentative Map, and the conditions set forth in the October 31, 2006, subdivision Committee Minutes.

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

Note: Tentatively scheduled for City Council meeting of June 5, 2007.

ITEM 5 - PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR NEWLOVE GARDENS FOR 11 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES, 580 EAST NEWLOVE DRIVE, PD-2005-026, E-2005-068. Review of a Planned Development Permit to allow the construction of 11 single family residences. The zoning of the site is proposed to be changed from R-2 (Medium Density Residential) to PD/R-2 (Planned Development/Medium Density Residential), Assessor's Parcel No. 128-076-028. The environmental Impacts of the project were analyzed in Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, E-2005-068, prepared for the zone change. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposed conditions of approval. No further environmental review is required.

ACTION: By motion continued this item to the June 6, 2007, public hearing, after City Council action on the associated tentative map, Tract 5910. Vote: 5-0.

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

Benjamin Kimball gave the staff report, citing the location and zoning. He explained the applications to first change the zoning by adding a PD (Planned Development) overlay; then create a subdivision map to make 11 lots with a remainder lot; and finally the Planned Development Permit to address the design and setbacks. Mr. Kimball explained that this project meets all of the zoning requirements regarding parking, height, landscaping, and open space; however, setbacks are an issue without a Planned Development overlay.

Mr. Kimball continued by stating that the proposal is to create a zero-lot line subdivision, and he explained how the zero-lot line concept works. Staff recommends that the side of the residences close to the property line have no windows on the side facing the next house, and if they do, they be glass block or opaque windows. Mr. Kimball cited the size of proposed houses, three bedroom, 2-1/2 bath units, with attached two-car garages and balconies on the second floor. The balconies have been altered to be allowed only in the side yard and not in the rear yard. Staff added a special condition of approval that no balconies can be in the rear yard, only the side yard.

Mr. Kimball passed out color elevations, depicting two models of Spanish Mediterranean style, finished stucco with architectural details. Mr. Kimball also discussed that the fences be masonry instead of wood, and that was made a special condition of approval. Staff found that since there is not a significant level of fencing, masonry would be acceptable financially and reduce maintenance issues long-term. Staff has required CC&R's as a special condition of approval for maintenance of all the common facilities. A mitigated negative declaration was prepared for the site, and the mitigation measures have been incorporated into the conditions of approval. Mr. Kimball concluded by stating that staff recommends approval of this project in all three applications, and was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Brown asked about the rear deck being eliminated, and a discussion ensued concerning the balconies.

Bill Orndorff, representing the applicant, addressed the Commission. He responded to Commissioner Lopez by stating that the concrete strips in the guest parking will replace the grasscrete as shown in the Tentative Map. He also stated that the staff report indicates 11 units and 11 guest parking spaces. Mr. Orndorff clarified that there are actually 11 units and nine guest parking spaces. Every unit has a two car garage, and 18-foot driveway apron. Two of the units would not have a guest parking spot because there is no room.

Bill Orndorff continued to ask about the requirement for a fire hydrant. In reference to the Tract Map application, in the pink sheets, page 2, it indicates that a fire hydrant shall be installed. On page 2 of the Fire Department comments, the permit says that a hydrant is not required if the units are sprinklered. The applicant is proposing to have a fire sprinkler system with an alarm, which would include the attic area as well. Because of that, the Fire Department is allowing the 3-point turn around, in lieu of the on-site fire hydrant. Mr. Orndorff asked staff for clarification.

Rodger Olds responded to Mr. Orndorff by stating that currently there is an on-site water line that feeds this site already approved. At the end of any waterline, there is a hydrant or a blow-off to flush the waterline. He stated that it is a standard condition to put a hydrant at the end of any cul-de-sac, which this is not.

Rodger Olds responded to Commissioner Brown by stating that the Fire Chief would determine if the applicant could remove the sprinklers from the units if a fire hydrant is installed.

Peggy Woods interjected that the Fire Department memo wording gives that flexibility on Attachment C, page 2 of 2, Water Supply Requirements, whether they would install a hydrant or sprinklers.

Commissioner Moats suggested having the concrete parking strips be a color. Mr. Orndorff suggested the color green, and they agreed.

Ben Kimball clarified for Bill Orndorff concerning the condition in the Planned Development Permit on page 4 of the green sheets concerning private street treatment that the condition only addresses the entry portion of the drive. Mr. Kimball suggested removing the wording "and throughout the development."

Bill Orndorff suggested the wording for the condition: "Decorative pavement treatment to the driveway entry off of Newlove and all the concrete parking strips."

After a bit more discussion about the placement of the fire hydrant, Chair Waterfield closed the public hearing and called for a motion. Commissioner Lopez made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2465, recommending that the City Council file a Mitigated Negative Declaration, E-2005-068 and adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Project GPZ-2006-003. Commissioner Andrade seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

Commissioner Lopez made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2466, recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance re-zoning the 1.01 acre site from R-2 (Medium Density Residential) to PD/R-2 (Planned Development/Medium Density Residential) as shown on Exhibit A to the Planning Commission resolution for Zone Change for Newlove Gardens, located at 580 East Newlove, GPZ-2006-003, E-2005-068. Commissioner Moats seconded, and it passed, 5-0.

Commissioner Brown made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2467 for the Tentative Track Map for Newlove Gardens, 580 East Newlove Drive, Tract 5910, E-2005-068, subject to the design as shown on the Official Tentative Map, and the conditions set forth in the October 31, 2006,

subdivision Committee Minutes. Commissioner Andrade seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

Commissioner Andrade made a motion to continue the Planned Development Permit for Newlove Gardens for 11 single family residences, 580 East Newlove Drive, PD-2005-026, E-2005-068, to the June 6, 2007 Planning Commission public hearing after City Council action on the associated tentative map, Tract 5910. Commissioner Brown seconded it, and it passed, 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m. to a Study Session on May 3, 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

S:\Community Development\Admin\Minutes\2007\May 2 PC Minutes.FINAL.Approved16May2007.doc