In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in a City meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office (473-4568) at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to ensure that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting.

**CALL TO ORDER** 6:30 p.m.

**FLAG SALUTE** Commissioner Blum

**PRESENT:** Commissioners: Alex, Blum, Marshall, Vice Chair Long, and Chair Coleman.

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Roberson.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** At this point of the meeting, members of the public may bring up any items within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission that are not on the agenda. Please limit your comments to three (3) minutes. The Planning Commission will listen to all comments; however, in compliance with the Brown Act, the Commission cannot act on items not on the agenda.

John Wysong expressed concern about local economics and didn’t feel like the City was doing enough to encourage tourism.

Linda McClure, American Property Management, stated that in the last couple of years, the City has taken big steps to improve business in Grover Beach, and feels that the City Council and Planning Commission are doing excellent jobs.

**CONSENT ITEMS:**

1. **Approval of Minutes of Planning Commission meeting of October 13, 2009.**

At staff’s request, these minutes were pulled from the agenda, to be presented at a later meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:**

2. **Development Permit Application No. 09-021**
   Applicant – Paul Bischoff

This application is a request for Coastal Development Permit, Site and Architectural Plans, Use Permit, and Tentative Parcel Map for the removal of the existing structures and to allow the construction of a four-unit Planned Unit Development at 158 & 174 Atlantic City Avenue (Assessor Parcel Nos. 060-076-003 & 006) in the Coastal Residential District (C-R-2).

**Recommended Action:** Adopt the Resolutions granting the Coastal Development, approving the Site and Architectural Plans, granting the Use Permit, and approving the Tentative Parcel Map.

Planner Janet Reese presented the staff report. She described the current site and outlined the plans for removal of existing structures and oak trees. She stated that they will be replacing some trees on site, and others will be placed elsewhere in the City.
She described the four application components and the reason for each component. The Final Map will be approved by the City Engineer before recordation takes place. Staff recommends approval of the project.

Chair Coleman opened the public hearing.

Paul Bishoff, applicant and Grover Beach resident was present and available for questions.

Vice Chair Long asked if the planned pavers would impact the trees in the driveway. Mr. Bishoff indicated that the arborist did not express concern about that.

Cindy Cleveland, Atlantic City Avenue resident, opposes the project because a PUD is not appropriate for the area and makes it less desirable. She, and indicated that she doesn't feel public input makes any difference.

John Wysong, Grover Beach resident, expressed concern about unfinished projects that the applicant has, and feels that they should be completed before new projects are approved. He also felt that the buildings are too tall.

Chair Coleman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Marshall stated that the project fits the zoning for the neighborhood, and doesn’t see a reason not to support the project.

Chair Coleman stated that she didn’t believe that PUDs depreciate the neighborhood values.

Commissioner Alex stated that the new development is better than the current conditions, as it relates to property value.

Commissioner Blum likes the design and landscaping and doesn’t see any issues with parking.

Vice Chair Long stated that there are other two-story structures in the area and feels that it would be compatible.

Commissioner Alex made motion to approve the project per staff’s recommendation; Commissioner Blum seconded, and it was carried with a vote of 5-0-1-0 (Commissioner Roberson absent).
3. **2009 Update of the Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan**
   Public Hearing to consider the Public Hearing Draft of the Land Use Element update and the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) and to make recommendations to the City Council for their consideration of adopting the Land Use Element.

**Recommended Action:**
1. Conduct the public hearing and receive comments from the public. Close the public hearing and by motion and voice vote, adopt Resolution 09-035 recommending that the City Council certify a Final Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) including the Errata, Responses to Comments, findings of fact and a statement overriding considerations for the Land use Element.

2. By motion and voice vote, adopt Planning Commission Resolution 09-036 recommending that the City Council adopt the 2009 Land Use Element Update with revisions recommended by the Commission.

Pat Beck, Interim Community Development Director, stated that the Land Use Element doesn’t require state certification like the Housing Element. However, if there were changes that would relate to the Coastal Program, they would have to also be approved by the Coastal Commission. She described the Commission’s role in the process and noted that their recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council.

She then introduced Mary Reents, SWCA (formerly Morro Group) and Dave Moran, Crawford, Multari and Clark who were part of the team that worked on the Land Use Element.

Dave Moran outlined the background of the Land Use Element and described the Public Outreach and Participation that had occurred.

He detailed the various components that guided the work on the Land Use Element draft, including the Visioning project, changes in State Law, affordable housing issues, requests by property owners, neighborhood compatibility and efficient use of limited and underutilized land resources.

He stated that there were four new land use categories: Visitor Serving Mixed Use (VSMU), Central Business District Mixed Use (CBDMU), Neighborhood Serving Mixed Use (NSMU) and Urban Reserve.

He spoke about the estimated holding capacity (number of dwelling units and commercial and industrial floor space) which is accommodated by the Land Use Diagram, which includes the number of dwelling units and commercial and industrial floor space. He indicated that the projected population is consistent with projections used by SLOCOG.

He outlined the recommendations and alternatives for the Grand Avenue area and described the goals for the area: revitalize and intensify the area, emphasize mixed use, and strengthen the City’s connection to the beach. He suggested that the City prepare a master plan to guide efforts in the Grand Avenue area.

In the beachfront area, the focus was on Visitor Serving Mixed Use district, preservation of the LeSage mobilehome park and evaluation of opportunities on Front Street.

He described Front Street as a transition area that is bordered by residential, industrial and vacant lots and stable residential neighborhoods to the east.
He outlined the recommendations in the draft LUE as follows:

- Re-designate the area south of Atlantic City between North First Street and the railroad tracks as Visitor Serving Mixed Use (VSMU).
- Designate the area south of Newport Avenue to VSMU and maintain industrial zoning on the northerly portion or
- Maintain the industrial designation on the entire area and strengthen development standards to address conflicts for the neighborhood.

He indicated that the Strawberry Fields property is the last one with ongoing agricultural operations in the General Plan area. He stated that the Visioning recommendation was to keep the site as it is, until the owner initiated a change request.

One recommendation is to create a new land use designation, Urban Reserve, for this property. At the time the owners request a change, a Specific Plan for the area is required to be prepared. The site could be used for a range of housing products rather than one kind and indicated that there are other more suitable locations for industrial uses.

Atlantic City/Oak Park Properties

Mr. Moran stated that the Atlantic City/Oak Park properties are some of the last remaining larger vacant parcels in the City. There are existing constraints to developing on the sites, including vehicular access, biological resources, and topography, among others.

He indicated that the three separate property owners suggest both residential and commercial and propose possible senior housing.

He stated that due to the topography, no access could be taken from Oak Park and stated that one of the properties is mostly landlocked and would have to take access through another property.

Their recommendations are: Southerly property along Atlantic City to be High Density Residential at the southeast corner; Medium Density Residential on the remainder. The middle and northerly properties are recommended to be retail commercial services. Policy 3.4 recommends that all three sites be developed under a single Master Development Plan to address access resources, views, and hazardous conditions.

The property owners have requested that the City change this requirement for the Master Plan and the possibility to waive the requirement for the development plan by the Planning Commission if circulation issues are addressed in the plan. The property owner has requested that they designate a larger portion of the southerly parcel to High Density; allow housing or commercial on the middle property by amending the definition of Retail Service to allow housing as a conditional use and designate the middle property as Medium Density Residential.

He stated that any of the alternatives would work on the site, so it is a matter of preference. Commissioner Marshall asked why the area couldn’t be Urban Reserve. Mr. Moran indicated that this was a request by the property owners, and it also meets the City’s housing needs.

Interim Director Beck indicated that one of the properties is identified as an opportunity site for affordable housing in the Housing Element that was just adopted. Urban Reserve would not have
met that requirement.

Commissioner Blum asked why more of the area isn’t higher density. Interim Director Beck sated that there was a letter from the property owner regarding their desires.

Farroll Road Property

Mr. Moran indicated that the Farroll Road property was suitable for residential development. He also stated that the extension of 16th Street is recommended. He stated that the site is surrounded by Single Family Residential and the current land uses are varied along Farroll Road. The recommendations include balancing competing interests of the site owners, the finite availability of vacant and underutilized properties for housing, and neighborhood compatibility.

The recommendations are Low Density to the West of 16th Street, Medium Density Residential to the east. To address compatibility issues with the existing homes, the Medium Density would be located in the middle of the site, and single family around the perimeter of the site.

The other alternative is to leave the entire site as Low Density Residential.

Ron’s Nursery Property

Mr. Moran stated that the owner of Ron’s Nursery originally expressed interest to redevelop the property, which is currently low density residential. He stated that the area may be appropriate for Neighborhood Serving Commercial and also allow for housing.

Other alternatives include leaving it as Low Density Residential or designate it as Medium Density Residential.

Mary Reents described the environmental process for the Land Use Element. She stated that the MEIR process looks at various impacts and incorporates mitigation measures into the Land Use Element.

She stated that Strawberry fields were the only area that they were not able to mitigate. Because it is an agricultural use, there is no way to mitigate for the loss of that use. She stated that it is a significant impact, but the overriding consideration is that there is limited land availability for residential development in the City. She stated that the MEIR is revisited every 5 years, or each time it is amended due to a new project.

She stated that under CEQA, you have to prove mitigation measures have been implemented, but those measures can be amended if it results in the same solution to the impact.

Chair Coleman opened the public hearing.

Linda McClure spoke on behalf of the Ron’s Nursery owners who have indicated that they are unable to continue at the site and requests a zoning change to accommodate for senior housing. Low impact on the neighborhood; objective is to provide housing for the elderly; in AG, there are senior residences that are attractive. Owners must sell the property and this is a possible vision to allow them to pay their debts and give back to community. Ingress and egress wouldn’t be an issue. They may need to ask for high density—whatever will accommodate senior housing. Traffic impacts would be less for that than for Single Family residences.
Joe Wolosz, property owner, stated that there is an easement on the middle property that allows access, so his property is not actually landlocked. He stated that it should be zoned high density residential and commercial. He requested that the properties be considered separately; with the west section a higher density and the middle parcel being more flexible.

Ed Dorfman, property owner stated that he doesn’t know what’s going to happen with the property, and would like to leave options open. Regarding the Master Plan, he stated that not all of the property owners are ready to move forward at this point, so a Master Plan between the three owners would not be practical or feasible.

Mr. Moran stated that housing could be allowed in the commercially zoned area if it is a made a conditional use. He recommended language to waive the Master Plan requirement as long as access issues have been addressed.

Interim Director Beck noted that if the Commercial designation is changed, it would not impact just the properties being discussed, but all properties of that specific zone in the City. They have to decide if that same zoning would work on the other sites. She noted that the MEIR did not address having mixed uses in other areas of the City.

Ms. Reents stated that they evaluated the middle property at a higher density, which would have more impacts. She also stated that there are drainage issues with the Meadow Creek area that require additional review.

John Wysong stated that Saratoga would be only access for those sites. He expressed that we don’t need high density in this town and would impact children since they would not have anyplace to get out and play.

Evelyn Lee, Rose Court, objects to any R-3 in the Farroll Road area. Interim Director Beck stated that the Land Use Element is not recommending R-3 (high density), but as R-2 (medium density). Ms. Lee said it would be a mistake to have clustered buildings and would spoil the area.

Carlyn Hitko, Rose Court, does not like the higher density areas. She stated that half-acre is the average lot size for that area and doesn’t think that reducing density on the outside of the development will mitigate the impacts.

Wayne Allen, Rose Court, stated that going from RA to R-2 is too drastic of a transition. He also stated that many people in the area are strongly opposed to R-2. He stated that if property owners in other areas agree to higher density, that could take the pressure off of Farroll Road.

Dan Pittaway, resident one block east of project, stated that they are affected by the existing traffic noise from Farroll Road and stated that a higher density area would cause additional noise and traffic impacts. He understands the need for housing, but would like to reduce noise, light and traffic impacts.

Ann McDowell, resident, stated that it doesn't seem like the City will need more High Density and asked how additional services would be paid for. She stated that it was not addressed in the MEIR. She also stated that water is a big issue. She stated that not all issues have been identified, and opposes higher density.

Interim Director Beck stated that there is an Urban Water Master Plan that has a complete listing of
all the strategies for water issues.

Nancy Bergstad, Baden Avenue resident, expressed concern about the Farroll Road property, and worried that once the property is rezoned, the maximum development would occur. Developers could request density bonuses, and increase the density further. She stated that the mitigation measures will cost taxpayers a lot of money, and we can’t fix the streets and sidewalks as it is now. She also expressed concern about water issues, increased infrastructure, traffic and other impacts. She stated that there was not much support for a higher density, but a lot of opposition.

Kathy Gildea, Farroll Road, stated that she has seen first hand the pressing need for affordable housing. She stated that the complicated documents are difficult for lay-persons to understand. She expressed concern that the increase in density would clear the path for maximum buildout. She stated that new buildings must be designed to respect the privacy of residents. She requested an addition to LU 3.2 per her submitted letter. She stated that the zoning designation does not protect density; granny units could create higher density areas. Good and bad can come from either designation, and the residents will have to live with it. She requested that the Commission balance the concerns of residents.

Dick Giles, Le Sage Riviera Mobilehome Park; thanked Interim Director Beck for being so helpful. He stated that he was happy that Le Sage will stay at the same zoning. He would like reassurance about future changes.

Ms. Shole, LeSage resident, appreciates the recommendation for keeping LeSage as a low income area for Grover Beach.

John Carpenzano, Farroll Road, stated that his property is directly adjacent to that property and stated that if there were two-story units, they would be looking inside their house. He stated that there should be limitations on height. He also suggested that there be mitigation for the dust and dirt that would blow across the lot during development.

Marcella McFall hopes that the Planning Commission and City Council continue their support of Le Sage for long term affordable housing.

Greg Nester, local builder and developer, was contacted by the Okui family to look at the documents related to the Strawberry Fields. He stated that they generally support the recommendations but expressed concern about the 1 unit/acre neighborhood serving use, and expressed that it should be revised. He stated that since percolation rates are very high, and maybe they can incorporate parks with retention basins. Regarding mitigation for the loss of agricultural land, he stated that these owners have other properties elsewhere in SLO County that may be able to mitigate that issue.

Charles Okui, part owner of the Strawberry Field, stated that the plan looks good with some minor changes; also reiterated the ability to farm in other areas to mitigate the loss of the strawberry fields.

Chair Coleman closed the public hearing and suggested continuing further discussion to November 17, 2009.

Interim Director Beck indicated that the additional week would give staff time to try to incorporate comments from the public and prepare alternatives for the Planning Commission to consider. She also indicated that the Commission can also comment on the MEIR and other documentation at that
time.

There was consensus to continue discussion at a special meeting on November 17, 2009.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:

Report from City Council Representatives

Laurel Coleman reported on CC meeting and spoke of a City Council request for direction from the Planning Commission related to vacation rentals which will be discussed at a future meeting. She also stated that the City Council approved the Housing Element.

Other Commissioners' Comments

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Interim Director Beck spoke of the City Council consideration of the Housing Element and indicated that it has been sent to HCD for final review and the Notice of Determination has been filed.

Regarding vacation rentals, she stated that staff received a complaint about an existing vacation rental and staff is doing research about other areas procedures. She stated that the City Council wants the Planning Commission to review the options presented by staff.

STAFF COMMENTS

Economic Development Specialist Status Report

ADJOURNMENT: 9:10

/s/
CHAIR COLEMAN

/s/
SECRETARY TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION
PAT BECK, INTERIM COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

(Approved at PC Meeting: December 8, 2009)