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 Alex.

PRESENT: Commissioners Alex, Blum, Coleman, Laferriere, Roberson, and Vice Chair Evans.

ABSENT: Chair Long.

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.

There was no one present who wished to comment.

CONSENT ITEMS:

1. Approval of Minutes of Planning Commission meetings for May 10, 2011 and June 14, 2011.

Commissioner Laferriere made the motion to adopt the minutes as written. Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion, and it was carried with a unanimous vote.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

Agenda Order: Staff requested that Item 3 be heard before Item 2.

2. Development Permit Application No. 11-010
   Applicant – Ron and Mary Valenti
   This Development Permit Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans to construct a two story addition on an existing two-story single family residence located at 339 Ocean View Avenue (APN 060-522-003) in the Single Family Residential (R-1) District.

Planner Janet Reese indicated that Commissioner Roberson was within 500’ of the project. Commissioner Roberson left the hearing room for the duration of the item.

Planner Reese presented the staff report. She described the current site and the background of the project. She indicated that the applicant is proposing a remodel and addition to the existing home, and to permit previously constructed, unpermitted work.

She described the proposed addition and the elevations. She indicated that there were
corrected elevations distributed for the resolution.

She stated that there is a Land Use Element Policy 3.1 that says housing within existing neighborhoods should be compatible. She stated that the neighborhood has a variety of lot elevations and stories. Some lots are lower than the street.

She stated that the Grover Beach Zoning Code requires that projects do not substantially and needlessly impact views. As the result of concerns expressed by neighbors, the project was redesigned with smaller 2nd story and deck on the east side.

Planner Reese indicated that a view analysis had been completed and described the efforts by the applicant to minimize the impacts. Staff concluded that the views had not been needlessly and substantially impacted. Staff recommends approval of the project.

Vice Chair Evans opened the public hearing.

Mark Vasquez, project designer, spoke representing the owners. He spoke in support of the project and indicated that they tried to be sensitive to neighbors’ views when they were designing the structure and made adjustments to the project to improve the view, including redesigning the deck railing to something that they could see through. He stated that they tried to work within the Municipal Code requirements and to come to some solutions to satisfy the neighbors.

Michael Hake, 355 Ocean View, spoke in opposition to the project. He expressed concern about loss of views, privacy and possible smoke from barbeques on the deck. He stated that he hopes that the project doesn't move forward, but if it does, that the Commission considers his concerns.

Diane Kilgore, 328 Ocean View, spoke in opposition to the project, expressing concern about view losses in the neighborhood, incompatible style and size, and that the home could end up being a vacation home or vacation rental.

Fawn Davis, 360 Ocean View, spoke in opposition to the project and expressed concern about the neighbor’s lost views. She was also concerned about the narrow street, and if there were parties, it could cause traffic issues. She felt that the house wouldn’t fit into the neighborhood because it is much newer and larger in size. She would hate to see this be the start of vacation homes in the neighborhood which would disrupt the residents.

Mark Vasquez stated that they designed the home with a flat roof in order to keep the mass of the house down and the roof lower. He also stated that the upper floor addition is set back on three sides of the structure.

Vice Chair Evans closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Blum thanked the public for their input. He asked if there are setbacks required for decks within five feet of a property line. Planner Reese indicated that decks can be within three feet of the property line.

Commissioner Coleman also expressed appreciation for the public input. She indicated that she viewed the site, and it appears from looking at the renderings that a lot of consideration has been given regarding privacy and other concerns. She expressed privacy concerns about the
Commissioner Laferriere asked if there are any Municipal Code rules or regulations related to fire pits and smoke, or if there was anything that the Planning Commission could do in that regard. Director Buckingham stated that there is nothing that regulates it, but it may be a nuisance that could be addressed by the Police Department.

Commissioner Laferriere asked about solar access and natural light restriction. Director Buckingham stated that it was a new policy that was part of the Land Use Element, but there has been no direction from the Council as to how to define that. The intent is that you can’t block solar access for solar panels and energy consumption. The minimum standard is a 10 foot separation, even with adjacent two story homes. It isn’t the intent of the policy to restrict the height of a building.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the Land Use policy is a guide. If a time comes when the Council and Planning Commission has that issue in front of them it may be an area for more definition.

Commissioner Laferriere expressed concern that the wrap around deck may present privacy concerns. He stated that the revised design has benefitted some of the neighbors. The neighbor to the east is impacted the most, but the applicant isn’t doing anything needlessly. He stated that it is not as bad as it could be but not as good as it could be.

Vice Chair Evans stated that the phrase “Substantial and needless” sticks out to him. He felt that though they have objective guidelines, there is a subjective aspect as well. This project meets the objective guidelines and he appreciates that the designer tried to make compromises.

Commissioner Laferriere stated that the base height of the existing house appears a bit elevated which adds to the concerns. He stated that it seems like an existing condition of the property and asked where the height is measured from.

Director Buckingham stated that the Municipal Code references average grade; the average at the corners of the lot are below the finish floor.

Commissioner Laferriere expressed concerns about the deck.

Commissioner Blum indicated that that is a concern of his as well. He stated that he appreciated the accommodations that had been made. Regarding the comments made about the style of the home, he stated that any new development is going to look more modern. It’s part of the evolution when people choose to remodel. Regarding it becoming a vacation rental, he stated that as a Commission, they have no way to determine future use of the property. They all would like to see more full time residents, but part of the attraction of Grover Beach is the lower cost of real estate.

He stated that he didn’t feel that the views would be substantially impacted. He expressed concern about the wrap around deck because it would overlook the adjacent home’s windows.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that if the Commission desired, they could ask the applicant to redesign the deck or condition the project to remove the deck or they could make findings for denial.
Mark Vasquez stated that if the Commission desires, they can remove the deck on that side, and change it to a roof structure.

Commissioner Coleman stated that she felt that was a good alternative that would address the privacy concerns of Mr. Hake.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that they do not need to amend the resolution, as it is on record, and building plans would not be approved if a side deck were shown. Planner Reese clarified that the exhibit to the resolution would be amended, but not the resolution.

Commissioner Blum clarified that the deck that would be removed would be from the north door entrance up to the front edge of the house.

Mr. Vasquez asked about changing the railing on the roof deck. Commissioner Coleman indicated that she could support that change.

Commissioner Blum made the motion to approve the project, with the noted changes; Commissioner Laferriere seconded the motion, and it carried with a vote of 5-0-1-1 with Chair Long Absent and Commissioner Roberson recused.

Roberson returned.

Mr. Hake retrieved the pictures that he submitted.

3. Development Permit Application No. 11-013
   Applicant – McHale Sign Company
   This Development Permit Application is a request for approval of a Use Permit to construct a new 21 foot high monument sign. The property is located at 684 West Grand Avenue (APN 060-222-014) in the Visitor Services (C-V) District.

Director Bruce Buckingham stated that the applicant requested continuance of the item; staff recommended opening the Public Hearing and continuing to the September 13, 2011 meeting.

Commissioner Coleman made the motion to continue the item to the September 13, 2011 meeting; Commission Blum seconded the motion, and it was carried.

4. Development Permit Application No. 11-014
   Applicant – City National Bank
   This Development Permit Application is a request for approval of a one year time extension for an approved Specific Development Plan, Site and Architectural Plans and Coastal Development Permit to develop a 134 room hotel. The property is located in the Coastal Zone at 950 El Camino Real (APN 060-011-036) in the Coastal Planned Commercial (C-P-C) District.

Planner Janet Reese presented the staff report and gave the background of the project including the original approval and the previously granted time extension. She indicated that three 1-year time extensions are allowed, of which this is the second.

Vice Chair Evans opened the hearing. Ken Taylor, adjacent property owner asked if it would be possible for his property to tie into the water and sewer line when it is done for this project.
Vice Chair Evans closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Laferriere asked how extensive the proposal could be changed if a different brand were to develop it. Director Buckingham stated that if the property is sold to another developer they hope that this design fits into what they are trying to accomplish. If it were to be modified, staff would make a determination whether the new proposal was substantially compliant with the Commission-approved plan. If it was not, it would come back to the Planning Commission. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that since this project is already approved and has been approved by the Coastal Commission, it might be unwise to make substantial changes.

Commissioner Blum made the motion to approve the project; Commissioner Coleman seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 6-0-1-0, with Commissioner Long absent.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Director Buckingham discussed possible upcoming agenda items, including the Zoning Code update.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:41 p.m.

/s/
CHAIR LAFERRIERE

/s/
SECRETARY TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION
BRUCE BUCKINGHAM, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

(Approved at PC Meeting: April 10, 2012)