



**MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
154 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET  
GROVER BEACH, CALIFORNIA  
TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2007  
6:30 P.M.**

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:**

**PRESENT:** Commissioners: Bright, Luce, Peterson, Snow, and Chair Marshall.

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Versaw and Vice Chair Keith.

**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.

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

*The following routine items listed below are scheduled for consideration as a group. The recommendations for each item are noted in parentheses. A member of the audience may speak on any items listed on the Consent Agenda. Any Planning Commissioner or Staff may request that an item be withdrawn from the Consent Agenda to allow for full discussion.*

- 1) **Approval of Minutes of Planning Commission meeting of December 12, 2006 and January 9, 2007. (Recommendation: Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the minutes as submitted.)**

Commissioner Bright made the motion to approve the minutes, as presented; Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion, and it was carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:**

- 2) **Development Permit Application No. 06-015  
Applicant – Bruce VanderVeen, Property Owner**

This Development Permit Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans, Use Permit, Tentative Parcel Map and Coastal Development Permit to construct a two unit Planned Unit Development. The subject property is generally located at 495 Mentone Avenue, the northwest corner of Mentone Avenue and South 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and is more specifically described as Assessor Parcel No. 060-325-009. Currently, the property is zoned Coastal Residential (C-R-2). The project planner is Erin McGranahan.

Planner Erin McGranahan presented the staff report. She stated that there are two lots proposed which would each have a single family dwelling unit, with an attached two-car garage and one guest parking space. One of the proposed parcels will take access from Mentone and the other from South 5<sup>th</sup> Street. The site is designed with a surface retention system, with the drainage for each lot contained in their respective drainage system. The project meets all requirements for development of a residential common area development. Staff is recommending approval of the project, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the resolutions.

Commissioner Bright asked about the on site drainage system. She asked if all of the turf area in the yard is part of the drainage basin. Director Hansen stated that that was correct.

Commissioner Luce asked if staff told the applicant that the Planning Commission prefers alternate types of drainage systems other than basins. Planner McGranahan stated that it was not discussed.

Chair Marshall opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Bruce VanderVeen, applicant, stated that he appreciated staff's assistance. He stated that they have met City requirements. He stated that they know that there are alternative drainage systems but as far as they know, they have met the requirements of the City. He believes it is a good project that will improve the neighborhood.

Commissioner Bright asked if they had considered having a different kind of drainage. Mr. VanderVeen stated that the basin would be usable for recreation. He stated that they did not consider any alternatives, since the basin was allowed by City standards.

Commissioner Peterson asked if they would consider undergrounding the drainage system. Mr. VanderVeen stated that cost is one issue with the underground drainage. He reiterated that the basins are allowed by the City. If the City had a standard that required drainage to be underground, they would have approached the project differently. They spent over a year getting the project to this point, and no one mentioned a requirement to put the drainage underground.

Chair Marshall asked about access to the guest parking for parcel one, indicating that it seemed like it was too tight of a space to be accessible. He indicated that requiring guest parking for small developments like this counterproductive because it adds more impermeable area to the projects. He stated that if they are going to require guest parking, it should be made of a permeable pavement.

Mr. VanderVeen stated that they would be willing to have permeable pavers with grass for the guest parking.

Chair Marshall stated that if this was more like an apartment complex, he would be more concerned about the drainage basins also being used as the open space. He stated that the City should keep in mind that a lot of these basins will not be maintained over the years.

Commissioner Snow asked what impact the permeable pavers would have on the size of the basins. Director Hansen stated that it is possible that it could eliminate the need for the basin, or make the basin shallower, allowing for more landscaped area. Director Hansen stated that they could also use permeable pavers in the driveway, and that would further lessen the need for the basin.

Mr. VanderVeen stated that making the whole driveway permeable would create maintenance issues. He indicated that people buying these types of homes may not want to upkeep the additional

grass area. He stated that he did not believe that this would eliminate the need for the basin, but it may make it shallower.

Commissioner Bright asked if they would consider doing both guest parking spaces with permeable pavers. He stated that he would be willing to do that.

Planner McGranahan stated that staff could support adding grasscrete or permeable pavers to the guest parking areas.

There was no one from the public who wished to comment, and Chair Marshall closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Peterson was concerned because undergrounding the drainage had not been discussed with the applicant, even though the Commission had made staff aware that they preferred that option. She felt it was important to make it clear that they were serious about that.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that if it is the position of the Commission to change drainage requirements, they would need to communicate that to the City Council to initiate a zoning amendment that specifically defines when the City would require drainage to be underground. It would be appropriate for a workshop session to set the standards for the requirement. Once those standards are established, and it is approved by City Council, then staff can require applicants to underground the drainage.

Commissioner Bright stated that her intention is not to eliminate the basins, but to look at options for minimizing them to create more usable space.

Commissioner Luce indicated that there had already been a workshop about the issue and maybe this was an oversight.

Director Hansen stated that they looked at the drainage system during the planning process, and it is very shallow, less than a foot deep. He stated that going forward with PUD type projects, if they want to create more usable space, they should consider allowing guest parking in front of the garage to eliminate the need for additional paved area. He stated that staff could encourage creative designs for drainage systems.

Chair Marshall stated that he agreed with the other Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Peterson stated that she liked the project, but she has issues with the basins, because most of the time they are unattractive. She stated that she will probably vote against the project because of that issue.

Director Hansen stated that the landscape plans can be redesigned to reflect design considerations that would emulate something that is more attractive. Staff could work with the applicant and bring the landscape plans back for their review.

Commissioner Snow stated that the applicant has agreed to use the permeable pavers, which will lessen the depth of the basin.

Chair Marshall suggested adding a condition requiring the driveway for Parcel 1 to be shifted to allow access for the guest parking space. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that they need to be specific about what they are requiring.

Chair Marshall clarified that they should require the driveway for Parcel 1 be moved five feet to the west.

Bruce VanderVeen stated that they would be willing to change the angle of the parking space, and that would allow a compact car to access the space.

Chair Marshall stated that that was acceptable to him, and rescinded his condition recommendation.

Commissioner Bright made the motion to approve the project according to staff's recommendations, and adopt the associated resolutions with the additional condition requiring the guest parking to incorporate pervious pavers. Commissioner Snow seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 4-1-0-2 with Commissioner Peterson voting no and Commissioner Versaw and Vice Chair Keith absent.

**3) Development Permit Application No. 07-002**

**Applicant – Rick and Vanessa Veen, Property Owners**

This development Permit Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans for the construction of a two story single family residence. The subject property is generally located at 1490 San Diego Loop, in the Oak Meadow Heights Subdivision, and is more specifically described as Assessor Parcel No. 060-034-023. Currently, the property is zoned Single Family Residential (R-1). The project planner is Erin McGranahan

Erin McGranahan presented the staff report. She stated that this site is the last remaining vacant lot in the Oak Meadow Heights subdivision. The proposal is for a two story home with an attached, subterranean garage. The property owners are requesting modification to two conditions, 30 and 33 from the approved Tract Map conditions of approval, as set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 87-51. Condition 33 restricts the second floor area to 60 percent of the first floor, and Condition 30 requires a 20 foot front yard setback. Without the requested modifications, the applicants contend that the site limits their ability to build. After visiting the site and reviewing the surrounding developed neighborhood, staff believes that the modification request can be supported. The lot has a steep uphill slope from the street, with a rise of approximately 45 feet from front to back. The greatest percentage of rise is in the first 20 feet of the site. Allowing the applicant to reduce the front yard setback will reduce the amount of grading necessary to construct the residence. Also, due to the steep slope, reducing the second floor to 60 percent of the first floor would create a second story that is only 486 sq. ft. If they were to make the first floor larger, the majority of the building would be built into the side of the hill, which would require more grading and a building that is almost all subterranean. Resolution 87-51, Condition 9 states that all reasonable construction methods to reduce grading shall be employed. Staff feels that by allowing these exceptions, the amount of on-site grading will be reduced substantially.

A view analysis was conducted for the project. The R-1 district limits building heights to an average of 25 feet above the natural grade. The structure is proposed at 24.42 ft. above the natural grade. The proposed residence has two floors of living space above a subterranean garage. Since more than 50 percent of the garage is below ground level, it is not considered a story when reviewing it for height. Story poles were erected, and a view impact analysis was completed. While some views will be affected, it has been determined that overall views will not be needlessly or substantially impacted.

Staff recommends approval of the project, with associated findings and conditions.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated if the Planning Commission wishes to approve the amended conditions, the resolution should be amended with “Whereas, site conditions exist to excuse compliance with original conditions of approval 30 and 33,” and in the last paragraph add “The planning Commission granted approval of the official design and exceptions to the original conditions of approval, as requested.

Commissioner Bright stated that she had a hard time assessing the view, so she is relying on staff’s judgment. Commissioner Peterson stated that she went to the site and looked at different angles, and from what she could see, there were no view impacts.

Chair Marshall asked about PWCE-5, which requires that curb, gutter and sidewalk must be installed, he asked if it needed to be revised since there is no sidewalk in that neighborhood and just rolled curb. Director Hansen stated that it should be modified.

Chair Marshall asked if all of the other conditions from Resolution 87-51 apply to this project. Director Hansen stated that that was correct. Chair Marshall asked if CDD-1, allowing for five minor changes, conflicted with Resolution 87-51, Condition 48. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that they do not conflict since the Planning Commission has given the Community Development Director the authority to approve the modifications.

Chair Marshall opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

John Mack, Architect, spoke representing the applicant. He stated that no one had wanted to develop this lot previously because of the challenges it posed due to the cross slope. They spent a lot of time with the City Engineer to come up with design solution.

He agreed that PWCE-5 should be amended, and also asked for an amendment PWCE-3, which requires a retention system. They are not required to put in a retention system because of the drainage system already in place.

Chair Marshall asked if it was acceptable to staff to remove PWCE-3. Director Hansen stated that that modification was acceptable. He also stated that PWCE-5 should be modified to read “Should the existing curb and/or gutter be damaged or in need of repair after construction, it shall be replaced or repaired according to the specification of the Public Works division.”

Chair Marshall asked about a door into the garage, in case of power outages. The applicant stated that they are utilizing a battery backup.

There was no one from the public who wish to comment. Chair Marshall closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Luce made the motion to approve the project according to staff recommendations, with the amendments noted, including deleting PWCE-3 and modify PWCE-5 adding the additional wording to the resolution regarding the original conditions. Commissioner Bright seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 5-0-2-0, with Commissioner Versaw and Vice Chair Keith absent.

## **WORKSHOPS**

### **4) Review Discussion of Third Draft of Suggested Planned Development (P-D) Overlay Zone.**

This item was removed from the agenda to staff to make refinements to the draft.

**5) Review of Revised City Density Bonus Ordinance.**

Planner Janet Reese presented the staff report. She stated that staff had attempted to address the comments made at the January 9, 2007 workshop.

Planner Reese outlined the incentives for units that did not meet the state threshold of five units, and the different levels of incentives, depending on the affordability of the units.

Commissioner Luce asked why normally second floors are limited to a certain percentage of the first floor. Planner Reese stated that it is mainly for aesthetic reasons.

Director Hansen stated that they created the incentive levels based on affordability to address the Planning Commission's concerns regarding encouraging low and very low income housing.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the City is taking a more conservative approach to granting incentives. The only time incentives will apply for the State bonus is if you are applying for a density bonus as well. Most of the time that is not the case in the City. They also removed several incentives from consideration, including additional height and parking reductions.

Chair Marshall stated that it would be helpful to see examples of real proposed projects where these incentives could be applied. Director Hansen stated that they could provide examples of typical situations when the item is brought back for public hearing.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that a lot of the affordable projects that the Commission has reviewed in the past would not be apply under the proposed ordinance, which included requests for additional height or parking reductions.

Commissioner Bright stated that she liked a portion of the PD Overlay that applied to affordable housing, requiring that the affordable unit be comparable to the market rate units. She asked if that would be appropriate for the Density Bonus ordinance.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that they can review that from a legal standpoint, and if it is appropriate, they will include it. There was some concern that if they put design criteria on the affordable units, that it would be interpreted as attempt to quash the affordable housing, which they can not do. A statement that says "all units will be the same" is probably fine.

Commissioner Bright asked about the incentives related to open space. She asked what the difference was between open space in size and open space in dimension. Planner Reese stated that there are requirements for a minimum square footage, and separate requirements that require that the square footage must be no smaller than 10 by 10, to prevent the open space from becoming unusable.

Director Hansen stated that this ordinance addresses the economic direction that the City has been going, by creating a single family character. This ordinance will allow smaller projects to be more flexible and still get some incentives, without having to put more units to achieve the state threshold.

Commissioner Bright complimented staff for the work that they've done.

Director Hansen stated that they will be forwarding the draft to City Council, and then it will come back before the Planning Commission for formal review and public hearing.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

/s/  
CHAIR MARSHALL

/s/  
SECRETARY TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
GEORGE HANSEN, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

(Approved at PC Meeting: June 12, 2007)