



**MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
154 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET  
GROVER BEACH, CALIFORNIA  
TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 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:** Commissioner Snow.

**PRESENT:** Commissioners: Commissioner Peterson, Snow, and Chair Marshall.

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

**INTRODUCTIONS:**

**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 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 Any Planning Commissioner or Staff may request that an item be withdrawn from the Consent Agenda to allow for full discussion.*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 March 13, 2007. (Recommendation: Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the minutes as submitted.)** Commissioner Peterson made the motion to approve the minutes as written; Commissioner Snow seconded the motion and it was carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:**

Chair Marshall made the statement at Staff's request that since there were only three Planning Commissioners present at the meeting, applicants are within their rights to request a continuation. City Attorney Koczanowicz clarified that any applicant before the Commission, due to the fact that there are only three commissioners present, has the opportunity to request a continuance until the Planning Commission is seated in full. If an applicant makes the decision to move forward at this meeting, the decision of the Planning Commission is binding and can't be appealed on the basis of there not being a full panel seated. If anyone wishes for the item to be heard by the full Commission, they should state that before the item is heard by the Commission.

Director Hansen stated that Item 2 is being recommended for continuance to July 10, 2007. Also, Item 9, regarding the density bonus ordinance is also being continued to July 10, 2007, so that the full commission can discuss and review the proposal.

**2) Development Permit Application No. 07-006**

**Applicant – Craig Cornett**

This Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans for proposed construction of a second story room addition to an existing single family residence. The subject property is located at 604 Ocean View Avenue (Assessor Parcel No. 060-534-001) and is zoned Single Family Residential (R-1). The project planner is Cassandra Mesa.

This item was continued to July 10, 2007 and will be re-noticed.

**3) Development Permit Application No. 06-030**

**Applicant – Tom Butler**

This Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans for proposed construction of a two-story single family residence. The subject property is located at 366 North 6<sup>th</sup> Street (Assessor Parcel No. 060-151-002) and is zoned Single Family Residential (R-1). The project planner is Lorie Ingan.

Director Hansen stated that staff received a letter related to this project that has been distributed to the Planning Commission.

Planner Janet Reese presented the staff report. The average height of the building is 24 ft. 6 in., which is permitted with approval of the Planning Commission. Story poles were erected and a view impact analysis was performed. Staff made the determination that no views would be needlessly or substantially affected since there is existing vegetation and other structures in the area that appear to be of similar height of the proposed structure that have already impacted the potential views. In reference to the letter that was received from the residents at 640 Newport, it appears from the photos that were submitted with the letter that the proposed project could block a substantial amount of their view. However, staff believes that while there may be some design alternatives to possibly reduce the view impact, the impact would still be very similar.

Planner Reese stated that there is a condition that requires that the existing, attached shed must be demolished or reduced in size so that it does not encroach into the required rear yard setback. Currently, it encroaches approximately one foot.

Staff is recommending approval of the development permit application, subject to the recommended conditions.

Chair Marshall asked if this was a second unit. Planner Reese stated that the approval before the Commission is just for the two-story dwelling. Secondary units are not under Planning Commission review unless they are north of Grand and are two-stories in the R-1 zoning district. Because the secondary unit is a single story existing unit, as long as it meets size requirements for a secondary dwelling unit, it is a ministerial approval.

Chair Marshall asked the applicant to address the Commission.

Tom Butler, owner/applicant, stated regarding the views, that the residence at 640 Newport still maintains most of their view. He stated that the residence in question still has views to the north and

south. Had they proposed adding a second story to the existing house, it would have impacted the views more severely, and they took that into account.

Commissioner Peterson asked if they had taken specific measures in the design of the project to address view impacts. Mr. Butler stated that they had considered adding a second story on the existing house, which would have had a bigger impact on the southern view. That is why they decided to build on the front of the lot.

Commissioner Peterson asked if they did anything with the design of the building itself to address view impacts. Mr. Butler stated that they brought the building as close to the front as they could. Mr. Butler stated that there are other two-story houses that already impact the views in that area. Commissioner Peterson asked if they considered moving the two story structure to the back of the lot, as suggested by the resident who submitted the letter. Mr. Butler stated that he disagreed with the letter, and stated that had they built on to the unit in the back, the footprint would have been increased. It would not be reasonable to ask him to build a very small addition to the existing home.

Chair Brown stated that he appreciated the use of grasscrete rather than concrete on the project.

Commissioner Peterson asked if they implemented any energy saving elements into the design of the project. Mr. Butler stated that they considered using solar panels, since they have good sun exposure. They also plan to use upgraded windows.

Chair Marshall invited public comment. There was no one present who wished to comment.

Commissioner Peterson stated that she would have liked to hear from the neighbors who submitted the pictures, because it is difficult to make out what their point was. She does not have enough information to consider the view issue.

Chair Marshall agreed with Commissioner Peterson's comments. He stated that if the neighbors were present, they could speak with the applicant and possibly work something out. He stated that views are not protected.

Commissioner Snow stated that his only suggestion to decrease the view impact is to incorporate a hip roof to lower the overall height, but that it probably wouldn't save the view. Director Hansen stated that the only change that could lessen the impact of the view would be a reorientation of the building, but that creates other site challenges. The other option would be to reduce the front yard setback to allow the building to move further forward, which would open up the southern view a little bit more. These are major design changes and would require a variance, which there may not be justification to support.

Commissioner Snow made the motion to approve staff's recommendations for the project. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 3-0-2-0 (Commissioners Luce and Keith absent).

**4) Development Permit Application No. 06-047**

**Applicant – Terry Joy and Patricia Wilson, Property Owners**

This Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans for proposed construction of a two-story single family residence. The subject property is located at 1100 Atlantic City Avenue (Assessor Parcel No. 060-114-014) and is zoned Single Family Residential (R-1). The project planner is Janet Reese.

Planner Janet Reese presented the staff report. The structure is proposed at 22 feet 4 inches

above natural grade. As part of the staff review, story poles were erected. A few neighboring property owners voiced concerns early on in the process regarding the view impact of the proposed project. The original design had the garage as the single-story portion of the house on the east side of the property and the two-story portion was on the west side. The plans that are before the Planning Commission have been adjusted so that the second story portion is over the garage and part of the house, leaving the western-most part of the house as single story. This was done in response to the neighboring property owners to help preserve some of their views.

The existing structure will be demolished and onsite drainage will be addressed with a basin in the front yard area. Staff is recommending approval of the site and architectural plans.

Commissioner Peterson asked for clarification about the view analysis. Planner Reese stated that there are other two story structures in the area that have blocked portions of the view. She stated that the views that staff can see when making the assessments are from the street. The views that the neighbors brought up were from somewhere other than the street where staff could not access them. Even with the original design, the view was only impacted a small percentage.

Commissioner Peterson stated that she has concerns about the conclusion that because the views are impacted by other two-story structures that the proposed structure does not add to that impact. She is looking at what happens when the project is built and if it further contributes to the loss of view.

Chair Marshall asked the applicant to address the Commission.

Joel Snyder, project designer, spoke representing the property owner. He stated that it is a two-story residence on the north side of Grover Beach. They think it fits in well with the other two-story structures that are being built in that neighborhood. He stated that they did a last minute redesign of the project based on concerns expressed by the neighbors. They went to the neighboring home and looked at the view in question, and then moved the upper portion of the floor to the easterly side. In addition, they cut the roof slope as much as possible to reduce the height of the building.

Commissioner Peterson asked if curb gutter and sidewalk is included in the project, or if it is existing. Mr. Snyder stated that it is already there on the Atlantic City side, and it is required on the 11<sup>th</sup> Street side.

Commissioner Peterson asked if any energy saving concessions had been made in the plans. Mr. Snyder stated that they are interested in looking into some advanced framing techniques, but those are part of the building process. In those techniques, there is less framing in the walls with fewer studs and less building materials, making it less expensive and using fewer resources.

Chair Marshall stated that he liked the porch of the first design but that this seems like a nice design.

Chair Marshall invited public comment.

Kermit Ceehauer, property owner adjacent to the project site, stated that he liked the original design. He stated that there is something more important than an ocean view, and that is the fact that he is losing his privacy due to the second story windows. He stated that in the redesign, the second story was moved further east and it overlooks the house and backyard.

Chair Marshall asked what the setback was for that. Planner Reese stated that the setback is five feet. Chair Marshall asked what the rooms were on the upper floor. Mr. Snyder stated that there are two guest bedrooms on that level.

Mr. Ceehauer argued for the original design to protect his privacy. Chair Marshall asked if there were other two-story buildings on the other side of him. Mr. Ceehauer stated that there were, but that there is a tree that gives more privacy on the other side. He also expressed concern about noise.

Javier Sanchez, property owner at 1113 Atlantic City, stated that his property is a flag lot uphill from the property that is going to be built. He stated that he will be losing part of his views, which is one of the reasons he purchased that property. He has an ocean and dune view currently and he will be losing a portion of that with this project.

Shauna Sanchez, resident, clarified that their home was only a one story house.

Chair Marshall stated that it seems that their home is too far removed to be impacted by this structure. Mr. Sanchez stated that he is referring to the dune and city view that he currently has, not the ocean view. Chair Marshall asked if it would be a substantial loss of view. Mr. Sanchez stated that it would be a partial loss of view.

Commissioner Snow asked if the view impact was based on the original design or the revised design. Mr. Sanchez stated that he was unaware of the revised plans.

Mr. Sanchez stated that the story poles seem to be taller than the overall height of the proposal. Planner Reese stated that they are 22 ft. 10 inches. She stated that the surveyor's certification indicates that they are set at the correct height.

Chair Marshall stated that views are not protected.

Chair Marshall invited the Mr. Snyder to address the concerns that were presented. Mr. Snyder stated that the owner is willing to raise the windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> story windows to protect the privacy of the adjacent property owner.

Chair Marshall asked Mr. Ceehauer if raising the windows would address some of his concern. He stated that he is reluctant to remove windows, because natural light is important.

Mr. Ceehauer stated asked if only one neighbor had objected to the original design. Planner Reese stated that there were two properties that objected, at 1151 and 1127 Atlantic City. Mr. Ceehauer stated that he wished they were present at the meeting, because it was his understanding from speaking with them that the redesign did not remove the view impacts.

Terry Joy, project applicant, stated that when they met with the owners of 1151 and 1127, they suggested that the second story be moved, which is what they did. They went to great lengths to work with someone that had a problem. Regarding the window issue, he is willing to move them up and make them smaller to increase the privacy. He also indicated that there are trees in the backyard as well. It was his understanding that even with the original design, they conformed to regulations.

Mr. Ceehauer stated that the trees that Mr. Joy speaks of are shorter than the story poles that were erected. Commissioner Peterson asked if the window redesign addressed any of his concerns. He stated that it doesn't give him what he wants, which is the original design. He stated that the windows would be helpful.

Chair Marshall closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Peterson expressed appreciation for the color boards and thanked them for the efforts to work with the neighbors to address concerns. Regarding the view, there is a view ordinance, so that is something that they have to consider. There is not a similar privacy ordinance, though privacy is a consideration that they look at. She commends the applicants for considering making changes to address the concerns.

Commissioner Snow echoed Commissioner Peterson's comment, but stated that he did like the original porch better. He likes the design of the project.

Chair Marshall addressed the concerns of the Sanchez's. He understands their concerns about property values, but noted that they will be adding a home that is a higher quality, which will help property values. He stated that he doesn't see this project as being a direct negative impact on the Sanchez's property. He asked the applicant if this was the project that they wanted, regarding the changes to the design to accommodate the request of the neighbors. Mr. Joy stated that the original project would have been easier to build and the front porch was more attractive, but there are things with the revised design that are good as well.

Commissioner Snow asked if there was no significant blockage of views with the original design. Planner Reese stated that that was correct.

Chair Marshall asked if the applicant is supporting the original design or the revised design. Mr. Joy stated that he is supporting the revised design. Chair Marshall asked if they needed to condition the project to modify the upstairs windows. Mr. Joy stated that they can condition it if they wish, but either way, they will be modifying the windows.

Commissioner Peterson made the motion to accept staff's recommendations, Commissioner Snow seconded the motion and it was carried with a vote of 3-0-2-0 (Commissioners Luce and Keith were absent).

**5) Development Permit Application No. 06-033**

**Applicant – Alan and Elizabeth Neumann, Property Owners**

This Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans for proposed construction of a two-story single family residence. The subject property is located at 1323 Saratoga Avenue (Assessor Parcel No. 060-115-010) and is zoned Single Family Residential (R-1). The project planner is Janet Reese.

Planner Reese presented the staff report. The proposed structure will have an average height from the existing grade of 25 feet. Because the roof deck is more than 500 feet, it requires two access points. Story poles were erected and a view analysis was completed. It was difficult to see the poles because of existing vegetation on the property and other two story dwellings in the area. Staff believes that there would not be much of an impact to the views because of the proposed structure. To date, staff has not received any comments or requests from any neighboring properties.

Staff is recommending approval of the project.

Commissioner Peterson asked about the garage and square footage. Planner Reese stated that there is a two car garage and the square footage of the home is approximately 3,700 sq. ft.

Chair Marshall asked about the tower that exceeds the 25 feet. Director Hansen stated that it is a very limited size architectural element. It may have some impact, but not significant. Chair Marshall stated that typically, towers are more in commercial buildings. Planner Reese stated that the tower encloses one of the stairways. Director Hansen stated that they have seen some alternate designs

for these enclosures.

Commissioner Snow stated that the back wall of the structure is very plain. Director Hansen stated that the design is a combination of prairie style and Mediterranean with the windows. Prairie usually has a roof element that has long, sweeping overhangs. They discussed using different types of bands. He stated that the design is much improved from the original design.

Commissioner Snow stated that most of the time that they see a roof balconies, they are on one side of the building or the other and this one is right in the middle, and it is very large. Director Hansen stated that the oblique angle of the perspective, it isn't that large. Commissioner Snow expressed concern about roof drainage due to the large, flat roof. Director Hansen stated that they would have to provide diverters to drain any water which would be drained into the underground system.

Chair Marshall opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to speak.

Alan Neumann, applicant, stated that the back part of the building has decks and isn't box-like. It is a Mediterranean design. He stated that they are utilizing every piece of the property as much as possible. All setbacks are within guidelines and no views are impacted. The tower is required by code for the stairwell.

Director Hansen stated that because the stairwell is open to the floor below, it is required to be enclosed.

Chair Marshall asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to comment. There was no one present wishing to comment.

Chair Marshall closed the public hearing.

Chair Marshall stated that this isn't his preference for a building style, but he's ok with it.

Commissioner Peterson stated that she liked the designed. She likes diversity of styles in neighborhoods.

Commissioner Snow made the motion to accept staff's recommendations. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 3-0-2-0 (Commissioners Luce and Keith were absent).

**6) Development Permit Application No. 07-001**

**Applicant – Richard and Shannon Meyer, Property Owners**

This Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans and a Use Permit for proposed construction of a one-story addition on an existing non-conforming single family residence. The subject property is located at 1189 Saratoga Avenue (Assessor Parcel No. 060-111-017) and is zoned Single Family Residential (R-1). The project planner is Janet Reese.

Planner Reese presented the staff report. This project is being presented because of two non-conforming issues. One is the lot size. There is a non-conforming section of the code that requires additions to structures on non-conforming lots of less than 5,000 sq. ft. requires architectural approval, even if it is single-story. The other component is that they have non-conforming parking. Current regulation requires a two-car garage. Their parking is supplied by a driveway, which is proposed to be continued. The existing dwelling was built on an original lot that was 50 x 150, but

that lot was split around 1966. The current site is developed with the existing dwelling and a covered patio and a driveway. The applicant is proposing to construct a single-story addition to the existing residence. The existing patio and front deck will be removed to accommodate the addition of living area. Based on the existing impervious area, it appears that the proposed project will have less impervious area, and therefore will not be required to provide a retention basin. During the building permit process, staff will do more specific calculations to verify whether the impervious area is increased or decreased. If they are required to provide a basin, it would more than likely be located in the front yard area.

Currently, onsite parking is located in the existing driveway. The site is on a corner lot, and there is ample on-street parking available. Since the site currently provides for parking in the driveway for one car, and a two-car garage meeting development standards cannot be accommodated while providing the required setbacks, staff is recommending approval.

Commissioner Peterson asked if a garage could have been accommodated had they proposed a second story addition. Planner Reese stated that that would not be possible without removing a great deal of the existing dwelling, which they did not want to do.

Commissioner Snow asked about the impact on parking since two bedrooms are being added. Planner Reese stated that the residence will have two adults with two children.

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

Richard Meyer, applicant, stated that they had limited space and needed to add space to accommodate his family. They still wanted to keep the main part of the front and have the yard space.

Commissioner Snow asked if they had considered doing a second story. Mr. Meyer stated that they did, but it didn't fit in with existing renovations. They intend to keep the same style of the existing home.

Chair Marshall appreciated the use of pavers in the driveway.

Chair Marshall invited public comment.

Jerry Meyer, father of the applicant and architect, stated that the new home will have 1,435 sq. ft. They originally tried to accommodate a 2-car garage, but it was found that they could not get a variance for the substandard lot. They opted to use the pervious pavers so that the front yard could be maintained. They are also trying to recycle and use existing materials, where possible and are using low-maintenance landscaping.

Commissioner Peterson asked if they had made any energy concessions in building the home. Jerry Meyer stated that they are using hard wood flooring and they will reinsulated, dual paned windows and upgrade the wall furnace to an energy efficient ventilation. They are adding skylights for natural light throughout the house.

Chair Marshall closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Peterson stated that she had been concerned about the one-car garage, but it was already a non-conforming use. She is also glad to see a single story home. Many people prefer single levels and there are also no view concerns. Those things balance her concerns about the parking.

Commissioner Peterson made the motion to accept staff's recommendations. Commissioner Snow seconded the motion and it was carried with a vote of 3-0-2-0 (Commissioners Luce and Keith were absent).

**7) Development Permit Application No. 06-046  
Applicant – 10th Street Partnership**

This Application is a request for approval of Site and Architectural Plans, Use Permit, a Tentative Tract Map, and a development concession/incentive for proposed construction of a three-story mixed-use building with five residential units, one being income restricted for a moderate income household. The subject property is located at 158 North 10<sup>th</sup> Street (Assessor Parcel No. 060-234-026) and is in the Central Business District (C-B-D). The project planner is Ray Hetherington.

Ray Hetherington presented the staff report. He indicated that the proposed affordable unit is comparable in size to the other units. He outlined the four components of the project: Site and Architectural Review, Use Permit, Tentative Map and Request for Development Concessions for Provision of a Moderate Income Unit. He stated that though the project is eligible for two development concessions, the applicants are only requesting one: to allow the residential component of the mixed use project to exceed the 50 percent ratio normally required. They are requesting 63.3 %.

The project was able to utilize parking reductions because the project is within 500 ft. of a transit facility. Staff has no concerns related to parking, because there is additional parking since the site is on a corner. There is abundant parking on the street frontages. There are five parking spaces below the second and third floors, and an additional seven spaces along the south property line.

One of the features proposed by the applicant addresses parking along Ramona Avenue frontage, which is compatible with a proposal contained in the Ramona Park Specific Plan. One concern that staff had was that the original plan had the sidewalk partially on the project site. Staff prefers to have the public sidewalks within the public right of way, and requested that the sidewalk be moved 3.5 feet to the north to allow it to better align with the Ramona Specific Plan, and allow for more landscaping.

On the original site plan, staff had a concern about a landscape area that might conflict with a van-accessible parking space. Staff requested that they cut the landscaping back. With the addition of the landscaping on Ramona Avenue, they have slightly more landscaping than the calculations on the site plan.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the alternative site plan, with the modifications described related to sidewalk placement and landscaping.

Commissioner Peterson stated that her initial concern was with parking. She asked if there was a way to incorporate garages in a mixed use project. Planner Hetherington stated that if garages were used, the parking wouldn't be accessible to the commercial uses during the day. He stated that there are not usually garages incorporated with mixed use projects because of the type of development. He stated that it is a factor of this type of development. People who want garages likely wouldn't buy a unit in a mixed use environment. He stated that there is ample on-street parking to accommodate any overflow parking, even though they meet parking requirements on-site.

Chair Marshall asked if staff had spoken to the applicant about the possibility of using pavers or other materials for the parking lot. Planner Hetherington stated that they did not make that recommendation, but it is something that the Commission could request, if they desired.

Chair Marshall asked if there were discussions about the metal roof that is proposed. Director Hansen stated that the reason for the metal roof is to allow it to change its color and gain patina as it ages. Planner Hetherington stated that another advantage to the metal roof is that it lasts longer than shingled or tiled.

Director Hansen stated that early on in the project, they applicants were convinced to go with a totally underground drainage system. It is a very efficient system, and they were able to increase the amount of open space, making a lot more pervious area than was originally proposed.

Chair Marshall asked City Engineer Garing if the parking along Ramona was acceptable. Mr. Garing stated that the proposed parking is very similar to the plan for 10<sup>th</sup> Street for the Transit Hub, which plans for back-in parking for much of the area of Ramona and 10<sup>th</sup> Street.

Chair Marshall asked if Engineering gives credit for the use of pervious pavers. Mr. Garing stated that they do. He stated that it is an economic decision that the developer would make. They give credit for pervious surfaces, as long as that surface is capable of intaking a 100 year storm through the surface.

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

Joel Snyder, project designer, spoke representing the owner. He presented some slides and described the project. He stated that they tried to incorporate as much landscaping as possible. He stated that they wanted the project to be very pedestrian oriented. He stated that they incorporated features to reduce the massing of the building.

Mr. Snyder stated that they intend to bring the project up for review before SLO Green Build, once they have City approval. They are considering pre-wiring for solar panels, pre-plumbing it for hot water heat. Regarding paving, he stated that they initially had proposed using pavers, but they were told not to by the City. He stated that it had something to do with the drive aisle, but they are willing to address this with the City Engineer. Regarding parking, he stated that it is shared parking for mixed-use. He believes that mixed-use projects take cars off of the road.

Chair Marshall asked Mr. Snyder if he agreed with the new site plans. Mr. Snyder indicated that they were fine with the changes. Chair Marshall asked if there were any issues related to glare coming off of the metal roof. Mr. Snyder stated that on the revised elevations, they have gone with less metal roofs, using it more as an accent, because of cost considerations. He stated that there are no glare problems associated with metal roofs, because the metal is treated and has a dull finish.

Chair Marshall asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak; no one stepped forward, and the Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Snow asked if people who owned the shops could live upstairs. Director Hansen stated that they could. Planner Reese clarified that it was not a requirement of the project.

Commissioner Peterson stated that she is excited about this project. She has seen back-in parking used, and it is a creative solution. She likes the project and likes that the applicants have

only asked for one concession. She is glad they are undergrounding drainage and will be considering pavers.

Chair Marshall asked about Resolution 07-043, Page 4, CDD 10, regarding trash enclosures. The conditions states that the location of the enclosure must be approved by the Community Development Department. He asked if that should be approved by South County Sanitation, instead. He also suggested that the word “located” be changed to “location”.

Director Hansen stated that they work closely with South County Sanitation, and that they are given the opportunity to comment early on in the process to make sure that the access works for them. Changing the word to “location” would be appropriate.

Commissioner Peterson made the motion to approve the project according to staff's recommendations, with the amendment noted. Commissioner Snow seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 3-0-2-0.

**8) Capital Improvement Program Project No. 296  
Applicant – City of Grover Beach City Engineer**

Planning Commission consideration of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Coastal Development Permit for Capital Improvement Program Project No. 296, a proposal to replace the existing bridge at the West Grand Avenue crossing of Meadow Creek and the installation of new storm lines along West Grand Avenue from North 4<sup>th</sup> Street westerly to Meadow Creek. The project planner is Ray Hetherington.

Planner Ray Hetherington presented the staff report. He outlined the two components of the plan: replacement of the existing bridge and the installation of new storm lines along West Grand Avenue. This will improve filtration of stormwater and coastal access to the beach areas which meets the goals and policies of the Local Coastal Plan. There was a mitigated negative declaration was prepared by Rincon Associates and City staff and was circulated and went to the State Clearinghouse. The only comment received was from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, dealing with issues related to construction, and those will be incorporated into the project approval. Also, the Coastal Commission was notified and received copies of the environmental document and the plans. No comment was received, to date. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the mitigated negative declaration and grant the Coastal Development permit.

Commissioner Peterson asked if the City Council had approved the design of the project. Director Hansen stated that that was correct. He stated that the Planning Commission is evaluating the impact of the proposed construction activities for the bridge and drainage system. Commissioner Peterson asked if they have architectural purview over this project. Director Hansen stated that the City Council took the lead on this project and selected the design.

Commissioner Snow asked about the filtration system, and how is the extra cost accommodated.

City Engineer Jim Garing stated that the filters are inserted into the drainage inlets and these filters collect sediment and absorb oil during the course of the rainfall year. After the rainfall year is over, City crews change and/or clean these elements. It is part of the normal maintenance procedures to go about maintaining these features.

Commissioner Snow stated that he thought the filters were expensive. City Engineer Garing stated that the last bid price on the filters for the Mentone Storm Drain was \$700-800 per inlet. Director Hansen stated that those are factored into the budget under “Maintenance”.

City Engineer Garing stated that the staff report indicated that the bridge would be about two feet higher, but as they got further into the design, the bridge will actually rise about 1 foot. This is beneficial because it reduces the amount of paving that has to be removed and replaced and cuts the project costs.

The existing bridge is a 20 foot span, and has treated timber with a concrete deck on top of that. The original south half was built in 1951 and the north half in 1964. It is an old structure, and is partially out of service. One of the reasons for the new bridge configuration is because it has a longer span, 32 feet compared to the 20 feet of the existing bridge. There is room to operate behind the wood abutments and avoid disturbing the environment while pouring the new foundations for the bridge. The old abutments will stay in place as they construct the new bridge. The timber will be removed down below the water line. From an environmental standpoint, there are advantages to removing the old bridge. The traffic flow and striping for the new bridge won't change significantly from what is existing now.

Commissioner Snow asked about beach access during construction. City Engineer Garing stated that the sequencing will be to remove the south half of the bridge that is out of service first and the new south half will be built. Traffic will be on the north half during that time. Once the south half is completed, the north half will be constructed, with traffic moving on the south half.

He gave some background about the master storm drain plan. This is an updated design of the planned drainage system that was recognized to be needed and constructed 30 years ago. It has been a long time in coming, but finally funding is available to complete it. He stated that the water that flows through the system gets to the same location whether it is above or below ground, but the underground system keeps it from going through buildings. In preparation for this drain, in 1981, they designed a new drain on North 4<sup>th</sup> Street, and they left a stub out to connect to it.

Chair Marshall had a question about conditions related to notification about the work being done, and asked if other local agencies should also be notified. City Engineer stated that regarding access would remain at two lanes. He stated that they will be coordinating with Pismo Beach Public Works staff, since they have a significant waste water outfall going through that area, which will likely be relocated.

Chair Marshall requested that public transportation companies be notified of any road closures.

Commissioner Peterson asked about the treated timber, and asked if it is an environmental concern. Engineer Garing answered that it is an organic substance, and generally considered to not be good for the environment, and where possible they try to remove it because it has a negative impact on wildlife. Most piers have creosoted timber. It was a very common material in the past.

Commissioner Peterson asked about the proposed "shelf life" of the new bridge. Mr. Garing stated that the new bridge would be on steel pilings, which are coated, and they will be submerged under the earth and be fully protected. He expects the new bridge to last for 100 years.

Chair Marshall opened the public hearing and invited comment. There was no one present who wished to comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Peterson made the motion to approve the project according to staff's recommendations. Commissioner Snow seconded the motion, and it was carried with a vote of 3-0-2-0.

9) **Density Bonus Ordinance**

**Applicant – City of Grover Beach Staff**

Planning Commission consideration of a proposed Ordinance Amendment adding Part 49 “Housing Density Bonuses and Concessions/Incentives” Section to the Municipal Code implementing State Density Bonus law and the City proposed Density Bonus and Concessions/Incentives Section designed to address proposed housing projects that do not meet the State threshold of five residential units but propose one or more affordable units.

This item was continued to the meeting of July 10, 2007.

10) **General Plan Finding of Consistency**

Consideration and determination of a General Plan finding of consistency regarding proposed acquisition of property located at 506 Longbranch Ave. (Assessor Parcel No. 060-271-016) by the City of Grover Beach Improvement Agency for future affordable housing development.

City Attorney Martin Koczanowicz presented the staff report. He indicated that this item is before the Planning Commission for a formalization of an action that will pass this project forward to the City Council. The City Council established an affordable housing program which entailed the purchase of a piece of property on which the development would be committed to lower income housing. The funding comes from Redevelopment Set Aside funds which come from the improvement agency. The selection was made of 506 Longbranch, which is a parcel on which a 3 unit residential project was recently approved by the Planning Commission. The City has entered into negotiations with the property owner of that parcel and is intending to purchase it. What is before the Planning Commission now is a request to determine that the project is consistent with the General Plan. The parcel is zoned R-3, and is surrounded by R-3 and CR-2 zoning. Staff recommends that they make the finding of consistency and move the project forward to the City Council.

City Attorney Koczanowicz clarified that the City is intending to purchase the property and provide it as an incentive to a developer for an affordable (low or very low income) housing project. It will still be residential. Commissioner Peterson asked if it would be a 3-unit project, like the previously approved project on that site. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that it could be a 3 or 4 unit project. In either event, it is still within the parameters of the R-3 zone. No zoning change will be required. Director Hansen stated that the project would come back before the Planning Commission.

Director Hansen stated that the City has resubmitted a request for the 2006 Home Funds, which were originally allocated for a 13<sup>th</sup> Street project, to be allocated to this property under discussion. Those funds will be used for construction assistance. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that that is has been discussed, but it has not been approved yet. It could also be used to assist buyers in purchasing.

City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the price of the lot has already been negotiated, and is between \$400,000-450,000. He stated that this project will use up about half of what is in the City's current Set Aside funds. Once the set aside fund reaches 1 million, there has to be a plan in place to utilize that money.

Director Hansen stated that this project does bring the City closer to meeting the RHNA numbers. Every little bit adds up.

Commissioner Peterson asked what the process was for choosing a developer. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the method has not been determined. There are options of either an RFP process or other ways. It won't be a bid process. Commissioner Peterson asked what the process for ownership would be, since the City owns the land. City Attorney Koczanowicz stated that the land will be deeded to the builder under the development agreement, to be deeded to the prospective buyers.

Commissioner Peterson asked what the overall plan. Director Hansen stated that the plan is to acquire land and obtain requests for proposals. They are also looking at other funding sources in addition to agency funds.

Chair Marshall opened the public hearing and invited public comment. Seeing none, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Peterson stated that this is a step in the right direction.

Commissioner Snow made a motion to accept staff's recommendations. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion and it was carried with a vote of 3-0-2-0.

**ADJOURNMENT:** 9:10 p.m.

/s/  
CHAIR PETERSON

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

(Approved at PC Meeting: December 11, 2007)