

CITY OF MORRO BAY
PLANNING COMMISSION
SYNOPSIS MINUTES

(Complete audio- and videotapes of this meeting are available from the City upon request)

Veteran's Memorial Building
Regular Meeting, 6:00 p.m.

209 Surf Street, Morro Bay
Monday, November 19, 2007

Chairperson Nancy Johnson
Vice-Chairperson Bill Woodson Commissioner Michael Lucas
Commissioner Gerald Luhr Commissioner Gary Ream
Michael Prater, Secretary

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Rachel Grossman led the pledge.

III. ROLL CALL

Johnson asked that the record show all Commissioners were present.

Staff Present: Michael Prater, Rachel Grossman and Kimberly Peeples

IV. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

MOTION: Woodson, Ream 2nd to accept the agenda as stated. VOTE: 5-0

V. DIRECTOR'S REPORT/WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Prater highlighted the following action taken by the Council at their last meeting:

- They adopted the new Building Code along with all of the amendments that went along with it for the municipal code, which will take effect as of January 1, 2008.
- They adopted the lot split for the City owned Coral Street property into six lots with a deed restriction to preserve the trees along San Jacinto Street.

Ream asked if all the projects that come before the Planning Commission in the future could include not only the gross square footage of the lot but also the net square footage. Prater acknowledged that information could be provided on all future sub-division maps as per the new sub-division ordinance. Woodson asked if the City would take care of the site improvements on the Coral Street Property prior to the sale of the lots. Prater acknowledged they would potentially hire a developer to do those improvements and then choose to sell the lots individually or as a whole.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

VII. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of minutes from hearing held on November 5, 2007

MOTION: Ream, Woodson 2nd to accept the minutes as printed. VOTE: 5-0.

VIII. PRESENTATIONS

Prater noted there are not any presentations this evening but there will be presentation forthcoming at the future meetings.

IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- A. Pedestrian pathway and circulation plan.
- B. Secondary unit design competition and consideration to waive development fees for secondary units.
- C. More effective announcement of Planning Commission agendas.

X. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Site Location: 385 Kings Avenue in the R-1 zoning district. Applicant: Greg Meade. The applicant requests Conditional Use Permit approval to construct a 233 square foot addition to an existing nonconforming residence. This site is located outside of the appeals jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission. (Recommended CEQA Determination: Categorically exempt, Class 1). Staff Recommendation: Conditionally approve the project. Staff Contact: Rachel Grossman, Associate Planner.

Grossman presented the Staff report noting the non-conformities on this project and the previous additions in which permits should have required, but were not. Lucas clarified how habitable and non-habitable space was calculated and suggested a different way to approach it in the future. Woodson noted he had spoken at length with the applicant and clarified with Staff what the parking requirements are for this project. Grossman confirmed 2 covered and enclosed parking spaces are required. Woodson felt this site had plenty of onsite parking as the garage is currently designed. Luhr asked if the fourteen-foot garage door the client currently has, would meet current codes. Grossman noted our code does not specify a minimum size of a garage door.

Johnson opened the Public Hearing asking the applicant to address this Commission. The applicant Greg Meade addressed the Commission sighting the history of this site, his feeling that the previous additions should not be a consideration for this current project and he should not be required to get a conditional use permit for this project.

Seeing no further comment, Johnson closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant confirmed for Woodson that he could get one car in the existing garage.

Luhr confirmed with the applicant the location in the garage of the FAU. Noting his concern with the difficulty of moving a FAU to a code compliant location. Johnson explained the process to clarify for the applicant. Woodson asked Grossman to help clarify the process for the applicant. Grossman addressed the process concern.

Lucas noted he agreed with Staff on this project feeling the attic is of the appearance of being habitable and the roof deck appears to be very complex in design.

Ream appreciated Staff bringing this before the Commission for their review noting his only concern with this project would be if they were giving a special privilege, but Grossman confirmed there are other houses in this neighborhood with similar garages.

Luhr was in favor of the project and could go either way on leaving Condition 14 or deleting it.

Woodson was in favor of the project suggesting they delete Condition 14 and consider a condition addressing the height limit so no further additions would put this over 25' from average natural grade.

Luhr asked Staff to confirm how close this roof deck is to the height limit. Staff confirmed it is very close.

MOTION: Woodson, Ream 2nd to approved the project as presented removing Condition 14 in Exhibit B and adding a Condition to Exhibit B requiring that no object portable or permanent other than chimneys and vents, shall exceed 25 feet in height from the average natural grade elevation. VOTE: 5-0.

B. Site Location: 1900 Main Street in the MCR/R-4 (SP) zoning district. Applicant: Glenn Rider. The applicant proposes to subdivide an existing triplex into airspace condominium units, resulting in three for sale residential condominium units. This site is not located within the appeals jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission. (Recommended CEQA Determination: Categorical Exemption, Class 1). Staff Recommendation: Conditionally approve the project. Staff Contact: Rachel Grossman, Associate Planner.

Grossman presented the Staff Report noting the background of the triplex and the special nuances of this project.

Staff addressed the following concerns from the Commissioners:

- Storage provisions and that storage can be located in most locations
- Nine conversions have been done in the City in the past twelve months
- The front yard setback is at 15 feet from the property line, which is the building edge
- A three-foot fence is proposed to delineate the private open space
- How the private open space was calculated for this conversion
- Each unit has it's own washer, dryer and water heater, so they do not affect the open space
- Each condominium does not need to have a two-car garage
- Visitor parking is not required for this conversion

Johnson opened the Public Hearing and asked the applicant to address the Commission. Glenn Rider addressed the Commission highlighting the possible options for providing storage in an alternate location, the potential for removing the fence if the Commission feels that would take away from the appeal of the project, and the amount of open space.

Seeing no further comment, Johnson closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant and Staff addressed the following question and concerns from the Commission:

- If they remained apartments they would rent for approximately \$1500 per month or less
- The deck for unit A could be expanded from 90 square feet to 100 square feet
- The southwest corner of Unit A could not be included in the open space because it is not a minimum of 10 ft.
- The applicant would be willing to take the fence to the building edge
- Each unit has three bedrooms
- The Homeowners Association would be responsible for all of the landscaping

Woodson, Luhr and Ream all noted they spoken with the applicant today.

Ream noted he would vote no if they allowed a fence in the front yard, noting it would make it look too boxy and would make the landscaping the sole responsibility of Unit A owner instead of the Homeowners Association.

Lucas expressed his dismay over this project being approved only a few months ago when our new rules were only approved a few months ago and he strongly felt this parcel should have been zoned commercial. He wasn't sure how he was going to vote for this project.

Woodson was in favor of the conversion noting these apartments have never been occupied so there is not a loss of rental units and does not want to see a fence on this project.

Luhr echoed Commissioner Lucas's thoughts that this was an ill conceived project and should have been commercial or mixed use from the beginning, noting he is in favor of the project and could go along with the project not having fences.

MOTION: Woodson, Luhr 2nd to approve the project as presented with the exception of no private open space in the front set back on the ground level with no fences in the front yard setback with the exception for the existing fences.

VOTE: 4-1 (Lucas opposed)

- C. Site Location: 694 Ponderosa Street in the R-A (PD) District. Applicant: Bob Dalton. A request for a Conditional Use Permit and Coastal Development Permit to construct a new 2,075-sqft single-family residence with attached four-car garage and convert the existing 854-sqft residence into the secondary unit. The new residence would require the removal of three trees. This site is located outside the Coastal Commission's Appeal Jurisdiction. (CEQA Determination: Categorical Exemption – Class 3).
Staff Recommendation: Conditionally Approve the Project. Staff contact: Mike Prater, Planning Manager.

Prater presented the Staff Report.

Ream noted he had been by the site today and three trees had already been removed and is deeply disturbed that they did not follow the City's regulations.

Staff addressed the following questions and concerns from the Commissioners:

- Why a CEQA exemption was done on this project when there is a known archeological site very close to this
- What the Tree Removal Guidelines are for the Public
- Pavers would not need to be required for the driveway, loose gravel would be acceptable
- Lot coverage for the granny unit and the new house meets the requirements
- Average natural grade calculations could be noted on the elevation sheets on all future set of plans
- The curb cuts and the amount of driveways meet all current regulations
- Staff was of the impression the current home does not have a one-car garage; Woodson thought it did
- The parking requirements are being meet for this project
- The process that takes place should archeological items be discovered on the site
- Confirmed that the Commission could require an archeologist on this project
- Confirmed that landscaping plans are not required for this project because no landscaping is proposed
- Should landscaping be proposed, Staff would require they use drought tolerant plants from the approved list
- Confirmed that the Commission could require them to do landscaping
- Confirmed Staff did not get a chance to inspect the trees that were removed
- Confirmed that this project is before the Commission because it is in the Route 41 view corridor
- Confirmed that the items that are provided by applicants for projects are at the Commissions discretion

Johnson opened the Public Hearing and asked the applicant to address the Commission. The applicant's son, Paul Dalton addressed the Commission starting by apologizing for the early removal of the trees and noting the type and colors of materials that will be used on the new building will be matched to the existing building.

Seeing no further comment, Johnson closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant and Staff addressed the following questions from the Commission:

- Applicant confirmed the driveway width is designed at 21 feet for their work trucks
- The type of trees removed were one bottle brush and two myoporiums
- Additional landscaping will be added at a later date when they are financially able to
- Staff confirmed that on a R-A zoned property they could store work items
- Inquired if they plan to limit the peak runoff to predevelopment levels, which would need to be addressed by the applicant's engineer who was not present
- Applicant is willing to specify on the plans the materials that are intended to be used for the hardscape
- If they would be willing to eliminate one of the driveways and submit a landscaping plan – no response

Ream stated he thought the concerns about what additional items the Commission expects should be addressed with the Planning Staff and not wait until an applicant is before them and make them come back with more information. He also noted that he did not feel an archeologist was necessary, as the surrounding areas have not proven to be sensitive, the potential of future landscaping is noted in the conditions already and was in favor of the project.

During discussion the Commissioners expressed the following concerns and desire for additional conditions:

- Concern about the need for archeological monitoring
- The large amount of gravel area as it could potentially be paved
- Require landscaping plans
- Require on the site at least two 15-gallon trees for each of the trees that were removed
- Be sure the run off for this site is addressed
- Limit the width of the drive to 14 foot
- Require the paving to be screened from the street with drought tolerant plants
- Add a condition that they driveways must be a pervious material

Woodson clarified the circular driveway in front won't be removed, but only one driveway to the rear. The applicant noted if the second driveway is removed, which will eliminate the circular aspect of the rear driveway; the project probably won't be built.

Johnson summarized the Commissioners concerns as:

- Have only one 14-foot driveway
- Provide landscaping plans for screening with City approved plants and trees
- Require an archeologist on site during excavation

Luhr asked the applicant if they prefer an approval with conditions, a continuation, or a denial that could be appealed. The applicant asked to have the item continued.

MOTION: Ream, Lucas 2nd to continue the item to a date uncertain. VOTE: 5-0.

XI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Current Planning Processing List

Projects submitted for Administrative Approval (not single-family residential unless in MCR)

1. 1860 Main Street – Install fuel island canopy

XII. NEW BUSINESS

Ream would like to see on a future agenda in a very near date to discuss what the Commission would like included in plans for projects brought before the Commission including Staffs input as to what they would like to see included.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Johnson adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting at the Veterans Hall, 209 Surf Street, on Monday, December 3, 2007, at 6:00 p.m.

Nancy Johnson, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Michael Prater
Secretary