

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, December 4, 2006

Acting Chairperson Nancy Johnson
Vice-Chairperson Robert Tefft Commissioner Bill Woodson
Commissioner Vacant Commissioner Gary Ream
Mike Prater, Secretary

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

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

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ream led the pledge.

III. ROLL CALL

Johnson asked that the record show the four remaining Commissioners were present.
Staff Present: Bruce Ambo, Michael Prater, Rachel Grossman, and Kimberly Peeples

IV. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

MOTION: Woodson, Ream 2nd to approve the agenda. Vote: 4-0.

V. DIRECTOR'S REPORT/Written COMMUNICATIONS

Ambo highlighted the following City Council items from the November 13, 2006 meeting:

- Approved the appeal of the Colmer project on South Bay Blvd.
- Approved the 6 lot Sunset Project
- Adopted a Wastewater Fee Increase
- Awarded a contract to overlay South Bay Blvd.
- Refocused the study for the Fire Station to look at combining it all into one project

Some of the upcoming items the Council will be looking at are:

- Filling the vacancies on the various Boards and Commissions sometime in January
- After the vacancies are filled they will then schedule the joint meeting with the Planning Commission

Upcoming items for the December 6, 2006 meeting will be:

- The new council member and mayor re-elect will be sworn in
- Acceptance of the election results

The next regular Council meeting is set for December 11, 2006 and the item of interest for the Planning Commission would be the proposed South Main Street moratorium.

Woodson asked what is defined as South Main Street. Prater said that would be determined in the Staff report being prepared by Rob Schultz, City Attorney. Woodson also inquired about the City Council Sub-Division workshop that took place and if there were any significant differences that the City Council found from what the Planning Commission had determined. Ambo responded that there were a few and Staff will be taking back some additional information to them at the January 8, 2007 meeting and he would be happy to make that information available to the Commission if they were interested.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of minutes from hearing held on November 6, 2006

MOTION: Tefft, Ream 2nd to approve the minutes as presented. VOTE: 4-0.

VII. PRESENTATIONS – None

VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

John Parker read a portion of section number 15126.4 out of the California Environmental Quality Act.

IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS - None

X. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. *Continued From November 6, 2006*

Site Location: 810 Morro Bay Blvd in the C-1/S.4 Zoning District. Applicant: David Armentrout. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use, Coastal Development Permit, Parking Exception and Lot Merger to remodel and occupy an existing building to establish a restaurant with live music. The restaurant requires a total of seventeen (17) parking spaces. The proposed parking plan would provide eleven (11) on-site spaces, five (5) off-site spaces, and request In-Lieu-Payment for one (1) space. Modifications are requested for the angle and aisle width along with the need to back out into the alley before moving in a forward direction. This site is located outside of the Coastal Commission's Appeal jurisdiction. (Recommended CEQA Determination: Categorical Exempt, Classes 1, 3, and 5).

Staff Recommendation: Conditionally approve the project and Deny the Parking Exception.

Staff Contact: Mike Prater, Senior Planner, 772-6261.

Prater presented the Staff report highlighting the changes the applicant made based upon the Commission's previous suggestions, specifically noting the Parking Analysis the applicant obtained. He also reviewed Staff's recommendation regarding the in-lieu parking fee that is still being required. Staff also clarified the following questions asked by the Commissioners:

- Parking requirement for the neighboring property
- If the lighting plan is satisfactory
- Is the Urban Land Management Publication was a satisfactory reference

Johnson opened the Public Hearing by asking the applicant or the agent to address the Commission.

Greg Barker and David Armentrout addressed the Commission and satisfactorily addressed the Commissioners questions and concerns.

Seeing no further comment Johnson closed the Public Hearing.

During discussion all of the Commissioners spoke favorably about the project. Tefft spoke in favor of the in-lieu fee; he also suggested a grating at the front of the swale, additional landscape requirements for trimming and maintenance of landscaping, as well as a maintenance requirement for the awning. Woodson spoke in favor of shared parking as a potential possibility for future projects and asked on Exhibit B #9 to have the screening be specific to "screened from Morro Bay Blvd. View". He would also like 19b to be price specific and change the type-o on 19g by changing the word UNLOCKER TO "UNLOCKED".

MOTION: Ream, Tefft 2nd to approve the project as presented with the following additional items:

- Grating of swale
- Awning in good repair
- Parking lot lighting
- "Parking in Rear" sign in the landscape
- Additional landscape requirements
- Reflective tape on the pole

VOTE: 4-0.

- B. Site Location: 1170 Front Street in the C-VS/PD (SP) Zoning District. Applicant: Robin Martella and George Leage. The applicant requests Conditional Use Permit and Variance approvals to construct a six-unit hotel, associated manager's unit and seven space subterranean parking lot. This site is located within the original jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission. (Recommended CEQA Determination: A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared).
Staff Recommendation: Conditionally approve the project.
Staff Contact: Rachel Grossman, Assistant Planner, 772-6261.

Grossman presented the Staff report noting the exceptions and variances that are being requested with this application and Staff's support of these exceptions and variances. She also noted the error in numbering on the conditions beginning on page 20 and that these would be changed at the issuance of permit.

Woodson questioned and Grossman addressed the following items:

- How the angle of the bluff is determined
- How the height of the bluff is determined
- Condition number 37 and if a bond would better suit the situation instead of insurance

Johnson opened the Public Hearing and asked the applicant or the agent to address the Commission. Cathy Novak, agent for the applicant addressed the Commission regarding the set back exception.

Ream questioned the soils report and the conflicting information from the report for a property in the near vicinity. Bruce Elster, Project Engineer explained that the other soils report only reviewed the soils from the base of the bluff down and the report being used for this project includes the same information, as well as soils from the base of the bluff up into the bluff.

Tefft asked where the bluff survey came from and if it was the same survey that was used for the bakery building. He also asked why the building floors were setback to the location selected. Chris Parker, Project Architect satisfactorily addressed this topic. Tefft asked how it will be possible to get the 12 inches of materials behind the retaining wall in the area that is only has an 8-inch setback. Bruce Elster satisfactorily addressed the question.

Mark Smith, neighboring resident expressed his concerns about the construction infringing on his property rights, issues with the bluff height, drainage concerns, and property lines after construction, but was generally in favor of the project.

Peter Behman, neighboring resident and property owner for the Bayfront Inn and spoke favorably of the project, but expressed his concerns about the effects of the excavation on his property, preferring an adequate bond to be put in place instead of the suggested insurance and is also concerned about early construction hours affecting their patrons and would like to be apprised of their intended schedule.

Rolf Poprowski speaking for Jane Ford spoke in favor of the project but felt bonding should be put in place for some of the project, not just insurance. Woodson asked if the proposed projection adjustment by Staff would be something he is in favor of, since it would affect his view more than any others. Mr. Poprowski said he did not feel it was necessary and feels the project is satisfactory as designed.

Troy Leage, applicant's representative addressed the Commission and expressed the applicant's desire to develop the site with the blessing of the City and the neighboring property owners.

Cathy Novak addressed a number of the concerns expressed by the neighboring property owners. Likewise, Bruce Elster addressed the difference between insurance and bonding.

Johnson closed the Public Hearing seeing no further comments.

Ream spoke in favor of the project and felt the slope of the roof was not an issue. He also noted the concerns of the neighboring hotel should be addressed so as to not disturb their patrons.

Tefft was not in favor of a flat roof and would like to see this redesigned with a sloped roof, even if it meant a loss of the underground parking, but he was in favor of the setback as posed, the proposed public benefit and the step back at the angle proposed by the applicant.

Woodson asked Staff to address the flat roof topic. Grossman did so expressing their concern that a redesign with a pitched roof would kill the project. Woodson agreed with Staff and was in favor of the project as presented with the removal of condition 32 in Exhibit B.

Ream asked Staff if the public benefit money would be applied to this area specifically or general vertical access. Staff responded that it would be put into a fund for general vertical access from the bluff top to the bottom. Staff also requested that a condition be added that was left out regarding the public benefit money.

Johnson spoke in favor of the project and felt the value of the underground parking was much greater than having a sloped roof on the building.

MOTION: Woodson, Ream 2nd to approve the project with the removal of condition 32 in Exhibit B and addition of a condition for a public benefit of \$25,000 for Vertical Access. VOTE: 3-1 (Tefft opposed)

Johnson called for a break @ 7:52 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 8:09 p.m.

- C. Site Location: 978 Quintana Road in the C-2/S.4 Zoning District. Applicant: Cameron Financial. The applicant requests a Conditional Use Permit and Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing structure currently occupied as a residence and construct a new industrial suite complex made up of seven suite totaling 6,686 square feet of first floor area with the option to construct mezzanines totaling 1,855 square feet. This new complex will be built as a shell building with future tenant improvements as needed. This site is located outside of the appeals jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission. (Recommended CEQA Determination: A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared).
Staff Recommendation: Conditionally approve the project. Staff Contact: Mike Prater, Senior Planner

Prater presented the Staff Report noting the revised plans that were supplied today by the applicant which have addressed the concerns presented in the Staff report.

Johnson opened the Public Hearing and asked the applicant or their agent to address the Commission. Greg Ravait, architect for the project addressed the Commission detailing some of the recent changes made to enhance the appearance of the project.

Ream questioned if the power lines in the rear were going to be put underground and if not, he would suggest a different type of tree in the rear. It was acknowledged the power lines would not be put underground.

Bill Todd spoke in favor of the project, but did express traffic and drainage concerns for his neighboring property.

Roger Ewing spoke in favor of the project but expressed his concerns about drainage, parking, traffic and occupancy issues for the site. He would like to see a policy instituted requiring commercial properties to have tenants prior to approval of the building, so new building do not remain empty.

Greg Ravait addressed the concerns expressed by the members of the public that commented on the project.

Johnson closed the Public Hearing seeing no further comments.

Woodson confirmed that the rear garden wall would be of the same appearance on both sides. Ream questioned the number of exits in one of the suites and felt the occupancy being addressed after the building is built is a normal process and not one he would see done differently. Johnson confirmed the process any potential tenant would have to go through. During discussion all of the Commissioners spoke favorably about the project and the high need for this type of project.

MOTION: Tefft, Woodson 2nd to approve the project as presented. VOTE: 4-0.

XI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Current Planning Processing List

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

1. None

XII. NEW BUSINESS – None

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Johnson adjourned the meeting at 9:42 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting at the Veterans Hall, 209 Surf Street, on Tuesday, January 2, 2007, at 6:00 p.m.

Nancy Johnson, Acting Chairperson

ATTEST:

Michael Prater, Secretary