

**Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting
of June 13, 2012**

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

TA 12-05 – PARKING REGULATIONS

At the direction of the City Council, the Planning Commission will review the City of Lompoc Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.112 – Parking Regulations and prepare a recommendation to the City Council for possible updates.

Principal Planner Keith Neubert provided a brief history of the recent Parking Regulation Updates.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:35 P.M.

Jim Dixon, J B Dixon Engineering – indicated he has worked with the City Parking Regulations on many projects and generally they work; however, he noted requiring applicants to double-stripe parking spaces adds additional expense to development. He also questioned the need for loading zones on small projects since the Vehicle Code allows commercial vehicles to park on the street for deliveries.

Commissioner Hammons asked for specific jurisdictions where single line stripping was allowed and Mr. Dixon responded there was no universal standard. Commissioner Leach asked what is considered a small project and Mr. Dixon responded it should be left to applicant to determine individual need.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:40 P.M.

Commissioner Gonzales invited each Commissioner to discuss concerns/recommendations for the Parking regulations.

Section H -- Winery Uses:

Commissioner Clark questioned application of Option B on the table of required parking for Winery Uses and staff explained how this was interpreted. If there is a 20,000 square foot winery (processing & storage), a maximum of 15% (not to exceed 4,500 sq. ft.) could be used for wine tasting and office, or 3,000 sq. ft. Twenty parking spaces would be required for the building and the facility would be allowed office/tasting use up to 3,000 sq. ft. without additional parking required. There would need to be a recorded agreement on the project site.

Commissioner Hammons stated if there had not been problems with the wineries regarding the parking requirements they should remain as adopted.

Miscellaneous Discussion:

Commissioner Fink presented a handout of a statistics on employee density in the late 1990's in Portland, Oregon; referenced specific projects where parking had been a problem (Wyrick Lumber , Lompoc Valley Community Hospital, Sansum Medical Clinic, College Park Apartments), and the Planning Commission discussed these projects and how parking had impacted design of the projects and surrounding uses. The Commissioners discussed changing language under Section 17.112.010 Scope of Regulations-- Applicability C, D, E and staff explained how required parking is monitored .

Section C -- OTC Uses:

Commissioner Fink questioned not requiring on site parking in the *Old Town Commercial* District based on the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) and the fact the RDA owned some of the parking lots in the OTC.

Commissioner Gonzales indicated the lots may need to be sold as part of the dissolution of the RDA.

Attorney Ailin indicated there is currently legislation pending regarding requiring sale of public owned parking lots formerly owned by redevelopment agencies and what legislation might actually be adopted is unknown. However she noted many jurisdictions rely on commercial developers to provide parking in old towns.

Commissioner Leach indicated that some lots are privately owned and support a specific business.,She suggested language be clarified for the parking exemption in the OTC

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:50 P.M.

Mary Saladino, resident – suggested that the OTC is not as efficient as new development; states that the City should encourage walking; suggested requirements for bicycle parking; and noted the need for the buses to unload.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:55 P.M.

Commissioner Clark discussed the parking lot on Cypress Avenue utilized by commuters. Commissioner Hammons noted there are other lots including the one to the north of the Chamber building.

Section D – Manufacturing & Industrial Uses:

Commissioner Fink suggested a change to the current requirement of *1 space for each 500 sq. ft. of gross floor area to 1 space per 650 sq. ft. of gross floor area.*

Commissioner Gonzales indicated concern with combining Manufacturing/Warehouse Uses and suggested a reduction in the requirement to 1 per 750 sq. ft. of gross floor area.

Commissioner Leach noted the parking is intended to support the building over the life of the building and there could be a number of different permitted uses in any building, and indicated a willingness to leave the requirement as it is. She referenced requirements for the Cities of Paso Robles, Santa Maria, and San Luis Obispo.

Commissioner Gonzales suggested that the standards need to be flexible and suggested *1 space per 750 sq. ft. of gross floor area plus one (1) space per employee.*

Section E - Medical Uses:

Commissioner Fink indicated the requirement for medical facilities is not adequate and suggests for Doctor's Offices the requirement should be *3 spaces per exam room plus 1 space per employee* and for a hospital use *1 space per 2 employees* in addition to the existing standard

Commissioner Leach suggested adding *1 space per employee* to the hospital requirement in case of a future expansion. She indicated the parking for the Sansum Clinic is clearly not adequate.

Section F – Recreation & Public Assembly Uses

Commissioner Fink noted under Mortuary the statement *as determined by the Community Development Director* was not in any other section and should be deleted.

Commissioner Gonzales suggested a more flexible standard for the Non-profit Youth and Nursery School categories of *1 space per 500 square feet of gross floor area plus 1 space per employee.*

Section G – Residential Uses

The Commission discussed the need for Visitor Parking in Residential developments and whether there should be an additional requirement where a clubhouse was proposed. Commissioner Fink suggested an Option A (clubhouse for use of residents only) and Option B (clubhouse open to the public for various occasions). Commissioner Hammons agreed the proposal was a good one, even though there would be additional cost to the homeowner associations for the development and suggests a requirement for additional off-street parking.

Design and Construction

The Commission discussed combining sections A & B, however it was determined both sections were valid and served separate purposes.

The Commission questioned the rationale for the double striping requirement and staff will provide the information at a later date.

The requirement for a loading zone was discussed.

The need for covered parking vs. non-covered parking in the Mixed Use District was discussed and how the requirement for covered parking adds to the cost of development.

Section A – Automobile Uses

Commissioner Leach suggested reducing the requirement from *4 spaces* to *3 spaces* for Automobile Service. Commissioner Fink noted often cars are parked awaiting a part or for service.

In-Lieu Payments

The Commission discussed the concept and recommended removal of the section.

Tandem Parking

Commissioner Gonzales discussed the use of tandem parking in other jurisdictions to allow the adaptive re-use of residential properties and noted tandem parking is allowed in new projects in some areas to lower the cost of development in multi-family projects.

Commissioner Leach stated she would not be comfortable with tandem parking in new developments and noted the intent of the Zoning Ordinance is for new development and to make living space as comfortable as possible for the resident and the concept of tandem parking only benefits the developer.

Commissioner Fink indicated the need for strict regulation in view of recent developments in the City; noted the concept would only be successful if the parties were cooperative; and discussed the potential for conflict between neighbors.

Commissioner Clark expressed conflicted feelings and indicated the possibility of conflict in a multi-family application where the concept may work in a single family development.

Commissioner Hammons questioned the design detail of a single driveway and indicated parking is always a problem for regulation.

Commissioner Gonzales noted he was requesting consideration of the concept and agreed it must be design driven to work.

Staff will return with strike-out version of Ordinance and more information at a future date.

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of July 11, 2012

TA 12-05 – PARKING REGULATIONS

At the direction of the City Council, the Planning Commission will review the City of Lompoc Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.112 – Parking Regulations and prepare a recommendation to the City Council for possible updates.

Principal Planner Keith Neubert presented a brief staff report and provided supplemental information regarding “in-lieu parking”.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING / CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING 6:59 P.M.

Commissioner Clark distributed a handout on tandem parking which allows some leeway to allow this design concept. Commissioner Gonzales could support it if the concept were design driven. Commissioner Fink can see allowing in certain applications, subject to Planning Commission review. He noted it may be applicable to a wider range of uses than just Residential development. Commissioner Leach concurred.

Commissioner Fink would like staff to return with examples of how the manufacturing/warehouse standards would affect actual projects. He noted Denmat, Pali Winery, and Wyrick Lumber specifically.

Commissioner Leach expressed support for the San Luis Obispo Zoning Ordinance table format.

The Commission discussed *Section 17.112.060 Parking in Front Yard Setback Prohibited*. Staff indicated this was a section often violated and subject to Code Enforcement. It was being suggested that the 72 hour allowance be removed. Commissioner Fink expressed concern that enforcement may be too vigorous if the 72 hours allowance is removed and it may lead to the front yard being entirely paved over. Commissioner Gonzales stated he had considered alternatives such as gravel and drought tolerant landscaping for his properties. Commissioner Leach agreed the problem is a blight which Code Enforcement cannot solve.

Commissioner Fink expressed concern with making recommendations with no public input and the public then goes to the City Council. Commissioner Gonzales suggested expanding the public notice beyond what is legally required so the public can more readily understand what the Commission will be discussing.

The Commission discussed the standard for double striping parking spaces. The City Engineer had expressed support for retaining the concept for safety purposes. Commissioner Fink stated he saw no reason to change the standard that had existed for several years. Commissioner Gonzales agreed the double stripes help people park in a safer manner.

Commissioner Gonzales noted she had requested change to Section F Non Profit Youth Organizations. However, parking requirements for larger organizations with a function room should be different than for smaller organizations. Staff explained that projects would generally be reviewed as a CUP by the Planning Commission so the parking could be tailored to the specific need. Commissioner Leach then responded that she sees no reason to change the requirement. Commissioner Fink suggested adding a square footage limit.

Commissioner Gonzales noted the table and strikeout make the staff report easier to understand and work with.

The Commission discussed the section on "in-lieu" parking. Staff had provided a handout of the history of the "in-lieu" parking option and Commissioner Leach discussed the historic application and noted that one person had bought into the concept. Staff explained the concept had been in place prior to the Old Town Specific Plan and in the Zoning Ordinance it applied to all Commercial Zoning Districts. Commissioner Fink noted that no one had asked to utilize the concept, instead the Commission would generally agree to a 10% reduction where it was warranted. Commissioner Clark expressed interest in how the funds were collected and monitored.

There was a discussion of the RDA owned parking lots in the Old Town and how they may have to be sold. Attorney Ailin noted the typically the intent of in-lieu fees is to allow the City to provide parking and she noted the disposition of the City owned lots had not been resolved.

The Commission reached a consensus to recommend removal of the "in-lieu" Section with the recommendation to the City Council for commercial offsite parking.

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of August 22, 2012

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

TA 12-05 – PARKING REGULATIONS Continued from July 11, 2012 Meeting

At the direction of the City Council, the Planning Commission will review the City of Lompoc Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.112 – Parking Regulations and prepare a recommendation to the City Council for possible updates.

Principal Planner Keith Neubert presented a brief staff report, focused on parking requirements for “*Manufacturing and Warehouse*”, “*Tandem Parking*”, and “*Medical Offices*”. He also provided supplemental information regarding “medical office parking requirements” from architect Scott Richard Young.

OPEN/CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING at 6:40 p.m.

Manufacturing and Warehouse Uses:

Commissioner Leach supported adopting the San Luis Obispo standards which are more comprehensive. Commissioner Fink agrees with the retention of the existing *Winery* standards in the Lompoc regulations. Commissioner Hammons suggested looking at the Buellton Ordinance.

The Commission discussed whether a micro-brewery is in the same class as a winery and it was generally agreed a micro-brewery often is part of a restaurant. There is a difference between a brewery (industrial use) and a micro-brewery (a more commercial use). It was agreed the City did not plan for the wine industry and generally the regulations should be flexible for other possible future uses.

Commissioner Fink discussed covered outside storage such as that identified in the previous Weyrick Lumber proposal and the lack of flexibility in the current Ordinance that lead to excessive parking requirements for the business. The staff report shows how recent changes to the parking requirements would have required less parking which the Commission agreed was appropriate. It was noted that future lumber yard or other uses with large outside storage requirements could be accommodated through the Conditional Use Permit process.

Staff will revise language to reflect the San Luis Obispo standards and retain the City of Lompoc *Winery* standards.

Tandem Parking:

Commissioner Clark identified problems with applying Tandem Parking for Hotels only in the OTC. Commissioner Leach indicated Tandem Parking is allowed in downtown San Luis Obispo. Commissioner Hammons expressed concern with enforcement problems Tandem Parking may create for Homeowners Associations (HOA) in the future. Commissioner Fink indicated the majority of housing stock in Lompoc does not have a HOA. Commissioner Gonzales indicated his vision for Tandem Parking was in enabling legal non-conforming lots to be developed and provide parking on-site.

The Commission discussed requirements for new development and the concept of allowing Tandem Parking for new development vs. allowing it for legal non-conforming parcels to develop utilizing Tandem Parking with Planning Commission review. Staff will revise language to reflect language originally proposed.

Medical Offices:

The Commission considered the letter presented by Mr. Young and discussed existing medical facilities in the community. Commissioner Fink discussed the parking at the Sansum Clinic facility. Commissioner Clark questioned the parking impacts of the Champion Center and it was generally agreed to be a unique situation and would not impact the neighborhood.

The Commission discussed a variety of options and directed staff to update the Ordinance for Medical Offices to require:

- 1 space per 250 sq. ft. of office,
 - plus 1 space per exam room,
 - plus 1 space per .5 employee
- subject to Planning Commission approval.

Parking in Front Yard Setback

Commissioner Hammons was not at the meeting where parking in the front yard setback of residential property was originally discussed and noted his support of a change to this section. He indicated this should be viewed as an economic development issue because it impacts property values.

The Planning Commission discussed amending the Ordinance to prohibit the entire front yard from being paved and utilized for parking. It was agreed this would be discussed when the Residential uses are considered.

Commissioner Leach agreed there may have been a misunderstanding regarding the original discussions regarding allowing parking in the front yard. She agreed the Code Enforcement Officer would be hampered by the existing regulation and stated it is not OK to park in the front yard, except on a paved surface.

Commissioner Gonzales agreed with making the suggestion to the City Council but would like the notice to be clear about the potential policy change. He expressed concern with the possibility of front yards being paved over to allow the use.

Commissioner Fink expressed concern with future over-zealous enforcement and suggested the following language:

Parking on residential landscape is a detriment to a livable community. The Planning Commission believes that this is an issue that is both technical and political, therefore we recommend that the City Council consider amending *Section 17.112.060 Parking in Front Yard Setback Prohibited* to remove "in excess of 72 hours".

The Commission directed staff to include the above stated recommendation to City Council in the Resolution that will be considered at a future Planning Commission meeting.

Old Town Commercial:

Commissioner Leach opened discussion regarding parking in the Old Town Commercial (OTC) zoning district. Commissioner Gonzales was advised by Attorney Ailin that he could participate since the discussion was generally regarding development standards.

Commissioner Gonzales recused himself from participation in the public hearing discussion due to a possible conflict of interest resulting from his real property interests in the *Old Town Commercial (OTC)* zoning district. Commissioner Fink chaired this portion of the meeting.

The Commission discussed the standard allowing commercial development to occur in the *OTC* without providing parking in light of recent developments pertaining to City owned parking lots. It was generally agreed to hold detailed discussions during the upcoming review of the *Old Town Specific Plan (OTSP)*.

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of October 10, 2012

2. TEXT AMENDMENT – PARKING REGULATIONS – TA 12-05 Continued from August 22, 2012 meeting

Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council regarding changes to City of Lompoc Zoning Ordinance *Chapter 17.112 – Parking Regulations*. A Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Principal Planner Keith Neubert summarized the written staff report.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:28 P.M.

Tom Davidson, Real Estate Broker -- noted the current regulations are based on ratio developed years ago; stated the concern with wineries that are busy three (3) to four (4) months of the year during crush season; discussed barrel storage and how requirements for added parking increase cost of a project; noted the Ordinance also does not make allowance for large scale processing; and, stated projects such as DenMat with three (3) shifts should be considered separately.

Jenelle Osborne, Vice Chair of Economic Development Committee – specifically refers to Pali/Loring and Seasmoke developments which were required to construct excess parking instead of being allowed area for expansion.

Commissioner Clark indicated he would welcome suggestions from the speakers.

Commissioner Gonzales indicated he has had feedback regarding manufacturing being based on number of employees at various thresholds. Staff indicated “auto sales” are calculated in this manner and it could work for other uses.

Mr. Davidson indicated above 5,000 square feet the same number of employees are needed; he indicated he would provide comments; and discussed industrial parking ratio. Commissioner Fink agreed there could be flexibility above 5,000 square feet of barrel storage.

Commissioner Leach noted with 70,000 square foot industrial building the parking lot may not be completely used at all times but should be available for the maximum number of employees. She inquired about prior research on the topic. Mr. Neubert indicated considerable research was done in 2008 when the last parking update was processed; he noted not many jurisdictions have separate requirements for wineries and the City developed the current menu approach to allow maximum flexibility.

Commissioner Leach agreed there had been quite a lot of research done previously; expressed caution that reductions in parking for wineries were not so drastic as to render a building unusable for other uses in the future; and stated she could not support change to all industrial. She suggested considering:

1 space per 1,000 to 5,000 sq. ft. with 1 space per 3,000 sq. ft. thereafter

Commissioner Clark questioned if there should be new requirements created each time a use approached the City.

Commissioner Fink suggested the economic downturn had created a need for flexibility with the wine industry which is a fairly large industry in the City and noted he would like to move the Text Amendment on to the City Council

Mr. Davidson suggests staff be given some discretion in considering parking requirements when working with applicants.

Commissioner Fink questioned how this could be written. Attorney Ailin suggested it would be best for staff to return with specific language.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:55 P.M.

MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Fink and seconded by Commissioner Leach to continue the Text Amendment.

VOTE: The motion passed on a 4-1 roll call vote with Commissioner Hammons absent.

**Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting
of January 09, 2013**

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

2. TA 12-05 – Text Amendment

Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council regarding changes to City of Lompoc Zoning Ordinance *Chapter 17.112 – Parking Regulations*. A Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Principal Planner Keith Neubert summarized the written staff report.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AT 8:25 P.M.

Steve Pepe, Chair of the Economic Development Committee – in favor of the proposal which was a result of outreach to the EDC and addresses needs of wineries.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING AT 8:26 P.M.

Commissioner Fink asked if there were additional changes the Commission would like to see.

Commissioner Rodenhi stated he agreed with the proposed changes.

Commissioner Clark stated the language would simplify the Ordinance.

MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Fink and seconded by Commissioner Clark that staff return with a Resolution reflecting the Planning Commission recommendation to the City Council.

VOTE: The motion passed on a 5-0 roll call vote.

**Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting
of February 13, 2013**

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

2. TA 12-05 – Text Amendment

Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council regarding changes to City of Lompoc Zoning Ordinance *Chapter 17.112 – Parking Regulations*. A Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Principal Planner Keith Neubert summarized the written staff report and identified proposed changes to winery uses.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING / CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING WITH NO COMMENTS AT 7:41 P.M.

Commissioner Clark noted he was happy with the proposed changes. The other Commissioners concurred.

MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Clark and seconded by Commissioner Fink that the Commission adopt Resolution No. 748 (13) recommending the City Council adopt changes to the Zoning Ordinance Parking Regulations.

VOTE: The motion passed on a 5-0 roll call vote.