# Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of January 13, 2010

### 2. <u>CUP 08-05 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MODIFICATIONS / LOM 586-P</u> – VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP MODIFICATIONS

Principal Planner Keith Neubert summarized the written staff report and advised the Commission that supplemental information had been provided on the item which was available for the public. The supplemental information included a revision to Resolution 674 (10) and three (3) letters regarding the project.

#### PUBLIC HEARING OPEN – 7:10 p.m.

<u>Shellan Miller of Pacific West Communities, Inc., the applicant</u> – introduced the proposed project to the Commission.

<u>Lisa Plowman of Peikert Architects, Inc. the project architect</u> – presented a Power Point showing the proposed modifications to the project.

<u>Daryl Burgess, resident</u> – commented on the proposed parking.

<u>Joyce Howerton, resident</u> – expressed support for the project and the need for affordable senior housing in the community.

Robin Hayhurst, Executive Director of the Santa Maria Valley Contractors Association – expressed support for the project which will provide construction employment.

#### PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED – 7:20 p.m.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> requested confirmation that reduction in residential parking requirement calculations was result of zoning ordinance that permits a lesser requirement for senior and/or handicapped designated units. Staff confirmed.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> requested confirmation that all units would have low-income covenants (household of one and two persons with annual incomes between \$11,130 and \$32,220), excepting the manager's unit. Applicant confirmed.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> requested confirmation that all units, not just the RDA required 15% (9) affordable covenanted units, would have income restriction covenants. Applicant confirmed.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> requested confirmation of ownership for easement running east and west through the project. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> inquired with staff if area is a city right of way. Staff did not provide answer. Applicant indicated that easement was being provided to subject project.

## Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of January 13, 2010

### 2. <u>CUP 08-05 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MODIFICATIONS / LOM 586-P</u> – VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP MODIFICATIONS

Page 2 of 3

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> requested clarification from staff of what triggers a requirement to submit a new application versus the ability to amend an existing project. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> stated that that in concept (handicapped/senior units with commercial component) the amended project was similar to the original project but that substantial changes were made to the design and density. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> was concerned that the applicant should have submitted a new application and not an amendment. Staff provided feedback.

<u>Commissioner Free</u> noted the amount of vacant commercial properties in the City; discussed the reduced development standards; inquired how the Letz property to the north would be utilized; and, stated she was concerned with the proposed number of units; and, did not favor the project.

<u>Commissioner Hain</u> questioned the proximity of the loading zone to Building No. 1 and asked if a tenant had been identified for that building.

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> noted the need for affordable senior housing in the community and stated that she supported the project as it has evolved.

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> addressed questions that had been posed by Mr. Burgess in his letter: recent changes to parking requirements by the City; density bonus is part of project; commercial space may be attractive to medical professionals. He indicated that he felt it was an attractive building at the entrance to the City but suggested a more cohesive architectural style.

Ms. Plowman responded that the amount of commercial space had been reduced as part of the proposed project and indicated that the architecture was a mixture of styles but she would convey the comments to the architect.

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> that the Planning Commission:

- Adopt Resolution No. 673 (10) approving modified CUP 08-05 for the Cypress Court project;
- Adopt Resolution No. 675 (10) recommending that the City Council approve the requested Density Bonus; and,

## Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of January 13, 2010

## 2. <u>CUP 08-05 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MODIFICATIONS / LOM 586-P – VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP MODIFICATIONS</u>

Page 3 of 3

• Adopt Resolution No. 676 (10) recommending that the City Council approve modified LOM 586-P for the Cypress Court project.

The motion failed by the following roll call vote:

Yes: <u>Commissioners Rodenhi, Griffith</u> Noes: <u>Commissioners Free, Gonzales, Hain</u>

Arleen Pelster advised the applicant and the public of the appeal rights for this action.

The Commission took a short break and returned at 7:50 p.m.