Attachment No. 11 City Council Staff Report GP 07-04, FEIR 09-01, ZC 10-01 General Plan Update

The following are Meeting Minute excerpts from the Planning Commission meetings held on:

- 1) June 9, 2010
- 2) June 23, 2010
- 3) July 14, 2010
- 4) August 11, 2010 (draft)

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of June 9, 2010

3. **GP 07-04 – COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE**

Planning Commission consideration of the following:

EIR 09-01 – The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc., for the City of Lompoc Comprehensive General Plan Update was circulated through the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2008081032) pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) The study area evaluated in the FEIR consists of areas within current City Limits and four (4) potential annexation areas;

GP 07-04 – A General Plan Amendment to adopt the Phase 1 General Plan Elements (Land Use, Circulation, Housing) and to amend the City of Lompoc Land Use Element Map; and

ZC 10-01 – A Zone Change to amend the City of Lompoc Zoning Map to achieve consistency with the Land Use Element Map.

Planning Commission will formulate a recommendation to the City Council. Due to the amount of material to be considered and the complexity of the issues at hand the Planning Commission may continue the discussion to an adjourned meeting on June 23, 2010.

Staff: Planning Manager Lucille T. Breese, AICP e-mail address: lbreese@ci.lompoc.ca.us

Ms. Breese noted that supplemental information had been provided on the item which was available for the public. She introduced Mr. Richard Daulton of Rincon Consultants who coordinated the project team preparing the General Plan Update. Mr. Daulton presented a PowerPoint presentation outlining the General Plan Update process to-date and the requested Planning Commission actions.

<u>Chairman Rodenhi</u> advised the audience that there would be a time limit for comments and that there would be an additional opportunity to address the Commission on June 23, 2010.

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN - 8:30 p.m.

<u>Christina McGinnis, EDC</u> -- discussed Bailey Avenue Expansion Area; spoke in opposition to agricultural land conversion; and, noted that she will prepare an expanded comment letter recommending the Moderate Growth Alternative discussed in the General Plan EIR.

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of June 9, 2010

3. <u>GP 07-04 – COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE</u>

Page 2 of 2

<u>Judy Taggart, Healthy Lompoc Coalition</u> -- worked with <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> on suggested additions to the Land Use policies supporting community health, which were based on research that the Coalition has performed.

<u>Dr. Takashi Wada, Director Santa Barbara County Public Health Department</u> -- supports the work of the Healthy Lompoc Coalition to incorporate language for a healthy community.

<u>Bess Christensen, Resident</u> -- noted that the four (4) proposed expansion areas all contain prime agricultural land and expressed support for agriculture in the Lompoc Valley.

Bob Braitman, Executive Director, Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) – noted that the previous attempt by the City to expand the Sphere of Influence (SOI) to Bailey Avenue was not supported because there were not enough units to justify expansion onto prime agricultural land. Current request would provide a buffer between urban and agricultural uses and an increase in density.

<u>Joyce Howerton, Resident</u> – indicated an interest in discussing healthy community lifestyles and noted that she would provide further input at the next meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED TO JUNE 23, 2010 - 8:50 p.m.

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> noted that she had presented much of the suggested language additions to the Land Use Element and Circulation Element in collaboration with Healthy Lompoc Coalition.

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of June 23, 2010

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:

1. <u>GP 07-04 – COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE</u> Continued from June 9, 2010

Planning Commission consideration of the following:

EIR 09-01 — The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc., for the City of Lompoc Comprehensive General Plan Update was circulated through the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2008081032) pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) The study area evaluated in the FEIR consists of areas within current City Limits and four (4) potential annexation areas;

GP 07-04 – A General Plan Amendment to adopt the Phase 1 General Plan Elements (Land Use, Circulation, Housing) and to amend the City of Lompoc Land Use Element Map; and

<u>ZC 10-01</u> – A Zone Change to amend the City of Lompoc Zoning Map to achieve consistency with the Land Use Element Map.

Planning Commission will formulate a recommendation to the City Council. Due to the amount of material to be considered and the complexity of the issues at hand the Planning Commission may continue the discussion to the regular meeting on July 14, 2010.

Discussion of Expansion Area A.

Commissioner Hain stepped down.

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN 7:45 p.m.

<u>Joyce Howerton, Lompoc resident, Santa Barbara Action Network and Santa Barbara Can</u> – stated that many residents oppose inclusion; local housing needs are met; encouraged infill projects; and, noted that prime agricultural land would be lost.

<u>Christina McGinnis, Environmental Defense Center</u> – referred to letter she submitted; noted potential inconsistencies with LAFCO and the Santa Barbara County Agricultural Element; and opposed agricultural land conversion.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:49 p.m.

Commissioner Hain returned to the Dias.

Discussion of Expansion Area B – River Area

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 7:50 p.m.

<u>Joyce Howerton, Lompoc resident</u> – noted there is prime farmland within the area and opposed crossing the river.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:52 p.m.

Discussion of Expansion Area C - Miguelito Canyon

Ms. Ailin requested that recused Commissioners state their reason for recusement. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> recused himself from the discussion of Area C, noting his principal residence is within 500 feet of area under discussion.

<u>Commissioner Hain</u> stated he had recused himself from discussion of Area A because he owns property within 500 feet of the area under discussion.

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 7:53 p.m.

<u>Bess Christiansen, Lompoc resident</u> – asked the Commission to consider the geography of the canyon and the problems of expansion on the current mining operation.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:55 p.m.

Commissioner Gonzales returned to the Dias.

Discussion of Expansion of Area D - WYE

Commissioner Free recused herself due to the location of her principal residence.

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 7:56 p.m.

<u>Carol Nash, unincorporated area resident</u> – stated concerns with traffic congestion and population growth and wants to preserve the uniqueness of Lompoc.

<u>Steve Orosz, Summit View Homes and property owner</u> – thanked City staff for their assistance; stated interest in developing residential use; and suggested that the City include the area to have control over what type of project is constructed.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:05 p.m.

Discussion on Zoning Maps

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 8:10 p.m.

<u>Bess Christiansen, Lompoc resident</u> – requested that the zoning maps be made available at the Hearing.

Ms. Pelster clarified that all affected property owners had been notified; the maps were available on the website, in the Planning Division, and at the library; that maps identify individual parcels and would be illegible on a small map.

<u>Christina McGinnis, Environmental Defense Center</u> – stated that she could not locate Bailey Avenue in documents or maps. Ms. Ailen clarified that there was not a proposed zone change for Bailey Avenue and that only properties inconsistent with the General Plan Use Designation are being proposed for zone change.

Commissioner Rodenhi asked those who wanted to speak to the zoning maps to identify themselves so that the Commissioners could step down as appropriate.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> recused himself due to property within 500 feet of Mr. Culberson's property on East Ocean Avenue.

<u>Warren Culberson, Lompoc property owner</u> – stated he was the owner of property on 400 and 500 blocks of East Ocean Avenue and discussed zoning on those properties. He noted that on his property in the 400 block of West Laurel Avenue, he has unresolved issues with the City.

Staff clarified that Mr. Culberson's properties on Ocean Avenue were not identified in the proposed zoning changes.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:19 p.m.

Commissioner Gonzales returned to the Dias.

General Discussion of General Plan Update

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 8:20 p.m.

<u>Dr. Takashi Wada, MD, Director of Santa Barbara County Public Health Department</u> – restated comments of June 9, 2010 in support of health concepts and policy.

<u>Margaret Weiss, Lompoc resident</u> – agreed with Dr. Wada's comments and asked the Commission to consider utilizing language supporting healthy living in the General Plan.

<u>Judy Taggert, Healthy Lompoc Coalition</u> – restated comments of June 9, 2010 that health become a consideration and a priority in the General Plan and that community design include a public health element.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:25 p.m.

General Plan Consultant Richard Daulton provided a PowerPoint to focus discussion on the General Plan resolutions and requested actions.

Recommendation on Environmental Impact Review

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> asked for comments from the Fire and Police Departments. Mr. Daulton commented that issues regarding safety are addressed in the EIR at a general level and not specific to any projects. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> commented that it may be premature to discuss public safety prior to presentation of a project and Mr. Daulton stated that the details of specific projects will be reviewed as they come forward.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> asked Lompoc Police Chief Dabney to comment on the EIR review and the proposed annexations. Chief Dabney discussed the use of Developer Impact Fees to assist with police and fire needs; noted that the terrain in Miguelito Canyon could affect radio communication; and, noted that the EIR analysis adequately covers facilities and staff.

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> asked if capital costs were covered by impact fees and anticipated revenues. Chief Dabney indicated affirmatively, that a portion of property taxes, vehicle license fees and sales tax are contributed to the City's General Fund to pay for police and fire services. Ms. Pelster noted that policy exists to mitigate the impacts of certain projects. <u>Commissioner Free</u> clarified that the Developer Fee is a 'one time' fee. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> commented that since the proposed action is presented in segments, he was concerned that a decision made now may impact upcoming actions.

Fire Battalion Chief Kovak indicated that the standard fire response time is 5 minutes; that expansion areas may need additional sites and/or staffing; access to areas could be an issue where additional roads may be needed; that there is a solid Mutual Aid Agreement for services with the County of Santa Barbara; and that all expansion areas are within a 5 minute response time.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Hain</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 677 (10) recommending that the City Council adopt the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding consideration; the Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan; and certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR 09-01) for the City of Lompoc Comprehensive General Plan Update. The motion passed on a roll call vote of 4-1 with <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> voting no.

General Plan Amendment (GP 07-04) - Land Use Element

Mr. Daulton discussed the proposed Land Use Element Update and asked that the Planning Commission provide input and discussion for the recommendations to the City Council.

1) Land Use Element

a. LU Policy 2.2 – Revise LU Policy 2.2 to incorporate Mixed Use in Industrial designations.

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> noted that industry is not incompatible with residential use and she suggests changing language.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Hain</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt LU Policy 2.2 as proposed. The motion passed on a roll call vote of 4-1 with Commissioner Griffith voting no.

b. Ocean Avenue Corridor – OAC

<u>Commissioner Free</u> asked if an infill project could have a living unit above an office and Mr. Daulton stated that the Overlay allowed for mixed use. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> asked if the ability to maintain a small scale was conceptual and Mr. Daulton indicated affirmatively. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> noted that <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> owns property in the Overlay area. Ms. Ailin clarified that the Overlay proposal is very broad in impact. Ms. Ailen indicated that it was her determination that this item fell under Fair Political Practice Commission Regulation 18707, "<u>Public Generally"</u>. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated concern of an additional burden to current property owners and Ms. Breese indicated that new projects must come before the Commission. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> noted that the Overlay would increase desirability in the area and strongly suggested support of the proposed Overlay. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> stated that the Overlay would be beneficial and <u>Commissioner Hain</u> stated that the Overlay allowed for project flexibility and he supports the proposal.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Hain</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the Ocean Avenue Corridor be adopted as proposed. The motion passed on a roll call vote of 5-0.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission adjourn at 8:30 p.m. and continue the discussion to the next meeting.

The Commission took a break at 8:15 p.m. and resumed business at 8:25 p.m.

Staff advised the Commission that it was possible to complete work through the Land Use Element items in this meeting.

The motion failed on a roll call vote of 1-4 with <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u>, <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u>, <u>Commissioner Free</u> and <u>Commissioner Hain</u> voting no.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission work up through the Housing Element and continue discussion of the Zone Change Maps to the next meeting. The motion passed on a roll call vote of 5-0.

c. LU Policy 4.6 – estimate potential revenues and expenses of annexation areas prior to action.

<u>Commissioner Free</u> expressed that there was some confusion with the text and asks if this policy supports the City Council's direction. Mr. Daulton indicated that this policy does not endorse the proposed annexation areas but is general language supporting a positive fiscal relationship. Ms. Pelster clarified that the policy does not commit the City to annexation.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt proposed LUE Policy 4.6 requiring future annexation areas to show that they do "not negatively impact City fiscal health." The motion passed on a roll call vote of 5-0.

d. LUE Policy 4.2 – revised to strengthened public services.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Free</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt Policy 4.2 as revised; "The City shall allow development only in areas where adequate public facilities and/or services, with careful attention to police and fire services, will be available at the time of development." The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

e. LUE Policy 7.5 – revised to be a mandatory measure.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that Policy 7.5 state: "The City shall protect and enhance the agricultural industry, as well as other specialty crops that are unique to the region, through careful site design, agricultural buffers, and other design features intended to protect agriculture." The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

f. Revision of the Mixed Use designation to include increased densities and maximum floor area ratios (FAR). If the increased density is retained, the Zoning Ordinance will be updated to support the change.

<u>Commissioner Fr</u>ee asked about the basis for density increases and Mr. Daulton replied that the request would come from a project developer; Commissioner Gonzales asked about development standards. Mr. Daulton replied that underlying zoning standards would apply.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the proposed text change allowing increased density and FAR to the Mixed Use designation. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

g. Revision of the Old Town Commercial (OTC) designation to allow for additional floor area ratios (FAR) and increased maximum densities for residential uses. In the past, developers have noted that densities allowed in the OTC were not high enough to allow projects to continue. If the increased density is retained, the Zoning Ordinance will be updated to support the change.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the proposed text change to increase the density and the FAR in the Old Town Commercial area. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

h. The addition of the H Street Corridor Infill Area from Chestnut Avenue to Central Avenue. This area would encourage infill redevelopment, including mixed use development, which is primarily composed of commercial land uses developed in strip shopping centers. If the area is retained, the Zoning Ordinance, Zoning Map, and Architectural Review Guidelines would be updated to reflect the change.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the proposed text change to allow the addition of the H Street Corridor Infill Area from Chestnut Avenue to Central Avenue. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

i. Community Health and Wellness

Discussion of the proposed Community Health and Wellness language begins on page 11 of the staff report. The staff recommended Goal 9 with the supporting policies. Additional Language was proposed by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> in concert with the Healthy Lompoc Coalition. The Commission discussed the option of including additional language in the Phase II Elements.

Land Use Element - Policy 5.7 – Mr. Daulton suggested there are not supporting studies to indicate the 'soils of the Lompoc hills have proven to be unstable'. Commissioner Griffith disagrees.

After significant discussion it was decided to retain the original language on a voice vote of 4-1 with <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> voting no.

Circulation Element – Policy 1.1

Staff explained it was not good policy to have City standards based on standards of other jurisdictions.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commission Free</u> that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council to retain the original language as proposed. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

Circulation Element – Policy 1.12

Staff explained it was not good policy to have City standards based on standards of other jurisdictions.

MOTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Griffith and seconded by Commissioner Hain that the Planning Commission recommend that the word 'should' will replace the word 'shall' in the Circulation Element Policy 1.2. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

Circulation Element – Policy 2.4

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commissioner recommend that the word 'should' will replace the word 'shall' in the Circulation Element Policy 2.4. The motion passed on a voice vote of 4-1 with <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> voting no.

Circulation Element – Policy 2.5

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the word *'should'* will replace the word *'shall'*. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

Land Use Element – Measure 22

<u>Commissioner Hain</u> stated that economic development reports are important and recommended that the word 'should' be changed to 'shall'. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> noted his concern that the change may weaken the General Plan.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Hain</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the word 'shall' will replace the word 'should' in Land Use Element Measure 22. The motion passed in a unanimous voice vote of 4-1 with <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> voting no.

Circulation Element – Measure 14

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> agrees with the additional language, 'and implement' in Circulation Element Measure 14. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated his disagreement with the additional language. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> expressed concern the term 'explore' may result in an empty study.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council to retain language as originally proposed. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 4-1 with <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> voting no.

Land Use Element – Policy 7.7

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> recommended adding language supporting community gardens and Ms. Breese requested that the Planning Commission revisit this policy at the July 14, 2010 meeting. <u>Commissioner Free</u> expressed concern with private property owner rights and <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> agreed.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission review Land Use Element Policy 7.7 at the July 14, 2010 meeting. The motion passed on a voice vote of 4-1 with <u>Commissioner Free</u> voting no.

Circulation Element – Policy 3.4

The Commission asked Kevin McCune, City Engineer to discuss Circulation Element Policy 3.4 and the proposed language, 'The City should encourage local transportation services to accommodate the needs of bicycle commuters' and deleting the remaining language, 'by providing bicycle rack on COLT busses'. Mr. McCune state that COLT busses have the capability to carry bicycles; the City has implemented bicycle carriers as needed; that Breeze busses have bicycle carriers; and the Engineering Division supports deleting the remaining language.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council to only delete the language, 'on COLT busses' in Circulation Element Policy 3.4. This motion failed to receive a second.

<u>Commissioner Hain</u> asked about the current bike rack status. Mr. McCune indicated that Lompoc residents want the ability to transport their bicycles to other areas; stated that bicycle transport is provided as a customer service aspect; noted that a COLT bus can carry up to three bicycles at a time; suggested that the policy remain general to allow for flexibility; and, indicated that Public Works has a bicycle plan in place.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> asked what triggers a bicycle rack for a COLT bus and Mr. McCune responded that the availability of funding affects placement of bicycle racks and that bicycle racks are not available on every COLT bus.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the policy read 'by providing bicycle racks on COLT buses'. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> stated the elimination language in this policy is not in the best interest of the City and that the goal of the General Plan is to support a 20 year vision for the City. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

Land Use Element – Goal 9

Mr. Daulton directed the discussion to the addition of Goal 9, policies 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 to the Land Use Element to support Community Health and Wellness. Commissioner Griffith noted that the integration of this language policy through General Plan Phase I and II will strengthen the General Plan through the next twenty years and acknowledged the consultant's work in this area.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council accept the additional proposed language in the Land Use Element Goal 9, Policies 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

At this point in the discussion, <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> suggested continuing to the July 14, 2010 meeting. The Commission concurred.

G:\COMDEV\Minutes - PC\2010\excerpts\06-23-10 e.doc

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of July 14, 2010

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:

3. GP 07-04 - COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Continued from June 23, 2010

Planning Commission consideration of the following:

EIR 09-01 — The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc., for the City of Lompoc Comprehensive General Plan Update was circulated through the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2008081032) pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) The study area evaluated in the FEIR consists of areas within current City Limits and four (4) potential annexation areas;

GP 07-04 – A General Plan Amendment to adopt the Phase 1 General Plan Elements (Land Use, Circulation, Housing) and to amend the City of Lompoc Land Use Element Map; and

<u>ZC 10-01</u> – A Zone Change to amend the City of Lompoc Zoning Map to achieve consistency with the Land Use Element Map.

Planning Commission will formulate a recommendation to the City Council. Due to the amount of material to be considered and the complexity of the issues at hand the Planning Commission may continue the discussion to an adjourned meeting on July 28, 2010.

Mr. Daulton noted that good progress has been made with the recommendations for the General Plan Update and noted where the Commission had left off at their last meeting.

PROPOSED HEALTH AND WELLNESS TEXT CHANGES:

Ms. Breese indicated that proposed text changes to the policy language supporting Community Health and Wellness in the Land Use Element and Circulation Element were organized for the Planning Commission's review. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> stated her agreement with staff's suggestion.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Hain</u> that the Planning Commission approve and recommend to the City Council that the proposed text changes regarding Health and Wellness in the Land Use Element be accepted. The vote was suspended until <u>Commissioner Free</u> discussed her concerns with proposed changes.

<u>Commissioner Free</u> identified the following questions regarding the proposed language changes:

Policy 2.1 – requiring developments to provide undetermined amenities may place unnecessary burden on future projects; staff advised that new residential development must currently provide amenities to be determined by the developer, based on the number of units. This is not an additional requirement.

Restates current policy, Commission accepts change.

Policy 3.2 – for Mixed Use projects, requiring accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists may place unnecessary burden on future projects; staff advised that City currently reviews plans for this type of accessibility, this is not an additional requirement. <u>Commissioners Griffith</u> and <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> noted that the policy would "encourage" such accessibility, not require it.

Restates current policy, Commission accepts change.

Policy 3.4 – enhancing "public heath" to earn incentives seems like a broad statement, concern with lack of definition; staff advises that this is general policy language, not a specific requirement. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> noted it was not intended as a constraint but as a benefit for a project.

Broad policy language, Commission accepts change.

Policy 3.6 – concern that additional language requires pedestrian plaza in Old Town; staff advises that "pedestrian accessibility" does not require closed area, allows automobile traffic to continue.

Broad policy language, Commission accepts change.

Policy 4.6 – expressed concern with repetitive language in statement; staff advised that the context is slightly different.

Broad policy language, Commission accepts change.

Policy 7.1 – expressed concern with singling out a specific industry for recognition, could date document in the future. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> indicated that it was intended to recognize a major growth industry. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> agreed that statement did not add to document. <u>Commissioner Hain</u> and <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> concurred that specific industry shouldn't be named.

VOTE:

On a 4-1 vote the Commission agreed not to recommend "especially wine-related business.

Policy 7.7 – asked that staff recommended language be read into record and noted that the revised language protected private property rights:

"The City shall encourage voluntary community gardens in appropriate locations throughout the city, with the permission of the land owner, to enable residents without access to land to grow fresh, affordable food"

The Commission agreed to recommend the language.

<u>Commissioner Hain</u> noted the change to Measure 22 to "*require"* reports on economic development, thus emphasizing the importance of the effort. <u>Commissioner Free</u> agreed. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> disagreed, indicating that better reporting methods would be more effective.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission accept the proposed text changes to the Land Use Element. The motion passed on a 5-0 voice vote.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission accept the proposed text changes to the Circulation Element. The motion passed on a 5-0 voice vote.

Mr. Daulton provided a Power Point presentation which outlined the areas of consideration and advised the Commission that a consensus is not needed to forward a recommendation. Comments by the Commissioners will be recorded in the Minutes which will be forwarded to the City Council with any recommendations.

Expansion Area A - Bailey Avenue Specific Plan

<u>Commissioner Hain</u> recused himself from the agenda item due to ownership of property within 500 feet of the subject property.

Mr. Daulton outlined possible Commission actions.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission recommend Alternate 1 - move the Urban Limit Line to be consistent with the current City limit line, which would be an indication of no City interest to develop in this area in the future.

<u>Commissioner Free</u> stated that the Commission has heard the public's concerns. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> indicated that the City has adequate housing; noted there should be a focus on infill projects; and, stated there is no reason to expand into agricultural land. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> agreed with <u>Commissioner Griffith</u>, noting that there has been a recent correction in the housing market and adequate inventory exists at this time. The State recommends that the General Plan be reviewed regularly and, if in the future, there is a need, the area could be considered then. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated there is little need for housing currently; that Mr. Wineman and Mr. Hibbits outlined well-stated points of Lompoc's prime agricultural land; and, that there is no hurry to expand the General Plan into this area.

VOTE: The motion passed on a 4-0-1 vote with <u>Commissioner Hain</u> not participating.

Commissioner Hain returned to the Dias.

Expansion Area B - River Area

Mr. Daulton outlines possible Commission actions.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> stated that since the City owns the property and pays taxes on the property, he is willing to recommend including the area in City.

MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Gonzales and seconded by Commissioner Free

to recommend the Environmental Impact Review project description and

expand the current City limit line.

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> noted the concerns of local farmers; discussed the difficulties for police and fire regarding jurisdictions during large events at River Park; and, suggested that the City should annex the area to City limit lines so the area is clearly defined.

Commissioner Gonzales withdrew his motion.

Ms. Pelster clarified that the City can develop on the area it does not need to annex into City limit lines and the City will still owe property taxes on the land. If the City annexes area the question of jurisdiction will be resolved.

<u>Commissioner Hain</u> stated that the Commission has listened to public testimony; and noted that the City is paying taxes on the area so the City should be in control of the area.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by Commissioner

Rodenhi that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the expansion area as proposed and direct staff to initiate an annexation

request with LAFCO.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> asked if staff knows how much the taxes were on the area and staff indicated it was several thousand dollars a year. He also inquired if there was a problem for public safety regarding jurisdiction and staff agreed.

<u>Commissioner Hain</u> stated that at a prior public hearing, a community speaker commented that the area may have spots of prime farmland and some parts of the area are undevelopable. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> indicated that most of the property is in the flood zone and that development would be very cost-prohibitive. <u>Commissioner Free</u> stated that she will not support the motion and disagrees with moving the City Limits across the river.

VOTE: The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 4-1 with <u>Commissioner Free</u> voting no.

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> was not in favor of the expansion to the east but this is already controlled by the City and seemed like a natural expansion area.

Expansion Area C - Miguelito Canyon

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> recused himself from the agenda item due to ownership of property within 500 feet of the subject property.

Mr. Daulton introduced possible Planning Commission actions.

<u>Commissioner Hain</u> commented on Police Chief Dabney's statements regarding provision of safety services to this area. <u>Commissioner Hain</u> stated that providing safety services to this area could be cost prohibitive.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission recommend Alternate 1 - retain the area with no change to the Land Use Element Map, outside City limits and the City urban limit line, indicating no City interest to development in this area in the future.

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated that in previous public hearings some residents have been both for and against the expansion of this area; that perhaps 5-acre ranchettes might be practical for possible development in this area; and, that he cannot support the motion. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> stated that the majority of Miguelito Canyon residents are not interested in annexation of this area; that soils of the area are unstable for development; and, that impractical building in the area may be predisposed to disaster.

<u>Commissioner Free</u> noted that only the north section was subject to development and supports the motion. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> commented that the one form of housing the City lacks is large developable lots and this would be an area where that type of housing might be suitable. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> stated that there are currently larger homes on larger lots however, in the Valley executives she has spoken with are not interested in living in Lompoc. <u>Commissioner Hain</u> expressed concern with the cost of providing public safety and support to the area; and agreed with <u>Commissioner Rodenhi's</u> comment for the unmet need of executive housing.

VOTE: The motion passed on a roll call vote of 3-1-1 with <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> voting no and <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> not participating.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> returned to the Dias.

Expansion Area D - Wye Residential

<u>Commissioner Free</u> recused herself from the agenda item due to ownership of property within 500 feet of the subject property.

Mr. Daulton outlined possible Planning Commissioner actions.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Hain</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the Expansion Area as proposed; and that the City Council direct staff to work with the applicant to prepare an Environmental Impact Report for residential development and initiate an annexation request with LAFCO.

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> indicated that she would not support the motion, noting that housing is adequate and the City should focus on infill projects. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> indicated that he will support the motion, although he agrees with the need to focus on infill development. Commissioner Gonzales concurred.

VOTE: The motion passed on a roll call vote of 3-1-1 with <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> voting no and Commissioner Free not participating.

Commissioner Free returned to the Dias.

The Planning Commission took a break at 8:20 p.m. and resumed business at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Daulton introduced the proposed General Plan maps.

The Planning Commission discussed proposed changes to the General Plan Land Use Map changes. Ms. Pelster stated that the proposed changes are for consistency.

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> asked about the recent Text Amendment that the Planning Commission recommended regarding wine tasting. Ms. Breese indicated that the recent Text Amendment the Planning Commission recommended to allow tasting rooms in the industrial areas with a Conditional Use Permit will need City Council approval.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Hain</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed changes to the Land Use Element and Map as proposed (Map GP1 through Map GP8). The motion passed on a 5-0 voice vote.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Free</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the deletion of *Rural Density Residential*. The motion passed on a voice vote of 5-0.

Mr. Daulton directed the Planning Commission's attention to the policy of *Mixed Use (MU)* that is currently in place. If the *(MU)* area were to be expanded, additional studies would be necessary and the General Plan would be delayed. Commissioner Gonzales asked if the expansion of *Mixed Use* was because of the overlays. Commissioner Griffith stated that the expansion had been requested. Commissioner Rodenhi asked if this subject can be revisited at a future time for consideration and Ms. Pelster indicated that the expansion of *Mixed Use* was not studied in the Environmental Impact Report.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council delete the expansion of the *Mixed Use (MU)* designation. The motion passed on a 5-0 voice vote.

The Commission addressed the subject of specific language allowing wine tasting in *Industrial* and *Business Park* zones and agreed that language about wine-tasting rooms does not need to be included in the General Plan.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Hain</u> that the Planning Commission recommend that specific language adding winetasting rooms was not necessary in the General Plan. The motion passed on a voice vote of 5-0.

Ocean Avenue Corridor

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Hain</u> that the Ocean Avenue Corridor (OAC) be included in Table LU1. The motion passed on a voice vote of 5-0.

Circulation Element Update

Mr. Daulton indicated that Implementation Measure 23 had been included as a result of a request at the April 13, 2010 Joint Meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> to

recommend the addition of Measure 23 to the Circulation Element; "The City shall encourage Federal, state and regional agencies to widen State Route 246

east of the City Limits."

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> commented that he did not see a need to widen Highway 246 to four (4) lanes as it would detract from the rural character of the area. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> noted that Highway 246 is not consistent, that some areas of the Highway are wide while some areas of the Highway are narrow.

<u>Commissioner Free</u> commented that it would not be the City but other agencies that would oversee and pay for the widening of the Highway. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> agreed with <u>Commissioner Free</u> and discussed safety concerns about the Highway.

VOTE: The motion passed on a voice vote of 4-1 with Commissioner Rodenhi voting no.

There was a discussion of revised figures 4.13-4 and 4.13-7. Mr. Daulton advised that there were supporting information only and included as a matter of completeness.

Housing Element

The Commission discussed generalized references to local non-profit agencies with which the City partners. Staff recommends retaining the policy language as proposed and the Housing Consultant has advised that the State of California Housing and Community Development Department requires that specific organizations be identified in the Housing Element language. Commissioner Gonzales noted that the State requires specificity. Ms. Pelster clarified that the General Plan can be amended up to four times annually in order to provide accurate information.

MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Rodenhi and seconded by Commissioner

Gonzales that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that the

language in the Housing Element be adopted.

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> indicated she would support the motion with the understanding that the language can be changed in the future.

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

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u>

that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 678 (10) recommending that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment (GP 04-04) as shown on Exhibit A of the Resolution to adopt the proposed Phase I Elements (Land Use, Circulation, Housing) and the proposed Land Use Element Map. The

motion passed on a 5-0 roll call vote.

Ms. Pelster recommended continuing the meeting to discuss and vote on zone changes for consistency with the General Plan Update (Resolution No. 679 (10)).

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u>

that discussion regarding zone changes for the General Plan Update be

postponed to a date uncertain. The motion passed on a 5-0 voice vote.

G:\COMDEV\Minutes - PC\2010\excerpts\07-14-10 e gp.doc

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE LOMPOC PLANNING COMMISSION August 11, 2010

draft

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Helen Free Commissioner Nick Gonzales Commissioner Kate Griffith Commissioner Jack Rodenhi

ABSENT:

Commissioner Frank Hain

STAFF:

Community Development Director Arleen Pelster

Planning Manager Lucille Breese Assistant City Attorney June Ailin Staff Assistant Angela Wynne

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Free</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the minutes of July 14, 2010 be approved. The motion passed on a 4-0-1 vote with <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

None

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:

1. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – CUP 10-04**

A request by Antonio Moretti, representing A Taste of Santa Rita Hills, for Planning Commission consideration of a proposal for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a wine tasting room in an existing building. The project is located at 1505 East Chestnut Avenue in the *Business Park (BP)* Zoning District (Assessor Parcel Number: 99-520-03). This action is exempt pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Ms. Breese advised the Planning Commission that <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> would have to step down on this item; therefore, there would not be a quorum to consider a request.

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Free</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that consideration of Conditional Use Permit (CUP 10-03) be continued to the August 25, 2010 meeting. The motion passed on a voice vote of 4-0-1 with <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent.

2. **ZONING CONSISTENCY – ZC 10-01**

Continued from the July 14, 2010 meeting

Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council regarding a series of Zone Change's to amend the City of Lompoc Zoning Map. The proposed changes are necessary to achieve consistency with the General Plan Land Use Element Map. Copies of the maps showing specific parcels are available at City Hall at the Planning Division Counter, at the Main Library Reference Desk; or on the City of Lompoc website at:

http://www1.cityoflompoc.com/planningagenda/2010/100609/100609n3a3a.pdf. The Commission recommended approval of the General Plan Environmental Impact Report at the July 14, 2010 meeting. The Zone Change is a component of the General Plan Update.

Ms. Breese summarized the written staff report.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> indicated he had potential conflicts with proposed zoning map #3, #4, #5, #7, #8, #15, #16, and #23 and would step down when they were discussed. At the request of Commissioner Gonzales, the Planning Commission decided to consider the maps with which he had no potential conflict first. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> would then recuse himself and the balance of the maps will be considered.

ZONING MAP #1

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 6:45 and CLOSED AT 6:45 p.m. No one spoke.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> clarified that there were no requests from property owners within the area and that the proposed change is compatible to surrounding land use.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #1. The motion passed on a 4-0-1 vote with Commissioner Hain absent.

ZONING MAP #2

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 6:45 p.m. AND CLOSED AT 6:45 p.m. No one spoke.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> asked staff to explain to those in attendance the difference between *High Density Residential and Medium Density Residential*. Ms. Breese addressed the audience and outlined the differences. <u>Commissioner Free</u> asked if the proposal will allow apartments and Ms. Breese indicated that duplexes and multi-

family dwellings are permitted. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated that the change will assure consistency within the area.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #2. The motion passed on a 4-0-1 vote with Commissioner Hain absent.

ZONING MAP #6

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 6:50 p.m. AND CLOSED AT 6:50 p.m. No one spoke.

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> asked staff if there had been any property owner input to the proposed change and Ms. Breese indicated negatively.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #6. The motion passed on a 4-0-1 vote with <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent.

ZONING MAP #9

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 6:52 p.m.

<u>Susan Gallagher, 214 South F Street</u> – asked about restrictions on property if map is approved; noted inconsistency in the area and requested the Commission to not change the zoning.

<u>Jim Percell, 229 South F Street</u> – purchased property to develop and opposes the zone change.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 6:55 p.m.

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> noted that staff had not received input from property owners in the area. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> asked staff to clarify and define a <u>Medium Density</u> (R2) designation. Ms. Breese provided information. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> summarized that changing the zoning from <u>High Density</u> (R3) to <u>Medium Density</u> (R2) would not inhibit Mr. Percell's building rights.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> asked if the Land Use Map is the foundation for the General Plan. <u>Commissioner Free</u> stated her concern about providing zoning maps that did not accurately reflect actual zoning. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated that the General Plan superseded zoning maps. Ms. Breese stated that some owners requested retaining the *High Density (R3)* zoning and that staff recommends a *Medium Density (R2)* zoning for General Plan consistency.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> that the Planning Commission accept Zoning Map #9. The motion failed to receive a second.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> stated his concern with zoning against resident requests and public opinion. Ms. Pelster explained that existing structures are protected as legal non-conforming structures. Ms. Ailen advised the General Plan Map controls even if inconsistency is not noted.

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> reviewed the 214 South F Street property and noted that other jurisdictions had similar problems with the General Plan and Zoning Maps.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> indicated he will vote against the proposed map change, noting consistency, public opinion, and down-zoning.

Ms. Pelster stated a community workshop was held in March 2009; that a number of residential concerns were addressed and supported; and some spot-zoning still existed. Ms. Ailen suggested that the Planning Commission could allow the current zoning to remain and revisit at another time. Ms. Breese reported on each document received by residents in the area. There was further discussion between the Commissioners and staff regarding zoning consistency.

<u>Commissioner Free</u> commented that property owners may not be aware that a change of zoning may not affect their property. <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> asked Ms. Breese about notification to property owners in affected area. Ms. Breese indicated that each property received a notice; phone calls from residents were taken and addressed; that staff has not been advised of additional concerns until tonight's meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #9. The motion failed for a second.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the Planning Commission continue discussion and approval of Map #9 to a date uncertain. The motion failed on a roll call vote of 2-2-1 with <u>Commissioner Free</u> and <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> voting no and Commissioner Hain absent.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #9, with the exclusion of five (5) specific properties.

Ms. Ailen indicated this option will result in short term spot-zoning.

Commissioner Free withdrew the motion.

The Planning Commission took a break at 7:35 p.m. and resumed at 7:45 p.m.

Ms. Pelster outlined the process of approving the General Plan. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> stated that the potential of zoning discrepancies is why he voted no on the approval of the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report.

Ms. Ailen advised the Commission that there was no vested right in the law that zoning would not be changed. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> indicated that Mr. Gallagher's property concerns had been addressed and asked Mr. Percell to restate the situation of his property. Mr. Percell indicated the property was purchased after March 2009; that the zoning map reflected the property as *High Density (R3)*; that most neighboring properties have duplexes at the rear; and wants to develop his property in a manner that is similar to his neighbors.

Ms. Pelster stated that, at this time, too many details are still needed to determine what structure the property owner can build.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the Planning Commission table the approval of Zoning Map #9. The motion failed to receive a second.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by Commissioner Rodenhi that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #9 to be consistent with the General Plan since it won't have an adverse effect on the subject properties.

<u>Commissioner Free</u> indicated that she would support the motion; does not approve of down-zoning; and noted the map will maintain neighborhood character. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> indicated he would not support the motion; opposes down-zoning; and supports in-fill.

The motion passed on a roll call vote of 3-1-1 with <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> voting no and <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent.

ZONING MAP #10

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AND CLOSED AT 8:00 p.m. No one spoke.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Free</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #10.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> stated that he would not support the motion since there were multi-family units in the area that would become legal non-conforming which was not logical.

The motion passed on a roll call vote of 3-1-1 with <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> voting no and <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent.

ZONING MAP #11

Commissioner Rodenhi indicated there were no property owner requests.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AND CLOSED AT 8:05 p.m. No one spoke.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> asked why staff recommended the change from <u>Medium Density Residential</u> to <u>High Density Residential</u>. Ms. Breese indicated this recommendation was consistent with the General Plan.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #11. The motion passed on a 4-0-1 vote with <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent.

ZONING MAP #12

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AND CLOSED AT 8:06 p.m. No one spoke.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> stated he would not support the recommended changes to the map and that the proposed change was contrary to logic. <u>Commissioner Free</u> noted that some land uses had been changed in the General Plan. Ms. Pelster agreed and noted that zoning was now following.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #12. The motion passed on a roll call vote of 3-1-1 with <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> voting no and <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent.

ZONING MAP #13

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated that three (3) property owners of the total proposed in the area had requested a change to *High Density Residential (R3)*.

Public Hearing Opened at 8:14 p.m.

<u>Will Schuyler, Lompoc resident</u> - requested that the current zoning remain on the 400 block of North D Street along Maple Avenue where some owners want to possibly add units on larger lots.

Public Hearing Closed at 8:16 p.m.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> clarified the action to be taken and Ms. Pelster stated that multi-family are a legal non-conforming use. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> stated that addressing and approving the General Plan maps prior to addressing the zoning maps had 'pigeon-holed' the Commission and indicated that he will not support staff recommendations.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #13. The motion passed on a roll call vote of 3-1-1 with <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> voting no and <u>Commissioner Hain absent.</u>

ZONING MAP #14

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated there had been no property owner input on this map.

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 8:25 p.m.

<u>Mary Leach, Lompoc resident</u> – indicated that approving the Zoning Maps at this time was a 'housekeeping' item.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:29 p.m.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission approve Map #14. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with Commissioner Hain absent.

ZONING MAP #17

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated there had been no property owner input on this map.

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AND CLOSED AT 8:30 p.m. No one spoke.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #17. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with Commissioner Hain absent.

ZONING MAP #18

Commissioner Rodenhi stated that there had been no property owner input on this map.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AND CLOSED AT 8:32 p.m. No one spoke.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Free</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #18. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with Commissioner Hain absent.

ZONING MAP #19

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AND CLOSED AT 8:33 p.m. No one spoke.

MOTION: It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #19. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with Commissioner Hain absent.

ZONING MAP #20

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT CLOSED AT 8:35 p.m. No one spoke.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #20. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with Commissioner Hain absent.

ZONING MAP #21

<u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated that there had been no property owner input on this map.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AND CLOSED AT 8:40 p.m. No one spoke.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> asked which park the map included and Ms. Pelster indicated the area was located in the flood plain, cannot be developed, and was intended for recreational use. He stated he could support the change since the property cannot be developed.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission approve Map #21. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> indicated that he was supporting the approval of Zoning Map #21 because the parcel was undevelopable.

ZONING MAP #22

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> indicated that he has a conflict of interest regarding Zoning Map #22. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> stated that this map will be considered after <u>Commission Gonzales</u> recused himself.

ZONING MAP #24

This change was an owner request.

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> asked why the zoning was proposed for this map. Ms. Breese indicated that a change would result in spot-zoning and staff could not support. <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> indicated his support of the staff recommendation since a change would result in spot-zoning.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Free</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #24. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with <u>Commissioner Hain absent</u>.

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> recused himself from the remainder of the maps to be discussed due to business and property interests within 500 feet of the proposed areas. Commissioner <u>Gonzales</u> left the Dias.

ZONING MAP #3

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 8:45 p.m.

<u>Butch Browder</u>, <u>Lompoc resident</u> – stated that character of neighborhood is a *Single Family (R1)* and supports the staff recommendation.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:47 p.m.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Map #3. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> not participating and Commissioner Hain absent.

ZONING MAP #23

This change was a property owner request for a parcel at 415 West Laurel Avenue.

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN AT 8:49 p.m.

<u>Warren Culberson, Lompoc businessman</u> – had previously provided a letter to the Planning Commission; discussed zoning history of his property; stated that a Conditional Use Permit for the property constrains a potential renter or property purchaser; and asked the Planning Commission to rezone the parcel to *Light Industrial*.

<u>Will Schuyler, Lompoc resident</u> – supported Mr. Culberson's concerns and asked staff to assist Mr. Culberson.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 8:58 p.m.

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> asked why staff is recommending against the property owner request. Ms. Breese indicated that the property is currently consistent with the General Plan and that a Conditional Use Permit can be issued for a compatible use. Ms. Pelster stated that a Conditional Use Permit is allowable because of the unique existing conditions and that flexibility can be utilized in developing a plan.

MOTION:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Griffith</u> that the Planning Commission accept the staff recommendation. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with <u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> not participating and <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent.

Commissioner Free asked about Conditional Use Permit restrictions and revocation. Ms. Pelster clarified. Commissioner Griffith suggested that the Commission take the remaining maps as a block.

MOTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Griffith and seconded by Commissioner Rodenhi that the remaining Zoning Maps; #4, #5, #7, #8, #15, #16, and #22 be approved in one motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with Commissioner Gonzales recused and Commissioner Hain absent.

ZONING MAPS #4, #5, #7, #8, #15, #16, and #22

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 9:14 p.m.

Mrs. Kara-Schiff, Lompoc resident - addressed Zoning Map #8 and 214 South I Street; bought property at height of the market understanding it was zoned High Density Residential (R3); described current character of neighborhood; asked the Commission to retain the higher density; and, noted she was not able to attend the March 2009 workshop.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 9:17 p.m.

Commissioner Rodenhi asked staff to identify the property and current uses. Breese indicated Mrs. Kara-Schiff's property is zoned Medium Density Residential (R-2) and the lot will allow an additional unit(s) dependent upon lot size and development standards.

MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Rodenhi and seconded by Commissioner Griffith that the Planning Commission approve Zoning Maps #4, #5, #7, #8, #15, #16, and #22. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with Commission Gonzales not participating and Commissioner Hain absent.

Commissioner Gonzales returned to the Dias.

NEW BUSINESS:

None

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

None

DIRECTOR/STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Ms. Pelster asked the Planning Commission to adjourn to August 25, 2010.

COMMISSION REQUESTS:

<u>Commissioner Gonzales</u> clarified that previous General Plan decisions now impacted and directed current decisions. <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> commended staff on the presentation of the policy and statement changes and suggested that if the zoning changes had been similarly outlined, decisions might have been more easily reached.

<u>Commissioner Griffith</u> asked when the General Plan recommendations would move forward to the City Council and Ms. Breese indicated September 7, 2010.

<u>Commissioner Free</u> noted that some Council members had been in attendance at some of the Planning Commission meetings and had thanked the Commissioner's for their hard work on the General Plan.

NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN ATTENDANCE: 16

ADJOURNMENT:

It was moved by <u>Commissioner Rodenhi</u> and seconded by <u>Commissioner Free</u> that the Planning Commission adjourn to the August 25, 2010 meeting. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote with <u>Commissioner Hain</u> absent. The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Arleen T. Pelster, AICP	Jack Rodenhi
Secretary	Chair

G: Comm Dev\Minutes-PC\2010\8-11-10