

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of March 13, 2006

Attachment No. 3
City Council Staff Report
CUP 05-06 – Transitions Appeal
May 16, 2006

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:

3. CUP 05-06 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

A request by Frank Thompson, representing Santa Barbara Housing Assistance Corporation, for Planning Commission consideration of a proposal for a Conditional Use Permit to allow operation of a community counseling and advocacy office including a 39 unit independent living facility for mentally disabled individuals and other low income persons. The facility is proposed at 513 North G Street (Assessor Parcel Number 87-192-19 & -20) in the Central Business (C-2) Zoning District. A Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

City Planner Lucille Breese summarized the written staff report.

Detliev Peikert of Peikert Group Associates provided a PowerPoint presentation to the Commission.

Frank Thompson, Santa Barbara Housing Authority - provided additional information to the PowerPoint presentation.

PUBLIC HEARING OPEN

Public Hearing opened at 7:04 p.m.

Public Hearing closed at 7:31 p.m.

Frank Ricceri, Transitions – introduced himself and invited questions about the project.

Leroy Scolari, resident - stated that he is concerned with transient clients in the facility and requested the adoption of a condition to prevent loitering. Mr. Scolari indicated concern with individuals, who are not residents, loitering in the area.

Jim Small, owner of At Home Senior Services – indicated that he believes the proposal does not meet the current zoning standards; expressed concern with lack of parking; noted the lack of a recreation area for residents; and although he commended the idea of the project, he requested an alternate site be utilized.

Tom Piteo, property owner – indicated his ownership of office buildings to the west of the proposed site and noted his current tenants had expressed concern with the project. Mr. Piteo stated that the alley between the two sites is congested, unsafe, and historically dangerous at night. He is concerned that the placement of the project in this location will result in tenants leaving his building and a loss of rental income. Mr. Piteo presented a petition to the Commission containing 24 signatures opposing the site of this project. Mr. Piteo stated his approval of the project and but not in this location.

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of March 13, 2006

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:

3. CUP 05-06 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Page 2

Karen Orsua, owner of Tower Financial Services – indicated similar concerns of prior speakers and opposes the project at the proposed site.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Commissioner Harman asked Mr. Thompson if there were legal descriptions of mentally challenged individuals and Mr. Thompson indicated affirmatively. Commissioner Harman asked Mr. Thompson the type of client to be housed in the proposed project. Mr. Thompson stated the typical diagnosis of proposed clients, noted that the facility is not State licensed, and is proposed for adults only. Commissioner Harman asked if the project would have on-site managers and Mr. Thompson stated there would be resident managers. He also indicated that staff receives 40 hours of training, that some clients are offered staff services 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and that an on-site manager may provide additional guidance. Commissioner Harman asked how medication is distributed among the clientele and Mr. Thompson indicated that most clients go to Outpatient health clinics or local pharmacies.

Commissioner Harman asked if clients may live with married partners or significant others and Mr. Thompson stated yes, that the project anticipated 5 1-bedroom units to be occupied by 'couples'. Commissioner Harman asked if deterrents are placed on third floor windows for clientele safety and Mr. Thompson indicated that counseling supports are in place, windows will be enclosed, and a safe exit provided.

Commissioner Harman asked Mr. Granger about restrictions to whom low-income units can be rented. Mr. Granger indicated that any restrictions would be noted within the leases. Commissioner Harman asked where the setback is measured from and Ms. Breese replied it was the foundation.

Commissioner Harman asked about landscaping requirements and Ms. Breese indicated that the project is zoned *Central Business (C2)* and does not require open space for the residential portion.

Commissioner Harman commented that the project appears more as an apartment building than a commercial building. Ms. Breese indicated that the first floor of the project, as stated by the applicant, would be utilized as counseling and management offices.

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of March 13, 2006

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:

3. CUP 05-06 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Page 3

Commissioner Grames-Lyra asked if the facility would provide for elderly patrons and Mr. Ricceri indicated negatively. Commissioner Grames-Lyra asked if the facility would provide for the physically handicapped, long-term. Mr. Ricceri indicated that occupancy would be based on a monthly lease, with possible reconsideration based on adverse behavior incidents or an increase of income.

Commissioner Grames-Lyra asked if work training and recreation (TV and/or computer) would be provided. Mr. Ricceri stated affirmatively, that the recreation area would include lounge furniture and some exercise equipment. Commissioner Grames-Lyra asked if 'long term' with a hotel stay is the same as a month-to-month lease. Ms. Breese discussed the distinction between differing types of community being served.

Commissioner Ruhge asked Mr. Ricceri if clientele would be restricted to the building during the evening. Mr. Ricceri stated negatively and that this type of client typically tends to isolate themselves and generally fears external areas.

Commissioner Fink asked if clientele will be from the local community and Mr. Thompson indicated affirmatively. Commissioner Fink stated that the project looks to be a hotel with a conference room, offering more security. Commissioner Fink indicated that there are subtle differences between a care facility, boarding house, and a hotel with a conference room. Commissioner Fink asked if a condition could be added to revisit and reduce the number of parking spaces if the use changes. Ms. Breese indicated parking should be discussed. Commissioner Fink indicated his basic approval of the project.

Commissioner Rodenhi indicated that the parking use is questionable, commended the appearance of the project, and the validity of neighboring commercial property owner concerns.

Commissioner Harman asked if the project provides transportation for clientele to appointments and shopping. Mr. Ricceri indicated affirmatively. Commissioner Harman stated that the project is an apartment complex, is poorly developed, and does not fit the zoning. Commissioner Harman indicated that the building is too massive for the area, stated that the parking is not adequate, and expressed a desire to protect current residents. Commissioner Harman approves of the building and project but not at this location and stated he will not support the project.

Excerpt from the Lompoc Planning Commission Meeting of March 13, 2006

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:

3. CUP 05-06 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Page 4

Commissioner Grames-Lyra indicated her support of the project. Commissioner Harman reminded the Commission of previous denied projects (with demonstrated community needs) due to parking issues.

It was moved by Commissioner Ruhge and seconded by Commissioner Grames-Lyra that the Planning Commission certify the Mitigated Negative Declaration and adopt Resolution No. 474 (06) approving the proposal based upon the Finding of Fact in the Resolution and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Harman indicated that the Resolution contains a blank space for parking spaces and will not support the motion. Ms. Breese stated that the Resolution had been amended to add 31 parking spaces to the project.

The motion failed on a roll call vote of 3-2 with Commissioner Fink, Commissioner Harman, and Commissioner Rodenhi voting no.

It was moved by Commissioner Fink and seconded by Commissioner Harman that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 474 (06) denying the project. The motion passed on a roll call vote of 3-2 with Commissioner Ruhge and Commissioner Grames-Lyra voting no.

Ms. Pelster provided appeal instructions to the applicant.

Mr. Thompson asked the Commission to clarify if the project failed due to design or site placement. Commissioner Rodenhi stated that a residential project in a commercial zone results in greater impacts to the surrounding area. Commissioner Fink indicated he is supportive of the project but not in a C2 zone.

PETITION TO STOP THE 513 AND 519 N. G STREET 39 UNIT BUILDING

I do not want the City of Lompoc to approve plans for the above 39 unit building, with 31 parking spaces, for mentally disabled and low-income tenants.

3 - 9 - 0 6

	<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
1.	Mingo	518 N H Street
2.	[Signature]	514 N. H St.
3.	Jamel Small	514 N H St, Ste B
4.	Sherry Hammonds	514 N. H. St. Ste. B.
5.	Kao Van Jones	514 N. H St Ste B.
6.	Kristi Decirido	516 N. H St, Lompoc
7.	Reyna DePrater	518 N. H. St. Lompoc
8.	Ethel Johnson	518. B no. H St Lompoc
9.	[Signature]	514 A North H. St. Lompoc
10.	Ana [Signature]	518 N H Lompoc
11.	JAMES JUNIOUS	213 S 3rd St Lompoc

12.

NAME

ADDRESS

13. Emil Rifes 200 E. College Ave Lompoc Ca 93436
14. Augusta 116 e College Ave Suite A Lompoc, CA 93436
15. Bob Scantar 116 e College Ave
16. Jim Reese 1204 EAST NORTH AVE.
17. Nat Bodony 420 So HAWTHORNE
18. Myma Senak 528 W. H' St.
19. Jose Padella 518 A H' St.
20. John Mosey 115 E. College Ave. Ste 1
Lompoc, CA 93430
21. Cindy Allerting 115 E. College Ave Ste 1
Lompoc CA 93430
22. Scott W. Dunn 115 E. College, Lompoc. CA
93436
23. Judith A. Pison 115 E. College
Lompoc CA 93436
24. Alvin 203 E Olsen 93432
- 25.