

# ***Lompoc City Council Agenda Item***



**City Council Meeting Date:** November 1, 2005

**TO:** Gary P. Keefe, City Administrator

**FROM:** Lucille T. Breese, AICP, City Planner  
[l\\_breese@ci.lompoc.ca.us](mailto:l_breese@ci.lompoc.ca.us)

**SUBJECT:** Transmittal of Chamber of Commerce Sign Ordinance Comments  
(Planning Division File No. TA 05-01).

---

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the City Council:

- 1) Receive and review the comments from the Lompoc Chamber of Commerce Sign Subcommittee;
- 2) Receive and review the staff response to comments;
- 3) Direct staff to proceed with an update and re-formatting of the existing Sign Ordinance, incorporating policy direction from the Council;
- 4) Direct staff to return the revised Sign Ordinance to the Planning Commission for public hearing(s);
- 5) Direct staff to proceed with revisions to the existing Zoning Ordinance for Mixed Use Development Standards, Conditional Use Permit for Existing Uses and Facilities, as outlined in the staff report; and
- 6) Direct staff to pay the consultant for work performed on the Development Code to date and terminate the balance of the contract.

## **BACKGROUND:**

As previously reported, since the January 25, 2005 joint City Council/Planning Commission workshop was held to review the draft Sign Ordinance, staff was awaiting response from the Chamber subcommittee before scheduling the Sign Ordinance at the Planning Commission for public hearing.

## **DISCUSSION:**

Comments on the current City Sign Ordinance were received from the Chamber Subcommittee on September 14, 2005 (Attachment No. 1). Staff has reviewed the comments and made preliminary responses (Attachment No. 2). There are some changes that the Subcommittee has requested that staff believes are policy issues and those have been identified in the preliminary responses. Generally, the comments should be referred to the Planning Commission for public hearing and discussion prior to recommendations being forwarded to the Council.

## **DEVELOPMENT CODE STATUS:**

No additional work has been done on the Development Code due to the level of development activity that is consistently being processed by the Planning staff. It is anticipated that the current workload will continue for some time at the intense level we are experiencing. We are proposing the following steps to address immediate areas of concern with the existing Zoning Ordinance:

- A Text Amendment allowing existing uses and facilities to be expanded and updated with a Conditional Use Permit. This would allow the Planning Commission flexibility in applying the current development standards on a case-by-case basis.
- A Text Amendment to establish Mixed Use Development Standards. This would provide clear standards to allow Mixed Use development to proceed as indicated in the General Plan.
- An update to the City Zoning Map to assure conformance with the General Plan Land Use designation. This would alleviate the need for an individual property owner to have to process a Zone Change if the property is inconsistent with the General Plan Land Use designation.

There may be additional areas that the staff brings forward for consideration during this process to address changes that have occurred in State Law since the Zoning Ordinance was adopted. Such items would be clearly identified and the Council and Commission would review for adequacy prior to adoption. This update could be done as a part of the current staff work program as time permits.

If the Council chooses to direct staff to proceed in this direction, it is recommended that staff also be directed to terminate the contract with Crawford Multari Clark which was signed in November of 1999 for \$82,000 and amended in May of 2000 to have the consultant provide work on the Boardinghouse Text Amendment. To date the City has paid out \$14,520 with a balance remaining of \$73,680. There would be some funds due to the consultant for work that was done on the draft Sign Ordinance in December of 2004. A comprehensive update of the Zoning Ordinance could be performed in the future if the intensity of development activity reduces.

---

Lucille T. Breese, AICP, City Planner

**Attachments:**

1. Chamber Subcommittee Comments received September 14, 2005
2. Staff Response to Comments

**APPROVED FOR SUBMITTAL TO THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR:**

---

Arleen T. Pelster, AICP, Community Development Director

**APPROVED FOR SUBMITTAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL:**

---

Gary P. Keefe, City Administrator