



**PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, AUGUST 25, 2008**

6:00 P.M.
City Hall
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California

Members of the Planning Commission

*Kenneth Knight, Chair
Brent Daniels, Vice Chair
Edward Easton
Doris Kavanagh
Julie Kessler Solomon*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk
Scott Porter, Legal Counsel*

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by Chair Knight followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Planning Commissioners Daniels, Easton, Kavanagh, Knight, and Solomon.
Absent: None.

Staff present: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, Legal Counsel Scott Porter, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

PUBLIC FORUM

No speakers.

AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A.1 Planning Commission Minutes for August 11, 2008.

Recommendation:

Approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes for August 11, 2008.

MOTION: Vice Chair Daniels moved/Commissioner Easton seconded, to approve Planning Commission meeting minutes for August 11, 2008, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

B. PUBLIC HEARING

B.1 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043.

Recommendation:

1. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 08-__ (Attachment 1), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta Approving the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (07-MND-004) and Accepting the Addendum Dated August 15, 2008 to the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Adopting CEQA Findings and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Citrus Village Project; 7388 Calle Real, APN 077-490-043".
2. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 08-__ (Attachment 2), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta Approving a Vesting Tentative Track Map (TM 32,027) for Condominium Purposes, a Final Development Plan, and a Road Naming Application for the Citrus Village Project, Case No. 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN; 7388 Calle Real, APM 077-490-043".

Staff Speakers:

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller

Legal Counsel Scott Porter

Site visits: Made by Commissioners Daniels, Easton, Kavanagh, Knight and Solomon.

Ex-parte conversations: Vice Chair Daniels reported that Detlev Peikert, applicant, called him last week to see if he had any questions. Commissioner Kavanagh reported she met with Detlev Peikert and Lisa Plowman. Commissioner Easton stated that he received an e-mail from Karen Lovelace which he believes was sent to all Commissioners. Chair Knight reported that he met with Lisa Plowman over the weekend.

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller presented the staff report and PowerPoint entitled "City of Goleta Planning Commission, August 25, 2008, Citrus Village Project, 7388 Calle Real". She presented a document entitled "Citrus Village – Revised Conditions" with regard to Conditions of Approval #3 and #48.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 6:37 P.M.

Documents: 1) E-mail from Bill Pertsulakes, Manager, Padre Shopping Center, dated August 25, 2008. 2) "Brookside Condo Stats – 37 Units Total" submitted by Karen

Lovelace. 3) E-mail from Karen Lovelace dated August 25, 2008, subject: Citrus Village Comments, with attachments including photographs. 4) Five photographs submitted by Karen Lovelace on August 25, 2008. 4) Comments submitted by Ingeborg Cox, MD, August 25, 2008. 5) Comments for the August 25, 2008, Planning Commission Meeting from Barbara Massey.

Lisa Plowman, Planning Manager with Peikert Group Architects, applicant, presented the plans and PowerPoint. With regard to parking, she stated that there will be a requirement in the CC&Rs requiring that the residents must use their garages for their cars. Detlev Peikert, applicant, responded to questions from the Commissioners.

RECESS HELD FROM 7:25 P.M. to 7:32 P.M.

Speakers

Dr. Ingeborg Cox, MD, Goleta, read her written comments, which were submitted for the record, expressing concerns with regard to the proposed project. She expressed concern that the health of the future residents should be top consideration and demanded accurate up-to-date data before going forward on the project. She questioned why story poles were not installed for this project.

Gary Vandeman, Goleta, El Encanto area, spoke in opposition to the proposed project, stating that it is an inappropriate, visually attractive, market rate project on a site with a prior proposed low-income housing project that was inappropriate and unattractive. He expressed concern with regard to potential parking problems, stating that the size of the project is too much for the site. He suggested that it would be more appropriate to zone the site for Neighborhood Commercial use.

Barbara Massey, Goleta, read her written comments, which were submitted for the record, expressing concerns with regard to the proposed project. She stated that the proposed project has a number of shortcomings, but limited her comments to two concerns: a) the FARs which she believes are too high for the small site and exceed the standards; and b) the modifications which she believes are excessive. She also expressed concern with regard to the lack of setbacks on the western property boundaries. She requested that the problems with the project be addressed before the project is approved.

Earl Lovelace, representing El Encanto neighborhood, expressed concern that the proposed project would be enormously oversized. He read an e-mail from Bill Pertsulakes, Manager, Padre Shopping Center, dated August 25, 2008, which was submitted for the record. The e-mail indicated that the Padre Shopping Center owner hopes that any improvements of the vacant land would not block any visual exposure of existing tenants by passing traffic that would hinder their business.

Karen Lovelace, Goleta, stated that she has been following the proposals for this site for approximately eight years and provided a brief history. She expressed concern that the project is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, stating that the project is too tall and too massive, with units twice the size of adjacent condominium units at Brookside. She also expressed concern that it would be difficult to park two

cars in the garages because of the turning angles. She commented that the proposed project is the first project to be approved by the City that would be placed inside a neighborhood.

Bill Shelor, Goleta, stated that he believes the proposed project has a few challenges evidenced by the number of modifications requested. He commented: 1) The City needs more work force housing located close to arterials. 2) Questioned whether the proposed in lieu fee is equivalent to providing a unit of workforce housing, stating that the Planning Commission has discretion for determination of the in lieu fee amount. 3) The wide angle computer simulations distort the actual visual impacts on the viewshed. 4) This proposed project is another example of the need for the DRB and Planning Commission collaboration on conceptual review.

Commissioner Solomon commented that the project is beautiful and comparable to the projects shown by the applicant in terms of its quality and elegance. Her concerns are that the proposed housing development sets up conflict in the community and conflicts between the potential residents. She commented: 1) With regard to impacts, she does not believe that because houses were built adjacent to Highway 101 in the past necessarily justifies placing more residents adjacent to the highway. 2) Although parking requirements are met, the parking in these types of neighborhoods is usually inadequate, which will cause disputes. 3) There is no room for any overflow parking, noting that no parking is allowed on Calle Real. 4) It is not appropriate for children to be playing in a tot lot next to a bar; and a six-foot wall is not adequate separation. There may be conflicts between the parents and the owners of the adjacent property and bar, who are business owners whose interests need to be considered also. 5) From her experience driving past the site in the mornings, there is quite a lot of traffic, especially people going to and from the high school. This area of the roadway is of special concern, particularly with the students and the glare from the sun. 6) The courtyard driveways will probably be used more heavily, with residents who work, which may set up a traffic situation where there would be conflict. 7) Closing windows and using air ventilation systems to provide a wholesome interior while there are energy constraints does not seem to be a "green" solution. 8) Expressed concern regarding whether the City's in lieu fees are adequate to help fund affordable housing.

Commissioner Easton expressed concern that there are a couple of problems that he believes have not been addressed satisfactorily which include: a) the adjacency of the tot lot to the bar located on the commercial property; b) noise; c) the impact of light from the adjacent commercial property on the westward facing bedrooms, noting that the 7-Eleven store is open all night and the bar is open until 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights; and d) parking and interior traffic concerns which need to be resolved, for example, guest parking and the courtyard design. He believes that studying how to resolve the problems might produce a better design. He noted that the suggestion in a letter from Karen Lovelace to redesign the site plan to accommodate parking on the west side of the property with a parking structure would buffer the adjacent commercial property and would seem to resolve many of the problems. He also commented: 1) A large amount of new data is now becoming known with regard to the long-term toxicity of hydrocarbons, which was not known several years ago when houses and schools were sited. 2) This project is an urban design set in a fairly rural

environment next to a small strip shopping center, stating that both the project and the site are unique. 3) The specificity shown in the staff report is appreciated.

Commissioner Kavanagh stated that while she appreciates the design and uniqueness of the proposed project, she believes there are some items that need restudy particularly with regard to the parking and overflow. She does not believe parking is sufficient even though it meets the requirements. She agreed with Commissioner Solomon's concern with regard to the potential for conflict in the neighborhood. She expressed concern that Calle Real needs to have proper striping to facilitate turning into the project safely.

Vice Chair Daniels commented that he noticed that all of the proposed units have three bedrooms, and that while the unit size is perhaps an appropriate unit size, there is no mix of unit size in the project.

Chair Knight stated that he has similar concerns with regard to the site that were expressed by the Commissioners and he believes that the project could be better. He commented: 1) Parking is an issue that needs to be addressed. 2) This project would have benefited from earlier conceptual review. 3) He believes that there will be more courtyard style development projects for this area in the future.

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved to continue 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043, and request that the applicant submit a redesign which resolves the problems that have been identified.

Lisa Plowman, agent for the applicant, requested a five minute recess for the applicant to consider options with regard to the project.

RECESS HELD FROM 8:40 P.M. TO 8:45 P.M.

Lisa Plowman, agent, requested a two-week continuation for the applicant to study issues raised at the hearing and return for a work session with conceptual drawings. She stated that during the work session, if the redesign will not resolve the concerns, or if the project is not viable or feasible, the applicant would probably request denial by the Planning Commission.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase recommended that forty-five minutes be allocated for the work session. He stated that if the redesign is acceptable, the project would move forward with the review process; or, if the project will not work, the findings for denial would need to be approved at a subsequent meeting.

AMENDED

MOTION Commissioner Easton moved/seconded by Commissioner Kavanagh to continue 04-226-TM, -DP, -RN: Citrus Village Project located at 7388 Calle Real; APN 077-490-043, to September 8, 2008, keeping the public hearing open.

VOTE: Motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

C. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller reported that the next regular Planning Commission meeting is September 8, 2008. The next joint workshops between the Planning Commission and Design Review Board on building intensity standards will be held on September 15, 2008.

D. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Chair Knight stated that he made comments at the City Council meeting on August 19, 2008, with regard to the interest in providing conceptual review of projects by the Planning Commission.

E. ADJOURNMENT: 8:55 P.M.

Prepared by Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

GOLETA PLANNING COMMISSION