



<p>CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL Chair La Fevers called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.</p> <p>Commissioners Present: Jane L. Benefield John Callender Glenn La Fevers, Chair John Moyer</p> <p>Commissioners Absent: David Allen, Vice-Chair</p> <p>Others Present: Alexandra Barnhill, Deputy City Attorney Nick Bobroff, Associate Planner Jackie Campbell, Community Development Director Approximately eight interested persons</p>	<p>CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL</p>
<p>PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Chair La Fevers called for the flag salute.</p>	<p>PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</p>
<p>INTRODUCTIONS, PRESENTATIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS Community Development Director Jackie Campbell displayed photos of two stray dogs: a Chihuahua mix found near Carpinteria State Beach and a Shepherd/Terrier mix found near Casitas Pass/Foothill Road. She asked that anyone with information about the dogs contact City Hall.</p>	<p>PRESENTATIONS</p>
<p>CONSENT CALENDAR Minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held July 6, 2010.</p> <p>MOTION Upon a motion by Commissioner Benefield, seconded by Commissioner Callender, the Planning Commission voted 4-0 to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held on July 6, 2010.</p>	<p>CONSENT CALENDAR</p> <p>MOTION</p>
<p>PRESENTATIONS BY CITIZENS – None</p>	<p>PRESENTATIONS</p>
<p>NEW PUBLIC HEARING Project: Islands Apartments Remodel Planner: Nick Bobroff</p> <p>Hearing on the request of William Araluce, AIA, agent/architect for Barbara and Peter Coeler, to consider Case No. 10-1551-DP/CDP for approval of a Development Plan and Coastal Development Permit to complete a comprehensive interior and exterior remodel of the existing Islands Apartments complex and reduce the total number of units from eight to five under the provisions of the Planned Residential Development (PRD-20) Zone District; and to accept the Exemption pursuant to §15332 of the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. The application involves APN 003-483-007, addressed as 261 Linden Avenue.</p> <p>Associate Planner Nick Bobroff presented the staff report. He described the project and said the ARB had recommended preliminary approval with a few suggestions regarding the patio materials and landscaping. He provided an analysis of the parking, density, height and setbacks and said staff believes the project is consistent with General Plan policies. He said the project complies with the Storm Water Management Plan and is exempt from Development Impact Fees because it contains no new units.</p> <p>Mr. Bobroff answered the Commissioners’ questions. In response to a request for information about parking on Third Street, he explained that it was never permitted by the City or County and has never been legal. He said it will be</p>	<p>10-1551-DP/CDP</p>

removed and replaced with public parallel parking similar to the parking arrangement that exists elsewhere on Third Street.

Commissioner Benefield commented that she had an issue with rental units being demolished and asked about the Ellis Act. Mr. Bobroff pointed out that only one other unit is currently being occupied on a part-time basis, aside from the two units which are occupied by the owner.

Deputy City Attorney Alexandra Barnhill explained that the owner may take the units off the market for any reason and they do not have to be occupied by the owner.

Commissioner Benefield asked about the palm trees in front of the complex. Mr. Bobroff explained that the ARB will review the placement of the trees as part of the final design review and will make a recommendation to staff. He said the applicant is amenable to relocating the trees somewhere on the site.

Commissioner Benefield asked what would happen if the City does damage within the easement where the patios will be located. Mr. Bobroff clarified that there is no pipeline within the easement. He said the property owner would be responsible for replacing patios if damage occurred. Community Development Director Jackie Campbell added that Public Works can revoke an encroachment permit at any time.

Associate Planner Nick Bobroff answered more questions, providing details about the project, such as how the trash area will be located along the rear property line and how the existing setting has no striping with respect to parking. About whether there was any indication the owner might convert the units to condominiums, he said he had no knowledge of plans for a condominium conversion; the ground floor units would be used as rental units and the upstairs unit would be occupied by the owner.

Regarding whether the rooftop deck is addressed in the pending Specific Plan and is appropriate for the particular location, Community Development Director Jackie Campbell explained that there is nothing in the Downtown and Beach Neighborhood Specific Plan that addresses rooftop decks but there is a reduced height requirement for the two neighborhoods to a 26-foot maximum height. She said the project would not exceed that building height, even with the rooftop deck and pitched roof.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Chair La Fevers opened the public hearing at 6:12 p.m.

Bill Araluce, project architect, stated that the owners could not be present. He said the building, as is, exceeds requirements of the PRD-20 zone in terms of density and does not provide the required number of parking spaces and that reducing the density would bring it more in line with the density for that zone. He said the owners recognize it is a gateway to the beach area and want quality architecture and construction, and have chosen New England/Hampton style detailing. He said they want the Commission to consider the following changes: parking will be in the back of the structure with pathways along the sides of the building; storm water management will be addressed by a bio-retention basin on the southwest corner of the property; exterior decks are incorporated in order to expand the living area of the ground floor units.

In an attempt to reduce the intensity of use, Mr. Araluce said that four units on the second floor were being converted into one. Regarding the deck facing northwest, he said the intent was to look at the mountains and not the neighbors. He said the units are condominium-ready in terms of construction, but the intent is not to

convert them.

Upon questioning, Mr. Araluce stated that there is no intent in the future for condominium conversion. Regarding the palm trees, he said a location on the property was found (on the side) for them and they will be relocated onsite.

Eileen Marcussen, owner of 4977 Third Street, said that the trash bins are very close to the northeast corner of her property, making her property vulnerable to vermin infestation, odors, etc. She said there is currently a place onsite where they store their bins, which is closer to the applicant's structure, and she wants the bins moved as far away as possible from her property line. She expressed concern that the wall where the cars are to parallel park will be vulnerable and said parking is tight. She complained that the balconies on the west elevation look right onto her property. Upon questioning, she said the trash bins are less than nine feet from her front door.

Stephen Marcussen, owner of 4977 Third Street, said that notices regarding the project hearings were returned to the City. He expressed concern about flooding in the area, noting that last winter his yard flooded. He said his yard is lower than that of the project site, and he is very concerned about the detention basin being located on his property line, noting that water does not flow naturally to that area. He said the balconies are inconsistent with any new building in Carpinteria, with most being in the front and rear of buildings but not looking onto adjacent properties and into living rooms and bedrooms. About the parking, he questioned if there would be an exclusive handicapped spot. He said the rear deck leads to a loss of space of about five feet in the parking area. He questioned why there would be decks around the entire building, commenting that this is not Montana. He complained that trash bins located eight feet from his door will create odors, flies, rodents, etc. and said it would be nice if the applicant could locate the trash bins closer to the building. He questioned whether one of the parking spaces on Third Street would be legal because parking cannot occur within 25 feet of a stop sign. He said that the property is already substandard and not in compliance with requirements and yet it is being expanded even more.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Chair La Fevers closed the public hearing at 6:45 p.m. He then asked staff to respond to various issues, such as privacy, parking and the trash enclosure location.

Regarding privacy, Associate Planner Nick Bobroff explained that the project is in a multi-family district and there is nothing in the Zoning Code or General Plan that requires or strongly encourages minimizing privacy impacts like there is for single-family zone districts. He said that no one at the ARB meeting raised concerns, and the ARB is not charged with looking at privacy impacts in the PRD district.

About the drainage, Mr. Bobroff explained that the applicant had the rear of the property surveyed and spot elevations suggested drainage occurs toward the property line where the swale is located.

Chair La Fevers suggested a raised edge on the rear property line to ensure water flows toward the swale.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Moyer whether the newly configured parking spaces parallel to the property line are legal as to size, Mr. Bobroff explained that they meet zoning standards in terms of dimension and placement, but the spaces would need additional buffering between them. He said the layout needs some adjustment.

Mr. Bobroff addressed the issue of the trash enclosure location. He said the enclosure is outside of all setbacks and acceptable from a zoning perspective. He said Public Works confirmed that its proposed location did not create a vision or safety clearance hazard.

Commissioner Benefield stated that she agrees that the trash enclosure should be moved closer to the building where it is generated. She said she would not vote for the project if the trash issue is not settled. She asked whether the deck facing the parking lot can be pulled in a few feet. She highly recommended a block wall between the project site and the neighboring property. She described the project as attractive and a real improvement to the neighborhood. She said she likes the roof deck and has no problem with the front yard easement. She would go with approval if the smaller issues are resolved, she said.

Commissioner Callender asked if the deck constitutes an enlargement and if it could be argued that it makes parking worse.

Mr. Bobroff explained that the new deck on the rear elevation would fit within the building envelope. He noted that there are six onsite parking spaces provided and the reduction in the density of units will reduce the demand for parking.

Commissioner Callender said he concurs with a lot of Commissioner Benefield's comments and the deck and parking issues are his main concerns.

Commissioner Moyer said he is not happy with the trash situation and wants it worked out. He said it would be more appropriate for a cinderblock wall between properties. He said he has no issue with the deck, noting that the community is tight. He described the project as a huge improvement and enhancement, a gateway that can also be seen from the beach, and that he would accept it other than with the trash and parking.

Chair La Fevers said he likes the project and it is a significant improvement. He said a reduction in intensity of use is not seen often, and overall it is good for the community, though it needs some work in a few areas. Regarding the privacy, parking and trash enclosure location, he suggested that the most efficient thing to do is to ask the applicant for continuation of the item so that there is ample opportunity to work problems out.

PUBLIC HEARING RE-OPENED

Chair La Fevers re-opened the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Bill Araluce said there was no problem with relocating the trash enclosure to a suitable location for both parties and that he is certain the applicant would be amenable to constructing a masonry wall on the property line (or on their property). He added that they will be flexible and work with the neighbor. He said he does not see the parking as an issue, that it is legal and conforming. Regarding the drainage, he said some minor adjustments with new paving can be made to create better flow to the back area. About the privacy, he explained that the rear deck architecturally affords shading potential, noting it is a sea of asphalt out there. He stated that the deck faces the neighbor's front yard and the street and not the neighbor's backyard private area, with the intent to capture mountain views. He pointed out that the intensity of occupancy of the second floor will be reduced, accommodating only one household as opposed to four under the current configuration.

In response to a question from Commissioner Benefield whether the rear deck can be made narrower, Mr. Araluce said that the area between the stairway and entrance can be reduced to three to four feet, and the length going towards the west can be three to four feet, but to obtain use out of the rear deck at least five



feet is needed. Benefield commented that the whole thing is one big deck.

Stephen Marcussen stated that there is a masonry fence bordering the two properties and he believes it is his, because it is in keeping with the structure of his home. He explained that there is a green wall, a masonry wall and a proposed new wall, and 14 inches would be taken off of the property to accommodate the new wall. He said he would like the parking as it is today, with the cars pulling under the balconies. He said a six-foot masonry wall is pretty ugly and asked if a concession could be made for a green wall instead of more concrete.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
 Chair La Fevers closed the public hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Commissioner Callender stated that with respect to the privacy issue, he could see the issue both ways. He said overall the benefits outweigh his concerns and it is a big improvement in terms of the east facing portion. He agreed with Chair La Fevers' comments and supports his strategy for a continuance, that a little more thought should be given before final action. He said he would be inclined to vote favorably with changes made to the trash enclosure and the parking. He said his preference is to continue the item to the next meeting.

RECESS
 Chair La Fevers called a recess at 7:37 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:42 p.m.

Commissioner Moyer said he would approve the project with conditions, noting that he heard that the applicant would relocate the trash enclosure, change the width of the deck and correct the parallel parking spaces.

Commissioner Benefield stated that due to the confusion over the notification and the issues the neighbors brought up, the Commission should get a clean report, with the conditions delineated for their next meeting.

Commissioner La Fevers noted that there is a consensus for the item to come back to the Planning Commission. He said the details would be best worked out by the applicant and that the issues are clear. He reviewed the issues: relocation of the trash enclosure and clarity about the structure itself; parking worked out with staff and the applicant, with the spaces meeting code requirements; the type of fence at the property line; and the privacy issues related to the deck. He suggested that the west facing decks be looked at, with changes that can reduce the privacy issues, such as possibly eliminating walkways between the decks. Regarding the run-off, he said slight changes in elevation on the west side might be beneficial to all.

MOTION
 Commissioner Callender moved and Commissioner Benefield seconded that they continue the Island Apartments remodel item to the September 7th hearing. Motion was passed 3-1 (Moyer opposed).

MATTERS PRESENTED BY COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Callender asked for a status report on Tomol Park, which is across from the project. Community Development Director Jackie Campbell reported that the Parks Department is seeking bids and is in the selection process for choosing a contractor. She said they are working on obtaining grant money to fund the trail component.

Commissioner Benefield asked for a status report on the Skate Park. Ms. Campbell suggested that Benefield check with Matt Roberts, Parks Director. She said representatives from the park came to a recent City Council meeting and were asking the City Council to acquire property. Commissioner Moyer added that the

MATTERS PRESENTED



<p>Skate Park is in the middle of fundraising efforts and a successful fundraiser took place at the Contemporary Arts Forum.</p>	
<p>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</p> <p>a. Distributed Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Action Minutes of the Architectural Review Board meetings of July 1 and July 15, 2010 ii. City calendar for the month of August 2010 iii. Community Development Project Status Report as of July 29, 2010 iv. Construction Permit Report as of July 29, 2010 <p>Community Development Director Jackie Campbell distributed the standard information and reported that there would be no second City Council meeting in August.</p>	<p>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT – 8:00 p.m.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Secretary, Planning Commission</p> <p>ATTEST:</p> <p>_____ Chair, Planning Commission</p>	<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>